



Universiteit
Leiden

The Netherlands

Introduction: the language of inclusion and exclusion in the context of immigration and integration

Schrover, M.L.J.C.; Schinkel, W.

Citation

Schrover, M. L. J. C., & Schinkel, W. (2014). Introduction: the language of inclusion and exclusion in the context of immigration and integration. *Ethnic And Racial Studies*, 36(7), 1123-1141. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/58664>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/58664>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



Ethnic and Racial Studies

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rers20>

Introduction: the language of inclusion and exclusion in the context of immigration and integration

Marlou Schrover & Willem Schinkel

Published online: 08 May 2013.

To cite this article: Marlou Schrover & Willem Schinkel (2013) Introduction: the language of inclusion and exclusion in the context of immigration and integration, Ethnic and Racial Studies, 36:7, 1123-1141, DOI: [10.1080/01419870.2013.783711](https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783711)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.783711>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly

forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at [http://
www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions](http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions)

Introduction: the language of inclusion and exclusion in the context of immigration and integration

Marlou Schrover and Willem Schinkel

(First submission October 2012; First published April 2013)

Abstract

When migrant status and citizenship are defined by means of state categories, the language of inclusion and exclusion is key to an understanding of their contemporary shape and historical transformation. This introductory article provides an overview of some of the most relevant concepts in the discourse analysis of in- and exclusion, specifically with a view to the functioning of nation-state categories. It discusses forms of discursive problematization, such as defining, claiming, legitimizing, expanding, sensationalization and suggestion, and it connects these to the discursive drawing of boundaries discussed by the authors contributing to this issue. They focus on discursive constructions of ‘illegality’, race, class, gender, immigrant integration and transnationalism. We argue that, as state categorizations continuously differ, both the historical analysis of their genesis, functioning and transformation and the contemporary analysis of their effectuation in practices are crucial to an understanding of in- and exclusion.

Keywords: immigration; citizenship; inclusion/exclusion; discourse analysis; problematization; categorization.

Introduction

This special issue focuses on the language of inclusion and exclusion in the context of migration. The leading question relates to the functionality of the discourse. Categorizations, words and phrases are constantly renewed with the intention to exclude (mostly) or to include (rarely) (Fischer, this issue). Society is defined so as to automatically exclude certain categories of people (Schinkel, this

issue). Constructions differ according to class, gender and ethnicity (Bouras, this issue). Problematization in one domain (the academic for instance) is not necessarily mirrored by problematization in another domain (political). Transnationalism, for instance, has retained its semi-neutral connotation in academic debates, while in non-academic debates the term is hardly used, but the 'ties' it refers to are problematized (Bouras, this issue).

The articles in this issue concern discourses of alterity and the construction of society through the binary opposition with migrants (Schinkel), redefinitions of citizenship in the context of decolonization (Laarman), state practices of classification and exclusion (De Genova and Fischer), the discursive labelling of refugees (Walaardt) and the shifting meanings of transnationalism (Bouras). In all cases, the contributions focus on the language of inclusion and exclusion, and highlight the practices through which discourses are effectuated. They do so in different contexts, ranging from state deportation centres to bureaucratic institutions and from state borders to academic research. Equally, in all cases they highlight the productive aspects of discourses, that is, the way discourses produce objects of problematizations that legitimate policies and practices of in- and exclusion.

The sections below first present some overall theoretical notions with the aim of drawing attention away from how language is used, and towards the functionality of discourse. For example, western feminists have eagerly bought into the construction of 'Third-World women' as 'powerless', 'exploited' and 'sexually harassed' women who were automatically and necessarily defined as religious and family oriented (Mohanty 1988). Their victimization was instrumental to the construction of a counter identity of 'western' women, who were modern and emancipated, and everything else these 'Third-World women' were not (Doezema 2001). The second section looks at the phases within the process of problematization, and the third looks at how and why boundaries between categories are continually redrawn.

Discourse theory

In discourse theory the word *discourse* does not refer to the language used to describe a social reality (as it does in discourse analysis), but to systems of relational identities (Sutherland 2005). Discourses emerge through the process of articulation in which so-called nodal points give a discourse stability and coherence. A nodal point is the point within the discourse in terms of which other meaning is defined (Laclau and Mouffe 1985; Hawkins 2009). The nation can be used as a nodal point and thus becomes the central reference point around which competing political projects are structured and in terms of

which political demands are articulated ('national interest' or to 'the good of the nation'). From a discourse theoretical perspective, the function of *nation* is not only to structure social relations, but also to provide a source of political legitimacy (Billig 1995; Calhoun 1997). Discourses are crucial to problematizations, as they refer, in the words of Howarth (2000, p. 9), to 'historically specific systems of meaning which form the identities of subject and objects'.

For their existence, discourses depend on the elements that they exclude. The homogenization of the nation, for instance, can only be obtained in and through the discursive construction of 'enemies of the nation', who are simultaneously outside and inside the nation (Torfinn 1999). Discourses use the logic of equivalence and the logic of difference. Within the logic of equivalence, chains are created that deny differences (Laclau and Mouffe 1985). The construction of the nation requires the construction of an alternative chain of equivalence in which certain enemies combine to conspire against the nation. The formation of chains of equivalence results in the emergence of discourses as coherent and identifiable entities. Chains of equivalence make clear what an object is not, rather than what it is. They link issues to each other, thus constituting a field of problematization. In the colonial context, for instance, colonizers defined themselves by pointing out all characteristics in which they differed from the colonized, rather than the characteristics they shared as colonizers (Laarman, this issue).

