

INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL SCHOOL

Faculty of Letters

Kinga KOLUMBÁN

Stance in Political Discourse during the Migrant Crisis of 2015

SUMMARY

Scientific supervisor

Prof.Dr. habil. Gabriela CHEFNEUX

BRAȘOV, 2024

1. The Aim of the Thesis

The aim of the present study is to identify stances realised during the migrant crisis of 2015, which convey relevant positions and attitudes within the political leadership of the European Union. As a typically interpersonal rhetorical category, stance is both personal and public as it represents a speaker's unique subjectivity in an interaction with other participants.

This study seeks to trace the meaning-making potential of interpersonal resources by examining texts that were formulated within the public debate on the effects of the crisis on the European community and the possible measures that should be taken in order to contain it. One theoretical assumption this study is relying on is the fact that the representation of events and their evaluation concomitantly construct meaning and convey clues for interpretation within a community.

Ideological content is significant in the analysed texts due to the political nature of the declarations; however, the emphasis of this study is a rhetorical one: it approaches ideologically oriented content with formal analytical tools. Although a few ideologies are identified as types of discourse in the analysed texts, their relevance is secondary to the process of meaning-making traced through the analysis of combined ideational and interpersonal resources pertaining to representation and realizations of dialogical and attitudinal stance. Therefore, even if identified, discourses of anti- and pro-migrationism, of legitimation of the European Union as a governing and legislating political organization, the discourse of federalism or Euroscepticism, in the case of some speakers, are acknowledged only inasmuch as they pertain to the process of stance-taking.

2. The Background of the Debate: The Migrant Crisis of 2015

The 2015 migrant crisis represented a socially and politically relevant event for the European Union. It started receiving more significant public attention in April 2015, when an increased number of casualties among people crossing the Mediterranean were reported. During this month the European Council agreed to mobilise efforts for better external border control on the Mediterranean and for redistributing responsibility for asylum seekers to all countries of the European Union. These measures meant the implementation of a Common Asylum System, assistance offered to countries dealing with a high number of asylum seekers (so called first-entry countries) by other member states and the possibility of relocating some of the applicants from first-entry countries. Such measures meant the amendment of the Dublin Regulation which attributed exclusive responsibility for the processing of the asylum request to first-entry countries. During 2015 more than 1 million people crossed the border of the European Union. Due to the high number of asylum requests this regulation brought about the collapse of border control in some cases, it determined some states to temporarily close down their borders and generated tension among the members of the European Union.

In September 2015, the European Union prepared a set of measures to contain the phenomenon that had gone out of control. A series of debates took place in the European Parliament in September 2015. The debates were occasioned by the Commission proposals for solving the crisis, including a

relocation plan of the asylum seekers based on a mandatory quota that generated dissent among the member states.

A package of proposals arrived on September 9th, announced by the President of the European Commission, J. C. Juncker, during his State of the Union Address. The package contained a relocation proposal for 120 000 people, a measure criticised and opposed by the Visegrad Four and it represented the crux of the tension within the European Union, generating a lingering debate and delaying decision-making at an institutional level. Additional proposals included a list of safe countries of origin, which allowed a more precise identification of those entitled for asylum, a more effective return policy, a trust fund for Africa, and measures that would allow an international approach to the migration crisis. The proposals were accepted by the Parliament but the real challenge was posed by the Council, composed of leading politicians of member states.

Several Council meetings took place after this event. One was a meeting of the Justice and Home Affairs Ministers on September 14th, resulting in a consensus on the proposed relocation of 40 000 people, and another, a meeting of the heads of states and governments, where the relocation plan for the additional 120 000 did not get consensus, with Hungary, Slovakia and the Czech Republic, three of the Visegrad Four opposing, with the addition of Romania. Finland abstained and Poland, the fourth Visegrad country finally voted in favour of the plan. The proposal was accepted, nevertheless, by use of the *'qualified majority voting'*, meaning that even if consensus had not been reached, the vote went through due to the majority. Objecting members criticised the mandatory nature of imposed quotas, while proponents emphasized the necessity of quick decision-making.

A temporary solution was found by the European Union's agreement with Turkey to host refugees and prevent them from crossing the sea to Greece, which significantly decreased the number of asylum seekers at Europe's borders. However, in the meantime, refugees' numbers have been increasing in refugee camps in Turkey, while the European Union has been blamed for not fulfilling its commitments, such as allotting the agreed financial aid on time or improving its legal asylum application procedure, which remains cumbersome. Moreover, Turkey has been accused of using the pressure of another potential crisis for forcing the European Union to agree to further financial aid and make various political concessions. The migration issue, as Donald Tusk noted in a speech in front of the European Parliament in 2016, is a *'never-ending story'* and the solutions put into practice *'are not ideal and are not ending our work'*¹. The process of improving migration laws and increase their effectiveness is still continuing.

3. The Corpus

The interventions which constitute the corpus of this analysis were made throughout September 2015 by various European politicians concerning the measures taken by the European Union to manage the migrant crisis. The texts have been selected from three discussions around the European Commission's proposals. The first one took place on the occasion of the State of the Union Address, on September 9th. The proposals were subsequently voted in the European Parliament. The second and third debate took place in the European Parliament concerning the Justice and Home Affairs Council meeting and the extraordinary meeting of the heads of states and governments.

In addition to the interventions during the three debate sessions, a further speech has been selected. The Hungarian Prime Minister, Viktor Orbán's speech was delivered in the Hungarian Parliament

¹ [Donald Tusk says EU migration crisis is 'never-ending' – POLITICO](#)

before the start of daily business, on September 21, 2015. By that time, Viktor Orbán had had meetings with the European leaders, on September 3 when he announced Brussels that Hungary was prepared to *'keep to the regulations'* (meaning the Dublin Regulation and the Schengen Code) and as of September 15th would be ready to close its borders, with a physical barrier, making sure that no migrants got past the border in the south of Hungary, which was also the southern border of Schengen.

Texts of the following speakers are analysed, with the dates of interventions included:

- Jean-Claude Juncker, President of the European Commission –, State of the Union Address (September 9)
The politician presents the Commission proposals to solve the crisis, among them, the controversial relocation plan.
- Viktor Orbán, Prime Minister of Hungary –, Address to the Hungarian Parliament before the start of daily business (September 21),
The speech is delivered with the aim to explain the Hungarian government's position on the subject of migration and justify its actions. The original Hungarian text has been translated into English with special consideration towards the interpersonal content of the original.
- Donald Tusk, President of the European Council – two interventions (October 6)
The politician presents the achievements of the extraordinary meeting of the Council where the proposed measures were discussed, without the relocation plan. Donald Tusk's second intervention contains some additional thoughts on the situation, as part of the discussion.
- Frans Timmermans, First Vice-President of the European Commission – three interventions (September 9, September 16, October 6).
The first intervention endorses and promotes the proposals presented by the President of the Commission, the second one discusses the urgency of the vote for the proposals in the context of the failed vote on the 14th of September, and the third one deals with the humanitarian aspects of the migrant crisis.
- Federica Mogherini, Vice-President of the Commission/High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy – intervention (September 9).
She discusses the importance of credibility towards international partners which can be achieved by unity.
- Dimitris Avramopoulos, European Commissioner for Migration and Home Affairs – intervention (September 9)
He outlines the implementation plans for the proposals.
- Guy Verhofstadt, leader of the Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE Group) – three interventions (September 9, September 16, October 6)
In the first intervention, the politician expresses himself in favour of the Commission proposals. In his second intervention, he expresses disappointment and scepticism related to a successful vote for the relocation plan in the near future. In the October 6th intervention, during the debate on the results of the extraordinary council meeting, the politician expresses disappointment with the activity of the European Council.

4. Theoretical Background

As the research is based on a selection of texts formulated during the above-mentioned events, the starting point of the analysis is to establish the parameters of the speakers' representation of the crisis.

4.1. *Micro- and Macro-analytical level*

On a macro-analytical level these texts qualify as samples of political discourse within the public debate that took place during the summer and autumn of 2015. The crisis was represented as a test of the values that have represented the core principles of the European Union, namely solidarity and responsibility. The process of stance-taking has been defined along the lines of this discourse on European values by the identification of the speakers' alignments and oppositions with other participants regarding this subject.

On a micro-analytical level, these texts represent speech acts of practical argumentation. Due to this fact, the elements represented within the debate, the speakers' solutions and justifications for the containment of the crisis are identified based on a model of practical argumentation structure provided by Fairclough and Fairclough (2012).

4.2. *Practical Argumentation*

Regarded as a genre of communicative activity, argumentation involves a speaker (political actor) proposing a specific course of action - and arguing in its favour - which entails his individual interpretation of a situation (circumstantial premises) based on values that he holds (value premises) which may or may not be aligned with those of other participants of the situation.

The proposed course of action, representing the object of his argumentation, is expected to bring about a desirable state of facts in the future that solves the current situation of crisis. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) focus on the discursive aspects of political practice during crisis, which carries a significant amount of '*agentive and strategic*' endeavour on the part of participants to a dispute on an optimal course of action. Practical argumentation, in these situations, is the speech act that represents the subjective aspects of participants' individual perspectives, providing a 'personalized' discursive frame for the issue at hand, in accordance with values and interests among participants. The aspect of an individual perspective negotiated and enforced through discourse can be correlated with the definition of stance as an individual position.

Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012) identification of political discourse as practical argumentation in view of a solution during a crisis specially makes sense in the context of the 2015 migrant crisis when representatives of the EU members, each with their unique status and interests engaged into discussions, accepted and rejected, made concessions to and criticized other members' or the European Union's positions and policies. The migrant crisis brought about a legislation crisis within the organization and forced member countries to modify and rephrase laws and regulations according to the new realities of the European Union. The subjective contributions that representatives of institutions and member states expressed at that time represent suitable samples for institutional and national perspectives on the crisis through dialogical and attitudinal stance-taking on the matter at hand within the frame of a public deliberation.

4.3. *Stance in Appraisal*

The stance-taking process is traced in accordance with the appraisal taxonomy described by Martin and White (2005) and Martin and Rose (2007). The interpersonal dimension of *appraisal* follows an alternative value dimension to that of the truth or falsity characteristic to the ideational dimension. The speakers' assessment of propositions as right or wrong contributes to discourse meaning along with other discourse systems belonging to the ideational and textual metafunctions. In an interpersonal focus on discourse, speakers formulate *value positions* which realise their engagement with and attitude towards the issue and the alternative value positions of the other participants. This value position is a publicly manifested individual reaction and a formulation of one's own point of view concerning an issue. According to the systemic-functional perspective this is what Martin and White (2005) call *stance*.

Stance implies both the positioning of a speaker towards a particular subject and the evaluation of that subject by the speaker. Additionally, stance is characteristically intersubjective as the speaker's position configures through an alignment or disalignment with other participants in a given conversation. In Martin and White's (2005) appraisal apparatus, speakers' positions are determined by their willingness to negotiate the arguability of their propositions and acknowledge or exclude and ignore alternative positions. In this respect, speakers are perceivable as engaged in an interaction (or refusing it), "*taking up, acknowledging, responding to, challenging or rejecting actual or imagined prior utterances from other speakers/writers or as anticipating likely or possible responses from other speakers/writers*"²

This description aligns with the specific characterization that Fairclough and Fairclough provide to political practice: politics implies a choice for alternatives, deliberation on these alternatives, the possibility of interaction for this to happen and the agency of participants to accomplish this process. Political action is the direct result of the reasoning process: the frame of the argumentation, the circumstances and values the individual uses to justify his actions and suggest possible solutions determines whether the action is taken or not and in what conditions this may happen. This is why it is reasonable to conclude that the speech act of argumentation in situations of political crisis provides a generic frame for the analysis of stance-taking, through which speakers' positions and evaluations are realised in favour or against a course of action or a particular matter discussed.

4.4. *The Approach in the Present Study*

The combination of the two theoretical frameworks represents a novelty in the domain of stance analysis. Their concerted use is necessary due to the specific generic and discursive aspect of the texts. Firstly, the parliamentary debate and speeches analysed in this study follow a deliberative pattern identified by Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) as typical for situations when solutions are formulated and their validity is verified by those participating to the debate. This implies the common aspect for the texts, representing examples of formulating claims and justifying them.

Secondly, due to the specific deliberative pattern, formulating the facts of the matter and presenting the possible options, representation is essential. However, due to the strategic nature of political discourse this representation is determined by the speakers' interests and concerns. Therefore, representation is not only a frame for the subjective evaluation of the speaker; it is concomitantly produced with it and the two aspects of discursive meaning-making mutually determine and shape each other. Although this interdependence is taken into consideration by appraisal theory, its

² <https://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/appraisalguide/unframed/stage5-engagement.htm>

practical application has not been considered on a connected set of texts. In the present case, representations of the crisis by various speakers can be confronted and their relevance for stance-taking can be identified.

4.5. *Additional Concepts*

Two additional concepts are relevant as the theoretical background of the present analysis: the strategic nature of political discourse and legitimation, as its main function.

4.5.1. *The strategic nature of discourse*

The general communicative function of language allows cooperation and problem solving in complex social matters; however, political discourse is often perceived as a means of manipulation and deceit. These two definitions, a tool of cooperation on one hand, and a means of manipulation on the other, represent the fundamental contrast that describes political discourse: struggle for power between those who aim to maintain it and those who resist it, and cooperation between various institutions within society that seek to solve dissensions over social matters.

The idea of political discourse as a means of cooperation in view of reaching a consensus is an ideal situation where felicity conditions meet to allow all participants' access to a discussion with an equal amount of influence and opportunity to expose their position. In political practice, however, validity claims or value claims that participants make become manifest only inasmuch as the power and authority of the one making the claim extends. Value claims, therefore, are rarely a set of common, objectively established set of principles, as they are permanently subject to distortion, negotiation, subjective reinterpretation, according to the interests of participants, who may employ deception in communication in order to achieve their goals.

This means that in politics, concomitantly with the principle of cooperation which results in solving problems and acting for the common good, the possibility of deceit is also present and may, at times, prevail. Although this type of distorted, Machiavellian communication is often claimed to be an implicit trait of political discourse as a means of preserving power, the term may be misleading, as it presupposes devious intent and does not allow alternatives, only a polarity between ideal and reprobate political conduct which is hardly the case in common practice. Interests are usually related to party, national, or other type of community values, which upholds the idea of common good. Regardless of the speaker's intention to manipulate or not, analysis can only rely on interpretation, which bears a certain level of subjectivity.