Dislocations, which can be the result of events (decolonization, migration, arrival of a new group of refugees), may lead to reformulation of the discursive order (Laarman and Walaardt, this issue). Discourses compete with one another to become the dominant system of meaning within their discursive environment. Studying this competition, and events that lead to change, makes it possible to analyse relational identities. At the same time, certain concepts of problematizations – immigrant integration for instance (Schinkel, this issue) – can be so dominant that it is hard to think outside them. Struggles over legitimate meanings can hide from view the fact that a dominant frame exists underneath the struggles.

The situational, institutional and social contexts shape and affect discourses and discourses influence social and political reality. In other words, discourse constitutes social practice and is at the same time constituted by it. Through discourse, social actors constitute knowledge, situations and social roles, as well as identities and interpersonal and intra-group relations. Discursive acts are socially constitutive in a number of ways. They play a decisive role in the genesis, production and construction of certain social conditions, for instance the construction of national identities. They might perpetuate, reproduce

or justify a status quo, and are instrumental in transforming it (de Cillia et al. 1999).

Problematization

Discourses on migration issues focus on *problems* (van Dijk 1992). The conservative and right-wing press emphasize the problems that immigrants are seen to *create* (in housing, schooling, unemployment, crime), whereas the more liberal press (also) focuses on the problems that immigrants *have* (as a result of poverty, discrimination). This binary construction is reproduced in the distinction between migrant men, who cause problems, and migrant women, who have problems (Roggeband and Verloo 2007), or between being *a* risk (to the labour market or security) and being *at* risk (of being trafficked, ending up in prostitution, forced marriages, situations of domestic violence or as victims of honour killings) (Schrover 2009, 2010b).

Problematization is the process in which actors (academics, politicians, journalists, non-governmental organizations, lawyers or others) analyse a situation, define it as a problem, expand it by attaching issues to it or by exaggerating the number of people or the cost involved, and finally suggest a solution (Foucault 1984). Analysing problematization leads to questions like: what is seen as the problem, and who or what is seen as the cause? The process of problematization, in our view, is characterized by six phases: defining; claiming; legitimizing; expanding; and sensationalizing the problem, and suggestions regarding causes and consequences via the use of metaphors.

Defining

Problematization involves, in the first place, the construction of a *problem-subject*, that is, an *object of problematization*, which is marked through practices of categorization and classification (Billig 1995; Clausen 2004). It is usually accompanied by the introduction of a new term, which is subsequently stretched beyond useful. Endless discussions on definitions ensure that the 'problem' remains visible, adding to its importance.

Rather surprisingly, new concepts, such as transnationalism (Bouras, this issue), are frequently introduced into (academic) debates without reference to similar earlier concepts, such as the so-called marginal man of Park (1982). Park's marginal man – living in two worlds – was a favoured object of study from the 1930s until the 1980s. In the 1990s, the transnational migrant replaced him, but the differences between the two categories were not large. Lack of references to similar concepts is not (only) the result of insufficient

historical knowledge or knowledge of the literature. It is also part of a strategy to present the problems of the world of today as 'new' and 'unprecedented', which calls for new policies. Not in the least, such strategies figure in academic struggles for recognition, which are also struggles for means for research grants.

The introduction of a new term is called a critical intervention (Laclau 2005, p. 110) for which academics are frequently responsible. The reasons for choosing one term over another are mostly implicit, but never neutral. Words can have a negative or a positive connotation, and people make choices regarding the words they use. Classic examples are the choice between a 'freedom fighter' and a 'terrorist', and between an 'economic refugee' and a 'true refugee' (Walaardt, this issue). Use of the term 'transnational mothering' and absence of the term 'transnational fathering' indicates that absent (migrant) mothers are a problem, while absent fathers are not (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1997; Yeates 2004; Pajnik and Bajt 2010).

Claiming

Second, there is the claiming the problem: if it is 'our' problem, 'we' have to offer a solution. When the cause of the problem can be located outside society, it is no longer a problem of society (Schinkel, this issue). Claim makers can be politicians, journalists or lobbyists, who try to generate support for their protégés (Walaardt, this issue). Justification for the claim is used as a structure, for example in the case of special attention for minority crime, by referring to the 'truth' or the 'right to know'. Mockery, ridicule and appeal to common sense are frequently employed structures, when stressing that 'of course' today's problems cannot be compared to those of the past. Routine combinations of fairness on the one hand, and firmness, realism or pragmatism, on the other (Prins 2002) are used to emphasize that the problem is normal and abnormal at the same time. The rhetoric of fairness seeks to combine the humanitarian values of tolerance or hospitality with the common-sense values of 'realism'. Humanitarian aims are recognized, but at the same time rejected as too idealistic and, therefore, impractical. Reference to fairness also aims to mitigate negative implications of, for instance, a proposed legislation, such as limitations on immigration (van Dijk 1992).

The pendant of claiming a problem is denying it. While some issues or subjects are problematized, others are trivialized (Schrover 2011). Use of quotation marks is a subtle form of denial, down-toning and minimizing are explicit forms (van Dijk 1992).