Therefore, the more favoured approach in this analysis is the examination of a text by considering the circumstances the text was produced in, both situational and social, and the speaker's position in this context: the office he/she holds in the situational context and the ideologies he/she aligns with in the social context. This perspective allows a perception of the text as a sample of *strategic communication*, where speakers' interests and positions are considered along with the limitations imposed by the institutional and social frame in which these samples are realised.

4.5.2. *Legitimation*

Legitimation is identified as the main factor of successful political action undertaken through political discourse. Legitimation is enacted through a representation of events, participants, etc., which is perceived by the audience as true and reliable. In other words, listeners who are the main target of the conveyed message, must believe the speaker and trust him to have their best interests at heart. This must at least prompt politicians to formulate a 'version' of reality that may be deemed plausible

and justified by interpreters (direct audience, voters, the speech/discourse community they are addressing and that they have an interest to persuade).

The concept of legitimacy is intertwined with that of authority and power. But while the last two can exist and can be exerted without the consent of those they are used on, legitimacy is dependent on cooperation and acceptance of authority, hence, on the speakers' power of persuasion. Therefore, it is safe to assume that obtaining legitimacy through political discourse does not only aim the *coercion* of the group it addresses but also their *cooperation*.

Coercion is defined as a means of persuasion, either by emotional or by cognitive means. This macro-function of political discourse is directly responsible for the legitimation of the speaker's authority, that is, the acceptance of his discourse as true and valid. Unlike physical coercion, which entails the silencing of all oppositional discourse, discursive coercion is power exerted through persuasion: the use of discourse in order to assert influence on the political and social environment it is formulated in. Acceptance of this discourse as valid is conditioned by the legitimation strategies employed by speakers or institutions manifested in the set of texts constituting discourse through representation.

Although, most frequently, argumentation is a strategy of legitimation (as it justifies a possible course of action), the source of legitimation is the speaker's position of authority which validates the *concrete actions* taken on behalf of the institution he represents, and the *representation* of those actions, the narrative/imaginary elements and mental conceptions that constitute the speaker's 'version' of the 'facts'. At the same time, legitimation strategies consolidate the position of governmental speakers as representatives of institutions, a process which is not trouble free: as the position of the speaker may be challenged by other participants representing alternative perspectives, discourse production with the aim to legitimize a position must be constant. A politician must constantly bring arguments and justification to the actions he is taking.

The legitimation process is enabled through the acceptance by the public of the speaker's declarations as true due to the institutional authority he holds. However, this status creates a special vulnerability for governmental discourse, as it is essential that the policies implemented and pursued by state government be accepted by the public as *normative*. Therefore, representations depict such actions as being consistent with the moral order of society.

4.6. Values that determine representation and evaluation

Values are decisive in the speakers' formulation of their claims and justifications, as they contain both the strategic element in the speakers' discourse, as well as the legitimizing power. Goals are defined and selected in accordance with the compatibility they hold with these values, which are representative of the social order actors operate within and, more importantly, which are adopted and internalised by the speaker and expressed as genuine concerns. The success of imposing a certain perspective depends on the creation of external reasons for people to act: that is, reasons that do not necessarily coincide with their intrinsic desires, but which represent values and norms of a deontic nature that participants consider to be justified. In short, successful political action involves the persuasion of all parties that the goal is one that serves the 'greater good', regardless of individual aspirations.

In addition to defining the goals formulated by political actors, values determine the way circumstantial premises, the facts, are formulated. The way we *interpret* a situation (of crisis) is determined by the values we align with and we claim as our own. The normative aspect of the claim, its reliance on moral necessity supported by references to laws and social norms, connects it to the

area of deontic modality with its most common linguistic resource of modal verbs, and the linguistic resource that is standardly used with stance-taking as well.

A further detail that needs to be touched upon refers to the intersubjective nature of the decision-making process, the type of cooperation that takes place through the process. Fairclough and Fairclough (2012) make a clear distinction between deliberation as a descriptive qualification and one that is normative. Despite the condition of social dialogue in order for a political choice to take place, these decisions are often not truly democratic as stakeholders can seldom validate their values and interests equally. These choices are controversial due to the very different interpretations of the situation by participants and the different values underlying their decisions, taken with a background of urgency and scarcity of resources. Political decisions are the result of a process of reconciliation of quite divergent interests and depend on the actors' power and legitimate authority to enforce them.

In a democracy the success of the process of decision-making does not necessarily hinge on the level of agreement but much rather on the possibility for options to be deliberated on publicly. Collective decision-making allows everybody affected by a possible measure to join in the process of deliberation and formulate an individual line of argumentation. This does not only allow the examination of a matter from all possible points of view but also gives an opportunity to people to understand several perspectives, ultimately turning them into more virtuous citizens. However, common political practice demonstrates that the legitimacy of political decisions is much rather influenced by the speakers' position of (institutional) power than by public consent. The choice of a perspective (and the goal premise it represents) depends on whether it is supported by those who have a position of authority.

4.7. *Self-presentation*

The relevant legitimation strategy from the perspective of stance-taking, which involves positioning and evaluation, is self-presentation and the alignment or disalignment with other participants and alternative courses of action. The evaluative aspects of the discourse which can be correlated with appraisal resources are manifest on stylistic and rhetorical levels through positive or negative lexical use (descriptions, metaphors) coinciding with resources described by Martin and White (2005) as attitudinal, and interactional levels, where criticism or accusations and occasional praise and endorsement are formulated or addressed. Such resources are classified within the category of *engagement*. Oppositional or inclusive representations are relevant in locating the speaker's position, the degree to which he accepts or rejects alternative positionings and the means through which he seeks to consolidate his own position.

The category of *judgement* of the appraisal taxonomy plays a special role in the process of legitimation. Stance manifested from a position of authority is the linguistic means that conveys validity to a speaker's discourse, constructed throughout one or multiple discursive events (a localized instance of discourse). If the success of strategies of representation depends on the acceptance of the speakers' political stance as legitimate, it ensues that formulating a position of common interests and values with those represented is a direct condition of maintaining authority. Claims of similar moral standards, stemming from a common set of values are some of the most important factors when establishing legitimacy and attacking an opponent on the grounds of their moral conduct is one of the most common weapons between political actors.

Consequently, the nature of the stance assumed in a debate over a particular issue reveals emotional traits, moral values and rationalizations manifested by the speaker and assumed as common with the

target audience, the in-group that speakers declare themselves to be part of and whose values and interests they claim to represent.

5. Research Methodology

The general question when tracing stance in these texts pertains first to the general identification of the value position realised in the text as a result of the input from all the interpersonal elements throughout. Due to the existence of both explicit and indirect evaluative elements, two types of analytical strategy are used. One is the process of locating explicit lexico-grammar which engages other participants or displays attitudinal content and the other is tracing tokens in the ideational frame of representation which may entail attitudinal reaction or indicates the speaker's statement of his own value position or engagement of alternative ones. Additionally, the types of positioning, attitudinal and dialogic, are modified due to the values of graduation which the speaker employs in order to intensify or mitigate evaluative content.

In the specific case of the political dispute on the migrant crisis of 2015, the values that represented the common premises for the speakers have been solidarity and responsibility. They are represented in the analysed texts both as moral principles to be followed by the participants or as values that enhance organizational efficiency. Although they seemingly pertain to aspects of a different nature, morality and efficiency, they are integrative to justifications for the existence of the organisation. In representing two aspects fundamental to the existence and functioning of the organization, a correct and moral conduct as well as efficiency in representing the citizens of the Union, both perspectives on the values are conducive to legitimacy.