Legitimizing

Third, the problem is legitimized; a step for which academics provide ammunition. Politicians who justify (controversial) policies do so by claiming that their actions were not only legal, but were also benefiting ‘the people’ and academically sound (Martín Rojo and van Dijk 1997). They emphasize normality and standing procedures: action was normal and hence legitimate (Fischer, this issue). They employ a consensus strategy – ‘we all agree there is a problem’ – and a strategy of comparison: reference is made to similar issues or policies. They stress the normality of policies in combination with the abnormality of circumstances, and the seriousness of the ‘threat’. They represent the Other in terms of threat to public order or to Us. Emphasizing that that action was pursued with great care is part of a positive self-presentation (Martín Rojo and van Dijk 1997). It is opposed to a negative other-presentation, for instance by systematically describing migrants as illegal, associating them with crime and violence, or representing them as victims (preferably of their own culture) (Walaardt, this issue). After emphasizing that the action was legal, careful, democratic, normal and (morally) acceptable, there is some recognition that it was not a ‘model’ solution, but it had nothing to do with intolerance or racism (Laarman, this issue). The Others are described in plural, as a homogenous group. No pejorative terms are used to describe Us while many are used to describe Them, and the reverse is true for positive associations. Euphemisms are used: expulsions or deportations are called ‘operation’ or ‘sending back’. Another stylistic tool is the use of medical, legal and bureaucratic jargon to show control and legitimacy (Fischer, this issue).

Politicians and other authorities, including academics, use a syntax that is formal and complex. They show a preference for long sentences and embedded clauses. This contributes to the bureaucratization of the discourse and legitimization of the problem. This is naturalized through the fact that influential institutional actors (including the academia) promote certain discourses and ignite their spread and acceptance, until it becomes increasingly difficult to think or talk outside dominant frames (Schinkel, this issue).

Expanding

Fourth, problematization involves the circumscription of a *field of problematization*, which delimits the scope of the discursive space in which problematization occurs (Schinkel and van Houdt 2010). In practice this involves the number of issues (e.g. housing, labour market, marriage regulation, cultural and religious convictions) that can be brought to bear upon problematized subjects.

Expansion makes use of 'tactical linkage', which clusters issues in negotiations as 'areas of joint gain', such as the linkage of social cohesion, safety, criminality and terrorism, to migration (Rhodes 1997; Betts 2006). Within text or speech, packets of organized conventional knowledge, called 'frames' or 'scripts', are commonly used. They are important determinants of the inferences necessary to understand words, sentences or sentence connections (van Dijk 1983). Frames or scripts are series of claims, topics or themes, strung together in a more or less coherent way, whereby some features of reality are highlighted and others obscured so as to tell a consistent story about problems, causes, moral implications and remedies (Entman 1996). The frames or scripts make text 'recognisable': they make it possible to omit part of the information, because it is an inherent part of the packet of knowledge, for instance about what is to the nation's interest or what is part of the nation's traditional values. Generally, there are many possible 'frames' to every story. Research has shown that cultural climate, economic interests and political contestation determine which frame becomes dominant (Scheufele 1999; van Gorp 2005; Bauder 2008a, 2008b; Horsti 2008; Matthes and Kohring 2008). Frames are especially pertinent in policy contexts, where they organize consent and legitimation. Schön and Rein (1994, p. 23) used the concept of frame reflection to study a variety of policy controversies. They understand it as referring to 'underlying structures of belief, perception and appreciation' that underlie policy positions.

Somewhat similar to the concept frame is that of *topos*, which literally means 'place' and is used as 'seat of arguments'. A *topos* is a system of public knowledge, a discursive resource in which one may find arguments for sustaining a conclusion. A *topos* is characterized by its social use in the political arena rather than by its formal properties. *Topoi* are general principles that support an argument without constituting the argument. They are the consensual, self-evident issues of a community – basic principles of human thought and conduct. *Topoi* vary according to time and place. They are often hyperbolic, lacking nuances. They are general in that they may be applied to many different situations rather than being limited to specific situations at specific moments. A *topos* can exist simultaneously alongside its opposite. *Topoi* are supportive strategic tools. They are the socially shared beliefs underlying and (discursively) informing argumentative moves, thus rendering them more effective. It is their effectiveness as tools of persuasion that make *topoi* attractive to politicians (van der Valk 2003).

In research on problematizations of migration, four *topoi* have been identified (Bauder 2008a, 2008b): economic, humanitarian, endangering and cultural. Cutting across the *topoi* is the portrayal of migrant men as a threat and women as victims (Schrover 2009, 2010b). In the

economic topos the emphasis can either be on the benefit of migrants to the host society (mostly as workers), or migrants can be portrayed as competitors in the labour market and as persons likely to become a public charge. The humanitarian topos is used in a comparative sense: no country wants to be accused of being less humanitarian than neighbouring countries, but no country wants to attract migrants with too much humanitarianism either. The endangering topos presents migrants as a threat to social order, cohesion, sovereignty and security. The cultural topos presents migrants as fundamentally different from the 'home' population. This can be seen as an asset, but it is usually presented as a problem.

Expansion of the problem thus takes place via strategic linkages, clustering of arguments in frames and embedding in systems of public knowledge (topoi). Expansion furthermore makes use of the numbers game: exaggeration of the number of people involved or the costs (Schrover 2009, 2010b). The endless speculations about the number of 'illegal' migrants, or the number of asylum seekers that might still arrive (Walaardt, this issue), are examples of this. Unfounded but seemingly precise estimates are key to the numbers game. The numbers game is not just that of semantic precision as one may expect in official discourse, but also to suggest factuality of the representation and hence credibility of the speaker. Precision is provided to contrast or mask missing or vague information. This rhetorical contrast has its semantic counterpart in the variation of so-called levels of description (general versus specific), and the relative completeness of such descriptions (many or few details mentioned). Rhetorical and semantic contrasts function within the overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. 'Our' good actions are described at a low, specific level, with many details, whereas 'our' controversial actions are either ignored or described at a fairly abstract level (and in euphemistic terms) and with few details. Only legitimate forces and legitimate social groups have the right to an authorized discourse.