Furthermore, an additional aspect of alternative frames must be considered. It is not only that speakers take a stance regarding the issue, but that their construal of the issue is divergent. Dissent, or personalised perspective, is not only realised at the level of opposing attitudes but it is first of all generated from the different representational frames underlying the discourses.

Solidarity and responsibility may be a common value reference for all speakers, but the details and aspects defining them are different for each of them. Due to the speakers' specific position, determined by the nature of the office they hold, they construct their argumentation from different perspectives. They formulate a variety of arguments that are based on these representative values, which are either named or implied, and often represented by other values which can be corroborated with the idea of solidarity among members of the European Union (supporting each other). The connected value of responsibility implies the engagement on each of these members part: namely the observance of regulations and the responsibility of acting in accordance with rules established unanimously, and, especially, acting consistently as members of *one* organization, which guarantees the European Union the possibility to pursue its founding principles and implicitly legitimize itself as an organisation.

Alternative representational frames create modulations of these values' representation and at times they seem to convey alternative realities. The most obvious illustration for this phenomenon is the rendering of the events in the anti-migrationist antagonistic stance. Although value premises in this stance are similar with the other speakers', their representation is carried out in an alternative narrative as compared to the one in the Mobilizing stance, for instance. This difference is easily detectable in the use of distinct terms (as in refugee/migrant) which can be qualified as ideological in nature (although this perspective does not represent the focus of this study).

5.1. *Self-reference*

The speakers approach the issue from the perspective of the European Union, as representatives of the member states present in the European Parliament and Council. The inclusive *we* most often designated as the speaker's perspective represents the focus on the issue from the perspective of the organization, the European Union, primarily perceived as a political entity acting in its own interests and that of the voters, citizens it represents, but also as a culturally defined entity acting in accordance with principles stemming from its identity and values.

If we limit ourselves to these two perspectives, the inclusive dimension of the indexing pronoun must be differentiated between the acting political entity bringing decisions, giving directives, legislating, in short, and a culturally and socially defined entity which defines and observes principles. In the case of the European Union as a political organization, the inclusive 'we' represents the organization as a legislating body and the interventions happen within a view of the acting capacity of the European Union as a political entity. A specific manifestation of this perspective can be identified in those aspects of the debate when focus lies on the actions and conduct of representatives as a manifestation of the principles they are meant to enact.

However, members of the Parliament are also representatives of the citizens in the member states in both their national and European dimension. Therefore, the inclusive 'we' often overlaps with the first-person plural of the community, representing the wider audience which follows and observes the activity of its representative body. From this perspective, declarations happen in view of the ideologies, beliefs and interests of the European citizen, the main legitimizing factor of these discourses and of the actions undertaken through legislature. Reference to obtaining citizens' alignment (or not losing it) is iterated quite often by the various speakers as an important aspect for politicians representing the European institutions to observe and to pursue.

A specific aspect in the case of national representatives is the identification with the nation they represent, indexed by the plural first-person. In the case of the plural 'we', references often include the name of the nation, explicitly indicating the perspective the proposition is made from.

In addition to the first-person plural, the first-person singular is occasionally used by speakers indicating personal reflection on the events and circumstances at hand, and drawing attention to the high degree of personal investment of the speaker through that proposition. In this respect, shifts in discourse from the plural to the singular are specifically relevant from the point of view of the speaker's dialogic stance as they indicate an increased investment (be that affective or reflective) on the speaker's part, generating a higher degree of evaluative charge, or they signal some type of modification of the authoritative stance the speaker is assuming, be that more categorical (because of the high degree of investment) or admitting alternative positions in the case of personal opinions, remarks, observations.

5.2. *The application of the concept of stance*

Stance is not only a socially relevant linguistic category but it also bears significance in the legitimising role of political discourse as well. The sociolinguistic perspective approaches the concept as socially situated and consequential, both for the individual taking it and for the social environment it has been taken in. Defining stance as an individual action that has social consequences posits stance as a discursive manifestation that is both institutional and personal.

A further relevant characteristic is the dynamic nature of stance which adapts to other participants' contributions, by reacting to them through various degrees of oppositions and alignments, by making

value judgments and modifying those judgements throughout the interaction. Stance, therefore, is conceptualised as a dynamic process constructed of repeated localized positionings enacted by the stance-takers.

A modality to analyse stance, therefore, could be the tracing of the stance-taking acts of an individual (representing an institution or not) for a longer period of time. In such cases, the result of the analysis may reveal these modulations and the impact of the situational context (including external events and other participants' positionings) on the stance of the individual. This possibility is to some extent possible for the present corpus since in the case of some speakers two or three declarations are available for the analysis within a span of one month (the period between the presentation of the proposals and the approval of the Commission proposals after the September 23 Council meeting).

The other possibility is the selection of declarations around an event significant for the participants, as in the present case the migrant crisis and the solutions proposed for it by members of European institutions. In this perspective the common ground for the emerging pattern constituting the stance is the crisis itself, representing the object of stance and the point of reference for various stance-takers who make their declarations from various perspectives. However, apart from the fact that they hold different political and professional roles, their positions are framed by another common element, the fact that they are all representative of the European Union and adhere to its principles.

The juxtaposition of the analysed declarations provides a detailed picture of the arguments that were brought at that time for the possible solutions of the crisis and delineates the activity and the profile of the European Union as an organization, acting through a set of constitutive institutions, as a political entity where various alternative ideologies are voiced through various representatives, and ultimately, as a community which adheres to a set of representative principles. While these declarations may convey the speakers' personal positions and evaluations, they are analysed as representative of the organisation - as samples of government communication.

5.3. The realisation of the dialogical stance

The values realising dialogical stance in the analysed texts pertain to the engagement resources described by Martin and White (2005). Their classification is undertaken within the spectrum of dialogical expansion, values allowing validity for alternative perspectives, and dialogical contraction, where the speaker dismisses and ignores alternatives. Along these two values a series of engagement types are realised. Given the circumstances of the debate, the urgency of finding a viable solution for the crisis and the importance of having a coherent response on the part of all the members, many of the interventions serve the purpose of call to action and have a pronounced exhortatory nature.

Besides the motivating aspect, speakers negotiate their positions along associations with others' ideas and perspectives, and more often, proclaim opposition towards alternative viewpoints. It is typical of representatives of the European institutions that while their main objective is to negotiate a middle ground acceptable for all members, they strictly disassociate themselves from attitudes that are not considered constructive in finding a commonly agreed solution.

5.4. The realisation of the attitudinal stance

The linguistic values that realise the speakers' attitudinal stance are classified according to Martin and White's (2005) system of attitudinal resources. This involves a differentiation between inscribed and implicit values, the type of attitude they realise and the relevance of the graduation.

In the case of speakers representing the European Union and member states, speaking from an organizational or national perspective, or that of an ideological principle, these values become part of their discourse as normative, either due to their assigned or believed quality of containing the crisis, or due to their quality of representing the organization, nation, or political allegiance. Speakers formulate their arguments around the idea of what is right and what is wrong and their aim is to define concrete actions through which those correct principles can be applied. Interpersonally, this perspective of normative behaviour recommended or prescribed for the group (the organization the participants represent) entails the frequent realisations of judgement values from an attitudinal point of view, and engagement values through which speakers proclaim their perspective while acknowledging and accepting other alternatives to various degrees. Given that the corpus consists mainly of the discourse from leaders of various institutions, a frequent tendency is that of correlating alternative value judgements from various polarized positions into a more integrated perspective, representative of the European Union as an organization.