Sensationalization

In fifth place, there is the sensationalization, spectaclization and personification of the 'problem' (De Genova, this issue). Problematisation by the media frequently makes use of pseudo-events (Boorstin 1961/1992) and moral panics (Cohen 1980), which create inflated ideas of threat via extensive or overdone media attention, rapidly succeeding media reports, exaggeration of numbers and consequences, and the expansion to other problems (Vasterman 2004). Problematisations of immigrant issues have in many contexts become part of the spectacle (defined by Debord (1994) as 'a social relationship between people that is mediated by images' of collective self-representation (De

Genova, this issue). Border policing and immigration law enforcement produce a spectacle that enacts a scene of 'exclusion'. Such spectacles render migrant 'illegality' visible and help to generate a constellation of images and discursive formations, which supply migrant 'illegality' with the semblance of an objective fact. The spectacle of border enforcement makes migrant 'illegality' into a *sui generis* 'fact', according to De Genova (this issue). The functionality of spectacle is illustrated by the patrolling and policing of geographical borders such as the vast land border between the USA and Mexico, or patrols of the high seas or rugged landscapes, which symbolize the borders of the EU, while only few migrants actually pass these borders, legally or illegally. Most migrants, whose stay becomes illegal at one point, arrive via less spectacular routes and overstay their visa.

Apart from the spectacular, personification is also a commonly used structure: one person is singled out to illustrate a certain issue (Walaardt, this issue). Personification makes use of detailed stories, full of gruelling elements, and puts women and children centre stage (Schrover 2009, 2010b). Personification is used to make claims on behalf of a larger group, but without making that too explicit in order to avoid fuelling the argument that a precedent will be created.

Suggestion

In sixth place, problematization works via the use of metaphors, which suggest causes and consequences without naming them. Van der Valk (2003) found that migration discourse, especially of the political right, is highly rhetorical. Repetitions, rhetorical questions, hyperbole and instances of irony occur frequently. Metaphors are employed to symbolize threat and danger, and the risk of losing control.

The conceptual metaphor theory, as developed by Lakoff, says that the reason that metaphors are so abundant in language is that they reflect underlying metaphorical thought (Lakoff and Johnson 1981). Metaphors are used to simplify and make issues intelligible, to resonate with underlying symbolic representations, to stir emotions and to bridge the gap between the logical and the emotional (Charteris-Black 2006). A metaphor is a conceptual mapping from a semantic source domain to a semantic target domain. The source domains are those things we easily think about: familiar parts of the physical world (e.g. family). The target domains are mostly conceptual ones (belonging) (Lakoff 1987). According to Ellis and Wright (1998), literary metaphors surprise and stimulate imagination. With overuse they become banal and lose impact. In contrast, scientific metaphors are meant to be overused: repeated public articulation marks a successful scientific metaphor.

Metaphors can be used both to highlight and to hide. The deployment of metaphor is a common rhetorical practice (Sutherland 2005), and problems are framed in large part through the employment of metaphors (O'Brien 2003). Texts on migration are riddled with metaphors such as culinary metaphors (from the classic melting pot (Lewis 1929; Stewart 1947) to the more recent salad bowl (D'Innocenzo and Sirefman 1992)), metaphors of rootedness (Malkki 1992) (the uprooted (Handlin 1951) and transplanted (Bodnar 1987)), water metaphors (whereby migration is described by using words like stream, wave, ebb and flow) and the mosaic metaphor (which emphasizes that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts), favoured in the discourse of multiculturalism (Gibbon 1938).

Metaphors change connotation. Lewis, who introduced the metaphor of the melting pot in the early twentieth century, was an admirer of early fascism, and used the concept with an explicitly negative connotation (Stewart 1947). Although scorned as a myth by historians and sociologists alike, the melting-pot metaphor retains ideological appeal but has largely lost its negativity.

The flood or inundation metaphor was used already in many languages and countries at the beginning of the twentieth century. Dams have to be thrown up against the rising tide, which undermines the dykes that keep out the infinite ocean (O'Brien 2003). Metaphors referring to liquids are popular because, by nature, liquids are not easily stopped. They seep through, break dams, swamp and flood. Through this metaphor, lack of control over movement is equated with lack of control over change. The liquid or water metaphors are not so much about controlling the physical movement of people, but controlling the rate of change in a society (Charteris-Black 2006).

The use of water metaphors is related to the presentation of the nation as a container that has to resist pressure from within and outside. The container metaphor is persuasive because it merges *time* with *space*. It implies that controlling migration through maintaining the security of borders (a spatially based concept) will ensure control over the rate of social change (a time-based concept) (Charteris-Black 2006). The metaphor grounds the abstract notion of society in the concrete terms of a bounded space (Schinkel, this issue). What is 'inside' will always be positively connoted, whereas the 'outside' remains problematic. There is nothing positive on the outside. This mental model gives rise to the political goal of moving those outside society across a boundary to become insiders. The metaphor's frame only allows for an understanding of people or places as either inside or outside society, limiting the scope for political action. When nations are presented as containers, migrants can jump from one container into the other, possibly with an uncomfortable oxygen-depleted period between both, but integration becomes as unlikely as the merger of

two fish tanks. The metaphoric expression 'social exclusion' tends to collocate with war metaphors such as 'tackle', 'attack', 'combat', 'fight' and 'eliminate'. Bringing 'the excluded' in is done via the spatial metaphor of building bridges (Koller and Davidson 2008).