The presentation of the European Union, or more exactly, the self-presentation realised through the representatives of the various institutions constituting it, is to a great degree achieved through attitudinal content that evaluates the organization in its various facets, either in terms of efficiency or in terms of the morality of the measures taken. Both evaluative directions serve as a means of legitimisation or an exhortation towards the need to act in a legitimate way.

5.5. Research Questions

The following research questions have been formulated:

1. What representational frame do the values of solidarity and responsibility generate in the speaker's reasoning process?
 - 1.1. Does the representation refer to the general moral nature or to the organisational value of efficiency?
 - 1.2. What are the threats identified by the speaker which endanger the observance of these values in the context of the crisis?
 - 1.3. What measures are suggested by the speaker in order to counteract or reverse the negative effects of these possible or real threats?
2. Who is the speaker addressing?
 - 2.1. What addressee is constructed throughout the analysed texts and how is it represented?
 - 2.2. What are the relations of exclusion and inclusion realised in the text, including the speaker's own positioning?
 - 2.3. What is the role of the inclusive *we* and how is exclusion from it (e.g. through the alternative *they*) relevant for the representational frame?
 - 2.4. What other alternative means of reference occur in the texts (e.g. you, names, etc.)?
3. What is the speakers' dialogical stance?
 - 3.1. What participants and alternative value positions does the speaker address?
 - 3.2. Through what engagement types do the speakers engage these participants and positions?
 - 3.3. What is the intensity of their engagement?

4. What is the speakers' attitudinal stance?

4.1. What participants are evaluated by the speaker?

4.2. How is self-evaluation realized?

4.3. What are the explicit and indirect discursive elements which realise the speaker's attitudinal stance?

4.4. What is the intensity of the attitudinal resources realised in the texts?

The values underlying the speaker's declarations are the two related principles of the European Union, solidarity and responsibility. In the speakers' stance-taking act these values are often explicitly stated and argumentation is organized around them. At the same time, however, the representation of these values is implicitly realized through naming other, related principles (such as unity, trust, or even credibility) or through concretizations through examples. Therefore, the first set of research questions, which represents a basis for the further details of the stance-taking process refers to the representation of values and the way it influences the speaker's reasoning.

The next set of questions refers to the interactive context of the declarations, namely, the ways in which the audience is represented and addressed (a single or fragmented group, a set of individuals). Given that the declarations occur within the virtual common entity of the European Union, this set of questions also refers to the role and position the speakers assume in this group. What bears relevance in this case is the extent to which the speakers include themselves as part of the community they are addressing or representing. With a concrete reference to the resources analysed for this set of questions, the aim is to establish what category is represented through the first-person plural 'we', which evidently represents self-inclusion in a community and what are those categories that are excluded from this inclusive *we*.

The next two sets of questions represent a similar process of analysis as they refer to the two subsets of interpersonal resources, in accordance with the Martin and White's taxonomy, which constitute the speakers' stance, dialogic and attitudinal. They are also referred to, in the analysis, as engagement type and evaluation. In addition to their identification the intensity applied in its realisation is also established, as it is the most relevant indicative of the speakers' interpersonal investment and probably the most important factor that contributes to establishing the nature of a stance.

The set referring to the identification of the speakers' dialogical stance aims to establish the alignments and oppositions constructed throughout the texts and their effect on the speaker's own position in the debate. The attitudinal stance is circumscribed along a similar process, that aims to detect the participants who are evaluated and the nature of this evaluation. In the case of the attitudinal stance, the evaluation of the organization, the European Union, bears special significance as one of the central aspects of this debate. Due to the fact that all speakers present themselves as constitutive of the community (even the most antagonistic ones), this evaluative aspect is referred to as self-evaluation.

6. The Chapters of this Study

6.1. *Chapter 1*

The first two chapters contain the theoretical background for this study and explain these theoretical tools that are going to be used in the corpus analysis as well as the conceptual frame these texts fit into, as instances of individual actions of meaning-making.

The first chapter outlines the sociolinguistic and systemic functional theoretical background of the action of stance-taking. In a socio-linguistic perspective, the importance of stance lies in the fact that it represents a discursive tool for an individual to place him/herself within the stream of social exchange by its constitutive gestures of positioning and evaluation. Stance is personal and public, discursive and action-oriented, consequential for the speaker and for the object of stance.

These characteristics are transposed by systemic-functional linguists into a cline of instantiation where stance is placed between the individual instantiation of a text and the pattern constructed by a series instantiation within the institutional limits of a genre. Stance is manifested as individual, due to the speakers' personal choices of resources, and institutional due to the generic characteristics of the discourse practice in a particular domain. The dialogical and attitudinal stances traced in the present corpus illustrate these characteristics.

6.2. *Chapter 2*

The aim of the second chapter is to identify the common ground between the formal, micro-analytical category of stance and the critical perception on discourse of the ideology oriented Critical Discourse Theory. The chapter seeks to demonstrate that stance and the action of stance-taking represent an analytically relevant category for tracing the process of legitimation in the case of political discourse. Legitimation is undertaken through strategic communication where a subjective, and at times biased or manipulative representation is employed by speakers to adjust their discourse according to their concerns and interests. It is emphasized that manipulation is not necessarily an aim of these discursive interactions, much rather, speakers, politicians try to obtain the best results for themselves (their interests) by negotiating with other speakers (who also pursue their interests). Cooperation, thus, occurs between self- and common interest. The process of stance-taking represents the rhetorical manifestation of negotiation, self-presentation, representation of the situation and its concurrent evaluation.

The chapter also locates instantiations of stance within the discursive practice of parliamentary debate and speech which, in their turn, are constitutive of the social practice of public debate on a particular subject. The analytical tool to trace the argumentative structure of the speakers' interventions is Fairclough and Fairclough's (2012) model which places values as a premise for the speakers' representation and reasoning.

6.3. *Chapter 3*

The third chapter, Research Methodology, presents the specific use of the theoretical tools explained previously by outlining the methodology particularly employed on the particular texts produced in the particular context of the migrant crisis. The starting point of the analysis conducted on the texts is the identification of the way the constitutive values of the European Union are represented in each

speaker's interventions. Solidarity and responsibility are fundamental and defining values for the organization and a crisis represents a crisis of these values as well.

According to the Fairclough and Fairclough model (2012), which is applied without modifications, the values of the speaker (concerns, beliefs, ideologies, interests) underlie the representation and claims that he/she makes in order to justify his/her solutions in solving a crisis. This theory is continued in the present study by the additional identification of the dialogical and evaluative interpersonal content as well. It is demonstrated that the interpersonal content of the speakers' claims and justifications is a relevant part of their argumentation process. Where they position themselves, who they align with, what or who they oppose, how they evaluate other participants calibrates their positionality and publicly proclaims it. In the case of these texts, the speakers' stance represents the rhetorical aspect of the legitimation process they undertake. The theoretical devices used to identify the speakers' position are the domains of engagement and attitude described by Martin and White (2005) and Martin and Rose (2007), which I refer to as *dialogical stance* and *attitudinal stance*. This differentiation is rather artificial since the two aspects of appraisal are complementary to each other. The distinction has practical reasons, since the identification of the participants engaged and evaluated may be better outlined by this method.