Pressure can build up within the container. It can become full, like a boat, which can pick up refugees drifting in the water, but which will sink when it becomes *too* full, taking all down (Charteris-Black 2006). The nation as a container has a certain maximum holding capacity. The nation can also be a home and a family (Laarman, this issue), which can welcome sons and daughters back (those who 'return' from the colony). Guests are only welcome on a temporary basis and friendship turns sour when the guests overstay their visit.

Redrawing boundaries

Crucial to the way that discourses produce objects of problematizations, which legitimate policies and practices of in- and exclusion, is the way that boundaries are drawn and redrawn. This section looks at the fluidity of boundaries, which have a semi-static connotation, such as citizenship and (il)legality, and concepts, which are endlessly redefined, such as 'refugee' and 'transnationalism'.

Citizenship and discourses of alterity

Crucial to the constitution of current western society has become a 'discourse of alterity' that has similarities to racism. This discourse, which Schinkel (2010) identifies as 'culturism', demarcates the boundaries of 'society' by rendering observable the 'non-integrated' who are said to reside 'outside society'. Debates about 'society' actively construct a stable referent of 'society'. In discourses on integration, this concerns the imposition of the dual notion of 'society' and of an 'outside of society'. Popular and political discourse refers to various categories, such as immigrants and inmates, as 'people outside of society'. Such a figure of speech shapes the realm of 'society' vis-à-vis a societal environment, which remains vague and under-defined. This turns 'society' into a pure domain devoid of social problems. Problems refer to persons 'outside society' (Schinkel 2007; Schinkel and van Houdt 2010). The discourse of integration is based on a common-sense differentiation between 'society' and an 'outside society'. It cleanses 'society' from problems, which it attributes to an 'outside society' (Schinkel, this issue).

Between 1945 and 2005, migration increased, as did the rights of citizens and the interest of states in withholding rights. The state's role shifted from control of the borders of the nation state to control of the borders of 'society'. Admittance policy became interwoven with

integration policies. Western states came to see the monitoring of integration as their task. This intertwined with an enormous growth in research output on these subjects, and massive media coverage. In the first decades of the period 1945–2000, the focus was on the public sphere, and social and economic factors affecting migration and integration. In later decades the focus moved to the private sphere and cultural (or religious) factors. Integration came to be seen as a personal and one-sided process (a responsibility of, or requirement on migrants only) (Schrover 2010a). With it the meaning of concepts, phrases and discourses changed, as did the emotional or moral value attached to them. ‘Citizenship’ was not only defined in juridical terms but increasingly also in moral terms, and it was conflated with ‘immigrant integration’ (Turner 2001; Bodemann and Yurdakul 2006; Lister et al. 2007; Schinkel 2010; Schinkel and van Houdt 2010).

Citizenship is a widely discussed concept, which is by no means attributed the same meaning over time and between countries. In current political and public discourse, it is equated with integration, civil society and active participation in society (Schinkel, this issue). The conflation of controlling borders with controlling society results from the definition of citizenship at two levels: the juridical and the discursive level (membership of the nation state and membership of society). At the juridical (or formal) level, citizens have rights that non-citizens do not (Marshall 1950). At the juridical level, a sharp distinction is made between citizens and non-citizens. At the practical level, differences between citizens and non-citizen residents are few. Over against formal citizenship, a moral citizenship can be discerned that has to do with being (seen as) part of a community or society (Schinkel 2010; Schinkel and van Houdt 2010). Related to this definition is that of good or active (virtuous) citizenship, which has to do with how states feel that citizens should behave.

Redefinitions of citizenship occurred when colonial empires fell apart and migration from the colonies ensued. In the nineteenth century, when nation states took shape and ideas on nationality and citizenship strengthened, there were discussions about the citizenship of the so-called native populations in the colonies. Western states enforced ideas about citizenship on their colonies (Stoler 1995), and at the same time moved towards a politically motivated denationalization of the native population, who (in part) became subjects of the empire, but not citizens (Pawley 2008). In many colonies, Islam and citizenship were constructed as mutually exclusive categories (Kholoussy 2003). Algerians, for instance, were French subjects (Algeria was a *département* of France) but they did not have French civic rights unless they renounced their commitment to Islam (Samers 2003; Silberman et al. 2007).

Decolonization led to discussions about the citizenship of the former colonial populations. In the process of decolonization, all metropolitan states changed laws, barring former subjects from citizenship or taking away citizenship, although not all states did this in the same manner (Reiter 2005; Small and Solomos 2006).

Relations between the so-called mother country and the colonies were labelled as special in the nineteenth century and were continued to be labelled as special after colonies became independent. Ties with (ex-)colonies were described using the metaphor of 'family' (Laarman, this issue). The notion of family implied loyalty and solidarity, and thus obligation. The metaphor also implied cultural reproduction within the 'family' in the form of a shared language and religion. It was a rhetoric that seemed inclusive, but in reality was so only partially. In the context of colonial migration, a difference was made between juridical citizenship and a discursive, 'ethnic' citizenship. In the Dutch case, it meant that the Dutch citizenship of some people, who came from the (former) colony, was denied, while others were granted discursive citizenship, and juridical rights on the basis of that (Laarman, this issue).

'Illegal migration' and the state

The meaning of illegal migration also shifts across time and space (Schrover et al. 2008). It is a fluid construction and is the result of increased state control over mobility. One reason why policies of controlling illegal migration persisted after it became apparent that they do not work, is that they remain useful in convincing the general public that politicians have not lost control over immigration (Cornelius 2005). In the post-9/11 era, immigration control and anti-terrorism efforts are conflated, and a continuing show of force on the border symbolizes the nation's resolve to fight terrorism even if it does nothing to enhance security (De Genova, this issue).

Legality is a seemingly straightforward category: the law decides what is legal and what is not. In reality, that is not true. Illegal migration is regarded as a problem because of the legitimacy of the state. Arguments used for legalization and illegalization have to do with the labour market, fears for precedents, ideas about control and safety, ideas about starting with a clean slate, and the need for spectacle. In this issue, the contributions by De Genova and Fischer illustrate the complex relations between state problematizations, sovereignty and migration. While De Genova illustrates the intricate connections between state policies and capitalist labour requirements, Fischer shows how 'the state' is a complex institution, which proffers a discourse of rights that can also be brought to bear on migrants in their favour by officials (lawyers, medical personnel) operating within

state institutions such as deportation centres. Migrants can legalize their stay and stop their deportation if they are ill. It is one of the few options they have – albeit one without much choice and agency – apart from contesting the fact that they have been denied refugee status.

Defining refugees

Feelings of guilt and a sense of failure towards the Jews during the Second World War, but also the geopolitical tensions of the Cold War, led to the first ever definition of what a refugee is. The drafters of the 1951 Refugee Convention started their discussions just after the end of the Second World War, at a time when there were still many displaced persons living in camps (Holborn 1975; Carruthers 2005). At the Yalta conference of 1945, it was agreed that they were to be repatriated to their countries of origin, but western states refused to repatriate some of those who came from Eastern Europe. The fact that in the meantime Eastern Europeans kept coming to the West embarrassed the communist states, but was welcomed by western states; it was good propaganda for capitalism. The definition of who is a refugee has not changed since 1951, but several other things have (Walaardt, this issue). These changes led to endless debates about who was a ‘true’ refugee. In the 1970s, lobbyists increasingly used humanitarian arguments in their attempts to claim refugee status for their protégés. Most asylum seekers did not get refugee statues but were allowed to stay on humanitarian grounds. Through their campaigns, the lobbyist changed the dominant image of a refugee from that of powerful male anti-communist or hero, who refused to fight in colonial wars, to the image as we know it today: deserving families with vulnerable women and fully integrated children. The 1951 Refugee Convention stressed the importance of pre-flight political activities. Lobbyists in the 1970s, however, focused successfully on post-flight trauma. Women and children were put centre stage in highly personalized campaigns. From the 1950s to 1970s, providing asylum to the victims of one’s enemies demonstrated the antagonists’ evil ways (Zolberg 2006). In recent decades it has become unclear what states stand to gain from a lenient refugee policy. It decreases the willingness to deal with the refugee problem at an international level and results in a restrictive discourse, on the one hand, and incidental regularization for those refugees that manage to get in illegally, on the other. Alternation of the two makes it possible to combine a stern face with a humanitarian face (Walaardt, this issue). When the discourse and the image changed, so did asylum seekers’ chances of gaining a right to stay.

Transnationalism and discourses of loyalty

Contacts of migrants with their country of origin, defined as transnationalism, are discussed in terms of loyalty and disloyalty. Migrants are not limited to one geographical location, but can engage in sociocultural, political and economic activities that transcend national boundaries. Transnationalism is problematized since an attachment to two states is perceived as a roadblock to integration by countries of settlement. As has been pointed out above, public and political discourse could be strengthened by using, copying or adapting concepts from the academic discourse. In the case of transnationalism we, however, do not see such a transfer. The concept transnationalism led to large-scale academic debates, but it did not cross over into the public and political domain. Ties were problematized, but without using the concept of transnationalism. This is surprising since academics were involved in the public and political debates as advisers. Transnationalism was given a cultural and personal connotation, emphasizing choice. This fits in with the way in which ties are portrayed and problematized in public and political debates. When transnationalism was introduced in the 1990s it had a positive cosmopolitan connotation, which made it less suitable for transferral. Invisible hands, sovereignty and disloyalty were more suitable for problematization than transnationalism (Bouras, this issue).

Conclusion

Migration and citizenship constitute ensembles of discourses and practices that are crucial to contemporary forms of governing. They are integral parts of the process of globalization and they offer both challenges to nation states as well as opportunities for nation states to reinvent themselves (Schinkel 2009). Large-scale immigration challenges nation-state closure by opening up closed forms of national citizenship. At the same time, and in response to this, nation states strengthen their internal and external borders, monitor migrants and their 'integration', and modify and diversify forms of citizenship. These are struggles over legitimate forms of membership, and in such struggles, power and recognition are at stake. In both issues of immigration and citizenship, discursive problematizations are involved that are closely linked to state-initiated categorizations. Such categorizations emerge in discourses, and they are articulated in practices through which such discourses materialize. Categorizations promulgate problematizations that highlight discursive distinctions between in-groups and out-groups. Such discursive constructions and the practices through which they are effectuated are sites of symbolic

power, and their study reveals the workings of power. As the contributions to this issue illustrate, historical analysis of discourses of in- and exclusion can help elucidate contemporary transformations of discursive power. History offers a reservoir of material for the practical construction of inclusion and exclusion. At the same time, the contemporary stage of globalization involves new frames of problematization, such as 'illegality' and transnationalism. The study of such frames can be aided by a historically informed analysis of past frames and topoi, of former policy categorizations, their legitimations and their subsequent transformations. The study of the boundaries between citizenship and outsidership, between the many forms of state-regulated social insides and outsides, calls for a broad range of social scientific analyses, of which discourse analytical tools form a crucial element. The future 'marginal man' is likely to be found hemmed in between the parameters of ever-adapting discourses.