6.4. Chapters 4-8

Chapters 4-8 represent the analysis of the concrete texts selected from the proceedings of the three parliamentary debates that took place in September 2015 around the Commission proposals and the controversial relocation plan. The only exception is the Hungarian prime minister, Viktor Orbán's speech which was addressed to the Hungarian Parliament in the same period. The speech was selected due to its topic and pattern the prime minister justifies Hungary's position with respect to the migrant crisis and the measures taken to contain it. Overall, 13 interventions are analysed.

The chapters are organized in accordance to the type of stance realised in the texts. The stances are established based on the person who delivered them (in some cases two or three interventions made by the same speaker are subject to one analysis), the position they are holding within the institutions of the European Union (which influences their position above anything else), and finally, the actual nature of the stance, influenced by ideological or personal predispositions.

Four types of stances have been identified through this analysis: the Mobilizing stance, the Self-reflective stance, the stance representing Principles in action, and the Antagonistic stances (anti-migrationist and pro-migrationist).

The process of analysis follows the same pattern, namely the tracing of representational elements for the organizational values, the identification of the speakers' audience and their positioning towards them by an analysis of the reference system they use (pronouns, other participants named and alluded to), and, finally the establishing of the speakers' dialogical and attitudinal stance. The relevant aspects of the dialogical stance are the identification of the participants engaged, the nature of that engagement, and the way the speakers position themselves towards those participants. In the case of the attitudinal stance, the objects of evaluation (participants, situation), the resources employed and the nature of that evaluative process are traced.

6.5. Conclusions

The last chapter integrates the findings of the analysis by pointing out similarities and differences between stances and explains limitations and possible further research. The texts have been attached in the annexes at the end of this document.

7. Research Findings

7.1. *Types of Stance*

The results of the analysis indicate that while there is one distinctively oppositional stance concerning the idea of receiving migrants (Antagonistic anti-migrationist), neither of the other speakers favour a categorically 'open door' policy in strict terms of their openness to receiving asylum seekers. It was one of the main findings of the analysis, that the criterion of the anti- or pro-migrationist stance becomes secondary to concerns related to organizational efficiency and legitimacy of action on the part of the leaders of the European institutions. Their focus was directed on the fast and efficient containment of the phenomenon which upset the regulations and agreements of the European Union, and on the imperative of representing the European citizens' concerns. In this respect reference to the enthusiastic and humane reception of refugees by locals is often mentioned, but worries are also expressed that the crisis has generated fear on the continent and that it is up to the politicians' responsible actions to alleviate that fear.

The highest degree of pro-migrationist attitude is realised in the Mobilising stance, by attitudinal values. A high degree of positive affect is provoked, designating a humane attitude towards the refugees as a European principle, inviting judgement of propriety. A considerably high degree of positive attitude is realised in the assertive stance of Principles in action, realising implied personal investment along with an affirmation of capacity as self-presentation. The pro-migrationist Antagonistic stance does not as much contain affirmative attitudes towards the refugees, as it dismisses the other extreme, which is evaluated negatively. Similarly to the stance realising Principles in action, an implicit positive attitude is combined with judgment of capacity towards the organization. In this case, negative judgment is directed towards the Council.

7.1.1. *The Mobilising stance*

The Mobilizing stance is realised in the texts representing the State of the Union Address by the President of the European Commission and the interventions of the First-Vice President, endorsing the perspective outlined by the head of the institution. A significant trait determining both speakers' stances is the exhortatory effort they undertake to bring all discordant participants under the common frame of solidarity and responsibility, the principles implied by both speakers as representative of Europe. This action is traceable as a conciliatory gesture by addressing the dissonant perspectives and admitting some of their claims as valid (J.C.Juncker) or dismissing the two extreme positions on migration as '*illusions*' in an attempt to channel them into a common middle ground.

In terms of its ideological content, this text as well as the other ones conveying pro-migrationist stances align with the general tendency of the official European discourse on migration. As samples of governmental discourse, they are attempts towards policy change regarding the perception and action towards asylum seekers in the European social and political environment. These policies, although, institutionally launched, are developed and conveyed by sentient agents.

The speaker's slightly lyrical style announces a high degree of personal investment, thus, building a very convincing case for a unified effort to help refugees. The attempt to expand the terms of the discussion on this topic on a global level demonstrates the speakers' (and implicitly the European institutions') effort towards a policy change that transcends '*politicization*' of the issue. In terms of its approach of the subject, the President's address qualifies as an example of *human* and *humane* approach to migration by emphasizing the humanitarian aspects of the phenomenon and its necessity for attention on intergovernmental and supranational levels.

7.1.2. *The Self-reflective stance*

The self-reflective stance preserves the previous speakers' exhortatory undertaking in that it urges the members of the audience to take their actions in the spirit of preserving Europe's '*good name*'. However, its tone is more moderate, inviting to cautious self-scrutiny, rather than immediate action.

The similarity between the two sets is the effort to balance the two polarities created due to the disagreements and different perspectives among the member states, the anti-migrationist and the pro-migrationist extremes. Regarding their political orientation, the speakers maintain a different perspective on the migrant crisis. The speaker of the self-reflective stance has a conservative, more reserved outlook on receiving migrants seeking consistency in enacting an authentic role for Europe as a symbol of humanity but also responsibly guarding those assets which allow it to be that symbol, namely applying a stricter asylum policy and maintaining the existent Schengen agreement by guarding external borders.

Considered from a discursive point of view, the texts from the two stances are illustrations of the dynamic process through which political discourse emerges as an interactive system of meaning production. In these concrete examples, the negotiation of what constitutes European values pursues to integrate discordant perspectives into a workable frame, allowing validity to the two opposite sides by a dialogically expansive engagement style and adequate attitudinal position. At the same time, a high degree of personal investment in both cases indicates their effort to align their audience to the values they proclaim.

7.1.3. *Principles in action*

The similarity of the two speakers in the stance realising Principles in action is that they are both representatives of the European Union on the international scene. The transparent structure of their interventions and their focus on concrete details illustrating the value they align to correlates their discourse on principles with concrete political action which benefits the organization on the long term and demonstrates its intentions and premises. It is due to the assertive and practical tone of the texts, that this stance has been named Principles in action.

Both speakers centre their text around the concept of *credibility*. *Credibility*, beyond values of solidarity, unity and responsibility often defined by speakers, represents, perhaps, the most important value from the perspective of a political organization, especially one such as the EU (due to its many members with various visions). If regarded from a discourse analytical perspective, credibility is where the performative nature of language is best demonstrated by the mutually supportive relation that political action and discourse accomplish. Credibility is the result of the *felicity condition* that consistent political action offers to discourse, while discourse is instrumental in the success of political action.

When they speak about credibility, they consider the guarantees Europe can offer on an international level when negotiating accords on migration with states outside the Union. Also, it is continuously implied that credibility is important within the Union as well, as proof towards citizens that European leaders are in control of the situation. Credibility, in fact, is the decisive value, and the quality, which establishes the organizations' (and its leaders') legitimacy to handle the issues that regard each member state individually, and the cooperation among them as a group. Setting it as the main focus of their actions, the speakers admit, in fact, that from the point of view of the organization, credibility subsumes all the other qualities and values that are regarded as relevant for the performance and existence of the organization.