References

- BAUDER, HARALD 2008a 'Immigration debate in Canada: how newspapers reported, 1996–2004', *International Migration & Integration*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 289–310
- 2008b 'Media discourse and the new German immigration law', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 95–112
- BETTS, ALEXANDER 2006 *Conceptualising Interconnections in Global Governance: The Case of Refugee Protection*, Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre
- BILLIG, MICHAEL 1995 *Banal Nationalism*, London: SAGE
- BODEMANN, Y. MICHAL and YURDAKUL, GÖKCE (eds) 2006 *Migration, Citizenship, Ethnos*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan
- BODNAR, JOHN 1987 *The Transplanted: A History of Immigration in Urban America*, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press
- BOORSTIN, DANIEL J. 1961/1992 *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*, New York: Vintage
- CALHOUN, CRAIG 1997 *Nationalism*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press
- CARRUTHERS, SUSAN L. 2005 'Between camps: Eastern Bloc "escapees" and Cold War borderlands', *American Quarterly. Special issue: Legal Borderlands Law and the Construction of American Borders*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 911–42
- CHARTERIS-BLACK, JONATHAN 2006 'Britain as a container: immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 563–81
- CLAUSEN, LISBETH 2004 'Localizing the global: "domestication" processes in international news production', *Media, Culture & Society*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 25–44
- COHEN, STANLEY 1980 *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The Creation of the Mods and the Rockers*, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- CORNELIUS, WAYNE A. 2005 'Controlling "unwanted" immigration: lessons from the United States, 1993–2004', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 775–94
- DEBORD, GUY 1994 *The Society of the Spectacle*, New York: Zone Books
- DE CILLIA, RUDOLF, et al. 1999 'The discursive construction of national identities', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 149–73
- D'INNOCENZO, MICHAEL and SIREFMAN, JOSEF P. (eds) 1992 *Immigration and Ethnicity: American Society: 'Melting Pot' or 'Salad Bowl'*, Westport: CT Greenwood Press

- DOEZEMA, JO 2001 'Ouch! Western feminists' "wounded attachment" to the "third world prostitute"', *Feminist Review*, vol. 67, (Spring), pp. 16–38
- ELLIS, MARK and WRIGHT, RICHARD 1998 'The Balkanization metaphor in the analysis of US immigration', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, vol. 4, no. 88, pp. 686–98
- ENTMAN, ROBERT M. 1996 'Reporting environmental policy debate: the real media biases', *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 77–92
- FOUCAULT, MICHEL 1984 'Polemics, politics and problematisations: an interview with Michel Foucault', in Paul Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader*, London: Penguin, pp. 381–90
- GIBBON, JOHN M. 1938 *The Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation*, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart
- HANDLIN, OSCAR 1951 *The Uprooted: The Epic Story of the Great Migrations that made the American People*, Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company
- HAWKINS, BENJAMIN ROBERT 2009 'Constructing Britain and the EU: a discourse theoretical account of the EU Treaty reform process 2003–2007', PhD Thesis, Politics and International Relations, University of Edinburgh
- HOLBORN, LOUISE W. 1975 *Refugees: A Problem of our Time. The Work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951–1972*, Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press
- HONDAGNEU-SOTELO, PIERRETTE 1997 'I'm here, but I'm there': the meanings of Latina transnational motherhood', *Gender and Society*, vol. 11, no. 5, pp. 548–71
- HORSTI, KARINA 2008 'Hope and despair: representations of Europe and Africa in Finnish news coverage of "migration crisis"', *Estudos em Comunicação*, no. 3, pp. 125–32
- HOWARTH, DAVID 2000 *Discourse*, Buckingham: Open University Press
- KHOLOUSSY, HANAN 2003 'Stolen husbands, foreign wives: mixed marriage, identity formation, and gender in colonial Egypt, 1909–1923', *Hawwa*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 206–40
- KOLLER, VERONIKA and DAVIDSON, PAUL 2008 'Social exclusion as conceptual and grammatical metaphor: a cross-genre study of British policy-making', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 307–31
- LACLAU, ERNESTO 2005 *On Populist Reason*, London: Verso
- LACLAU, ERNESTO and MOUFFE, CHANTAL 1985 *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, London: Verso
- LAKOFF, GEORGE 1987 *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press
- LAKOFF, GEORGE and JOHNSON, MARK 1981 *Metaphors we Live by*, Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press
- LEWIS, WYNDHAM 1929 *Paleface: The Philosophy of the 'Melting Pot'*, London: Chatto & Windus
- LISTER, RUTH, et al. 2007 *Gendering Citizenship in Western Europe: New Challenges for Citizenship Research in a Cross-National Context*, Bristol: Policy Press
- MALKKI, LIISA 1992 'National geographic: the rooting of peoples and the territorialization of national identity among scholars and refugees', *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 24–44
- MARSHALL, THOMAS H. 1950 *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- MARTÍN ROJO, LUISA and VAN DIJK, TEUN A. 1997 "'There was a problem, and it was solved!': legitimating of the expulsion of "illegal" migrants in Spanish parliamentary discourse', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 523–66
- MATTHES, JÖRG and KOHRING, MATTHIAS 2008 'The content analysis of media frames: toward improving reliability and validity', *Journal of Communication*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. 258–79
- MOHANTY, CHANDRA 1988 'Under western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses', *Feminist Review*, no. 30 (August), pp. 61–88

- O'BRIEN, GERALD V. 2003 'Indigestible food, conquering hordes, and waste materials: metaphors of immigrants and the early immigration restriction debate in the United States', *Metaphor and Symbol*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 33–47
- PAJNIK, MOJCA and BAJT, VERONIKA 2010 'Migrant women's transnationalism: family patterns and policies', *International Migration*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1–25
- PARK, ROBERT 1982 'Human Migration and the Marginal Man', *The American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 881–93
- PAWLEY, LAURENCE 2008 'Cultural citizenship', *Sociology Compass*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 594–608
- PRINS, BAUKJE 2002 'The nerve to break taboos: new realism in the Dutch discourse on multiculturalism', *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, vol. 3, no. 3/4, pp. 363–79
- REITER, BERND 2005 'Portugal: national pride and imperial neurosis', *Race Class*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 79–91
- RHODES, ROD A. W. 1997 *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance, Reflexivity and Accountability*, Buckingham: Open University Press
- ROGGEBAAND, CONNIE and VERLOO, MIEKE 2007 'Dutch women are liberated, migrant women are a problem: the evolution of policy frames on gender and migration in the Netherlands, 1995–2005', *Social Policy & Administration*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 271–88
- SAMERS, MICHAEL E. 2003 'Diaspora unbound: Muslim identity and the erratic regulation of Islam in France', *International Journal of Population Geography*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 352–64
- SCHEUFELE, DIETRAM A. 1999 'Framing as a theory of media effects', *Journal of Communication*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 103–22
- SCHINKEL, WILLEM 2007 *Denken in een tijd van sociale hypochondrie: Aanzet tot een theorie voorbij de maatschappij*, Kampen: Klement
- 2009 *Globalization and the State: Sociological Perspectives on the State of the State*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- 2010 'The virtualization of citizenship', *Critical Sociology*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 265–83
- SCHINKEL, WILLEM and VAN HOUDT, FRISO 2010 'The double helix of cultural assimilationism and neo-liberalism: citizenship in contemporary governmentality', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 696–715
- SCHON, DONALD and REIN, MARTIN 1994 *Frame reflection: toward the resolution of intractable policy controversies*, New York: BasicBooks
- SCHROVER, MARLOU 2009 'Family in Dutch migration policy 1945–2005', *The History of the Family*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 191–202
- 2010a 'Pillarization, multiculturalism and cultural freezing, Dutch migration history and the enforcement of essentialist ideas', *BMGN*, vol. 125, no. 2/3, pp. 329–54
- 2010b 'Why make a difference? Migration policy and making differences between migrant men and women (The Netherlands 1945–2005)', in Marlou Schrover and Eileen Janes Yeo (eds), *Gender, Migration and the Public Sphere 1850–2005*, New York: Routledge, pp. 76–96
- 2011 *Om de meisjes, voor de meisjes: Een historisch perspectief op problematisering en bagatellisering van onderwerpen die te maken hebben met migratie en integratie*, Leiden: Leiden University
- SCHROVER, MARLOU, *et al.* (eds) 2008 *Illegal Migration and Gender in a Global and Historical Perspective*, Amsterdam: AUP
- SILBERMAN, ROXANE, *et al.* 2007 'Segmented assimilation in France? Discrimination in the labour market against the second generation', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 1–27
- SMALL, STEPHEN and SOLOMOS, JOHN 2006 'Race, immigration and politics in Britain: changing policy agendas and conceptual paradigms 1940s–2002', *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, vol. 47, nos. 3–4, pp. 235–57

- STEWART, THOMAS D. 1947 *Anthropology and the Melting Pot: Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution for 1946*, Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution
- STOLER, ANN LAURA 1995 *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press
- SUTHERLAND, CLAIRE 2005 'Nation-building through discourse theory', *Nations and Nationalism*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 185–202
- TORFING, JACOB 1999 *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek*, Oxford: Blackwell
- TURNER, BRYAN S. 2001 'The erosion of citizenship', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 189–209
- VAN DER VALK, INEKE 2003 'Right-wing parliamentary discourse on immigration in France', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 309–48
- VAN DIJK, TEUN A. 1983 *Minderheden in de media: Een analyse van de berichtgeving over etnische minderheden in de dagbladpers*, Amsterdam: SUA
- 1992 'Discourse and the denial of racism', *Discourse & Society*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 87–118
- VAN GORP, BALDWIN 2005 'Where is the frame? Victims and intruders in the Belgian press coverage of the asylum issue', *European Journal of Communication*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 485–508
- VASTERMAN, PETER 2004 *Mediahype*, Amsterdam: Aksant
- YEATES, NICOLA 2004 'A dialogue with "global care chain" analysis: nurse migration in the Irish context', *Feminist Review*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 79–95
- ZOLBERG, ARISTIDE R. 2006 *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America*, New York: London Russell Sage Foundation

MARLOU SCHROVER is Professor in Migration History at Leiden University, The Netherlands
ADDRESS: History Department, Leiden University, PO Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

WILLEM SCHINKEL is Professor of Social Theory in Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands
ADDRESS: Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Erasmus University Rotterdam, P.O. Box 1738, 3000 DR Rotterdam, The Netherlands
Email: schinkel@fsw.eur.nl