7.1.4. *The Antagonistic stances*

7.1.4.1. *The Antagonistic anti-migrationist stance*

Two Antagonistic stances have been identified, characterized by sharp oppositions and a confrontational style. In the anti-migrationist Antagonistic stance, while interpersonal values duly realise the speaker's fervent opposition to 'Brussels' politics, the main factor that contributes to the construction of the anti-migrationist position is representational. Firstly, the speaker creates an alternative narrative that places his government as the defender of European values against the irresponsible politics of Brussels; secondly, an effective metaphorical scenario is produced representing the migrants as a formidable army besieging the borders of the European Union. This speaker is the prime minister of Hungary and represents a national perspective on the crisis.

The view on Europe represented in this text reflects a conservative, tradition-based perception. European history translates as cultivating historical connections with other sovereign states, connections the value of which has accrued in time throughout common experience and mutual support. The prerequisite of such a perspective is the stable, enduring existence of a sovereign state, and national borders are a materialization of that. Defending physical borders is very much the symbolic gesture of protecting those immaterial values that are connected to this view in public consciousness, cultural, national or Christian.

In this context, for the representative of the Hungarian government, history and statehood entwines with European identity, and it stems from this ideology that the speaker heavily relies on metaphor and myth in his representation of the events. The central myth based on which he formulates a metaphorical scenario, the so called *Antemurale* myth³ (*Antemurale Christianitatis*, in English, *the Bulwark of Christendom*) dominates his representation of facts in the analysed address, as well as numerous other declarations he formulated during this period. The statement that it is Hungary's '*historic and moral duty to protect Europe*' is a confirmation that according to this ideology, Hungary and Europe stand in an essential interdependence, reenforced in these discourses by various metaphorical or non-metaphorical references.

The *Antemurale* myth specific for countries in Eastern and Central Europe has contributed significantly in forging a typical frontier identity based on creating an ethos of defending Christian Europe from the various Eastern raiders. The analogy between the myth and the geography of the

³ For the connection between the myth and political justification for building walls, see Blažević, Zrinka (2021). *The Image of the Wall: The Antemurale Christianitatis Myth from an Imagological Perspective*. In: Jürgen Barkhoff and Joep Leerssen (eds.), *National Stereotyping, Identity Politics, European Crises*, Leiden-Boston: Brill (p.160-172)

2015 crisis is obvious, even if anachronistic. However, it effectively elicits an indirect attitudinal response by invoking affect related to both pride, due to the tradition of great resonance, and fear, due to the threat and danger connected to it. The *European values* and Hungarian ones, therefore, represent a common background, based on the continuity of interdependence the speaker explicitly states in his discourse and assumes as a premise underlying his stance.

A present-day consequence of this historical connection, and another achievement to take pride in is the Schengen membership, which not only the Hungarian prime minister but also his fellow politicians from the Visegrad Group regard as an affirmation of freedom that has been regained after the years of communism. Due to this specific aspect, the value of freedom occurs only among the Central European politicians but as the debate over the crisis advanced, the threat of losing Schengen due to the necessity to reestablish internal borders became the main subject on the agenda.

7.1.4.2. *The Antagonistic pro-migrationist stance*

The last stance identified is the pro-migrationist Antagonistic stance. It has been named so due to the speaker's unmitigated confrontational style, and sharp oppositional positioning, realised towards an alternative set of value resources. This speaker's position on the migration issue is in accordance with a vision aiming a more centralized policy on the part of the European Union, conveying more executive power on a union-level and prescribing member countries to observe a more integrated legislation.

7.2. *Self-presentation*

Due to the fact that the speakers are representatives of various institutions and public offices, the texts convey a consistent number of values referring to the organization, discussed in the study from the perspective of self-presentation. The negative evaluations, in these cases are directed towards those members who do not comply with community rules or are phrased in general terms, in the context of discussing values and their scarcity.

In all the speakers' cases, this aspect pertains to the discourse of legitimation and it is closely connected to the representation of values throughout the texts. Both positive and negative self-presentation is realised through the attitudinal values of judgement, of which the most frequent is capacity (regarding the efficiency of the organization), with some propriety (pertaining to the morality of the actions) and occasional tenacity (pursuing one's goals).

These values are associated with more or less intensified oppositions towards other participants, with the sharpest realisations occurring in the Antagonistic stances. In the case of the anti-migrationist stance the opposed participant is the 'short-sighted' Europe with its 'leftist' policy, while in the case of the pro-migrationist stance, the negative counterparts are Hungary, whose treatment of refugees is a 'shame' for the European Union, and the European Council, which is unable to carry out the solidarity principle-oriented politics of the European Union.

In the case of the moderate stances, it pertains to the speakers' focus on reestablishing unity that self-presentation is realised in a manner that seeks to tone down the extreme manifestations and establish an achievable common policy among the members. In the case of the Mobilizing stance values of *entertain* acknowledge the existence of various perspectives within the organization and, even if negative values exist, these are usually mitigated in some manner. In other cases, a dismissive attitude is formulated generally, aiming the negative conduct, without naming an addressee (e.g. Principles in action, Mobilizing stance).

The self-reflective stance represents a special example, as the thoughts conveyed by the speaker convey, in fact, a characterization of Europe through its leaders and its political actions. The main tenet of this stance is the value of responsibility the importance of which is forcefully proclaimed. In this case, although the general tone is a pensive one, the speaker explicitly names his targets when illustrating irresponsible behaviour. Still, his stance does not become antagonistic, as he establishes responsibility as a general moral value to be followed by all politicians

7.3. *Graduation*

A relevant aspect differentiating the individual stances in terms of moderacy pertains to the values realised by the intensification or mitigation of other interpersonal values. The two antagonistic stances representing the extreme values of the spectrum illustrate the highest degrees of intensification while mitigation occurs with the stances positioned in the mid-range of the dialogic and attitudinal scale. The role of the mitigating devices is associated with the speakers' focus on identifying workable solutions for containing the crisis and is supported by an awareness that the debate is taking place among the members of the same community.

However, intensifications occur often, even in the case of the moderate speakers. In typical cases, graduation has the role of adding personal investment to the proclaim values. In the case of the Mobilizing stance, for instance, the speakers seek to emphasize the importance of the proclaimed values for the organization and the community by intensified values of proclaim and affect. In other cases, as in Principles in action, intensification serves as a reinforcement of the speaker's dismissal of the conducts that go against the interests and goals of the organization (negative imperative).

7.4. *Values and representational frame*

In terms of the type of value represented through the solidarity and responsibility principles, the conclusion is that, in most cases, speakers combine a moral perspective and a pragmatic one. This aspect is due to issues of legitimisation. For the European Union, as for any government or institution, the elements of legitimacy imply the combination of characteristics that pertain to efficiency, and, implicitly, the ability to pursue the interests of its citizens and those that apply universal moral values: acting on behalf of its citizens and pursuing values consistent with the moral order.

In the case of the European Union, the combination of these two is especially important, as values of solidarity and responsibility represent principles pursued by the founders of the organization after the second World War, and efficient representation of citizens is a fundamental act of governance in the present. Solidarity and responsibility are both predominantly moral categories in the case of the Mobilizing stance, for instance, with the speakers emphasizing the necessity to act within the parameters of humanity and human dignity, as well as the coordinates of a community of values, in addition to the community of states that the European Union is formed by.

Generally speaking, the European Union is defined on two levels from the perspective of the discussed values, one pertaining to its dimension as a political and economic community with its capacity to materially handle the crisis (finances, material assets, member countries helping each other), and one in which Europe is defined as a community of values, of solidarity towards those in need, in the present case the refugees.

The Self-reflective stance reiterates these premises, with the difference that the two values are first of all connected to mutual solidarity, among the member countries, in order to be able to keep up a common effort to help others (we need to help ourselves first in order to help others). Here, the value of responsibility is mainly a moral category, because by maintaining a high level of mutual solidarity, the European Union can demonstrate its influence, live up to its good name by helping others. However, keeping this union intact is imperative. and this requires a responsible conduct of both pro- and anti-migrationists. with both refraining from extreme gestures. (*'political machos', 'radical, extreme politics'* - Self-reflective stance)

In the case of Principles in action, the morality of the gesture of helping those in need is implied, with some personal reflection on the personal satisfaction this brings. The main content of solidarity and responsibility pertains to efficiency, however, with both speakers focussing on the actions that have been undertaken as a means of applying the European principles in the concrete situation of international politics. This mixed content is discursively materialized as credibility, the ultimate legitimizing principle, implying the capacity of the organization to consistently reproduce a trademark policy which causes it to be acknowledged by international partners.

In the case of the anti-migrationist Antagonistic stance the values solidarity and responsibility are given an alternative definition through an alternative representational frame. The speaker creates an alternative narrative in which the values of the organization are defended against European short-sightedness and irresponsibility. The moral aspect of the two values stands in member states helping each other and responsibly preserving the achievements of the organization this far. This stance is antagonistic because it sharply positions itself against the official policy of the European Union. Values in this stance are described implicitly, in negative terms, by criticising the opposite position as one that is not correct.

At the same time, the speaker provides a self-presentation which is consistent with a responsible policy towards migrants (strictly controlling their access into the European union). In the pro migrationist Antagonistic stance, a similar definition in negative terms is phrased, this time against those who do not comply with migration-tolerant policy of acceptance.

In the context of the crisis, the organization is presented as lacking those values that represent its principles. Quoting J. C. Juncker's pun, the general concern in these texts is that *'there is a lack of Union in this European Union'*, a lack of solidarity among the member states. Indeed, this scarcity of values represents another level of crisis for the speakers. Beyond the reference to the extraordinary events of migrants or refugees seeking asylum in Europe and the need to bring efficient solutions, speakers refer to a 'community of values' (Mobilising stance) which has come under threat.

Accordingly, the crisis is described concretely as a series of extraordinary events which need to be controlled by increasing efficiency in the organization. Such an increase can be achieved by way of solidarity between member states and by demonstrating moral and humane conduct towards the refugees. Lack or deficiency in demonstrating these attitudes represents a threat to the assumed values, and the community they stand for.

The difference in representation which generates the distinction in the dialogical and attitudinal stance as well, is provided by the nature of the threat to the values and the existence of the community. Representatives of the European institutions designate lack of unity (e.g. 'finger-pointing' – Mobilising stance), short-term solutions as opposed to a responsible politics of taking slower steps towards a more comprehensive and enduring solution. A subcategory of this representation is that of the warning issued regarding the short-lived positive affect of solidarity which may soon end, emphasizing the need for solutions that have a lasting, sustainable effect (Principles in action).

The threat of 'radical and ruthless leadership' is given as warning by the representatives of the European institutions (Self-reflective stance) for politicians to increase responsibility in their governance. Raising fear is named as a feature of irresponsibility on the part of those politicians who pursue short term success (Mobilising stance), with leaders of European institutions (Mobilising and Self-reflective stances) implicitly referring to the risky politics of the right.

The most striking difference of representation is traceable in the anti-migrationist Antagonistic stance where a parallel narrative is conveyed to that of the leaders of the European institutions. The phenomenon is described as mass migration and the term '*economic migrant*' is used to categorize the asylum seekers. No explicit mention of the values of solidarity and responsibility occurs in this speech. However, their lack is implied by the description of '*Brussels' politics*' as '*short-sighted policy*' and the statement that the Hungarian government needs to perform above its strength 'by '*fighting a battle on two fronts*'. The specificity of the value of responsibility is indicated by defining the solutions of the Hungarian government as '*logical*', '*dictated by common sense*'.

7.5. *Dialogical stance*

The common aspect of all speakers is the predominance of the *proclaim value* in all of the analysed texts. This characteristic results from the argumentative and exhortatory nature of the texts. In these conditions, the difference in the speakers' dialogical stance is not realised in the type of engagement used but, in its graduation, (intensity/mitigation), and the participant it is directed towards.

Bare assertions are another frequently employed type of engagement. One example is the anti-migrationist antagonistic stance. An intensified opposition is present in this text against the European politics represented by 'Brussels' and 'the European left'. The use of bare assertions indicates that the speaker completely denies validity for alternative value positions. In Principles in action, the use of this type of monoglossic engagement style is associated with the description of policies and plans in a factual manner. In these examples, bare assertions convey the assertiveness and the practical nature of the implementation plan with no opposition assumed.

Disclaim: deny values tackle opposing perspectives which the speaker categorically dismisses. The value of *deny* is often combined with *proclaim: pronounce* engagement style, the speaker demonstrating this way the validity of his/her own perspective. A similar strategy occurs with *entertain* values where the alternative perspective is discussed only to be dismissed afterwards.

7.6. *Attitudinal stance*

As all speakers are official representatives of some type of political entity, self-reference realises evaluation of the institution or government represented. In the case of the institutional representatives, self-evaluation (evaluation of the organization) is generally realised through judgement of capacity, positive or negative, depending on the value of the assessment. As the topic of the interventions is mainly the lack of solidarity, responsibility or unity within the organisation, this evaluation is mostly negative. However, it is usually combined with an exhortatory action towards improving the negative state which is presented as temporary. Due to their mobilizing nature, the attitudinal stances of the speakers of the Mobilizing stance realise the most positive judgement of capacity pertaining to the organisation. Further values of judgement include propriety, since the moral aspect of European action and solutions is implied.

Attitudinal stance towards migrants is realised through *values of affect*. A positive attitude is implied in all declarations (excepting for the anti-migrationist stance) related to the migrants, with some

invited positive affect realised in their evaluation as victims when discussing policies or representing them as *'fleeing'* for their lives, from conflict and persecution. In this perspective, the most prominent difference between stances is realised between the polarized values of high intensity empathy (Mobilizing stance) and high intensity fear (anti-migrationist Antagonistic).

8. Conclusions

8.1. *The novelty of this study*

The novelty of this study is constituted, firstly, by the analysis of representation strategies in the context of stance, secondly, the combination of two different theoretical frameworks in order to suit the characteristics of the present corpus, and, thirdly, the institutional nature of the corpus, which foregrounds legitimation as the main objective of the discourse and shapes stance-taking accordingly.

8.2. *The possibilities to continue*

The possibilities to continue this research pertain both to further research on formal realisations of stance and on critical discourse analysis-informed research into the legitimation strategies that the European governance is using in order to impose its perspective in an international context. One possible direction would be an analysis of stance representing one individual or one ideology throughout a longer period of time in order to trace possible changes in its modulation considering the impact of other participants.

Selective references

Fairclough, Norman and Fairclough, Isabela (2012). *Critical Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. Routledge, London and New York.

Martin, James. R. and Rose, David (2007). *Working with Discourse. Meaning beyond the Clause*. Continuum, second edition.

Martin, James. R. and White, Peter. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.