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Introduction

The ongoing migration crisis that the European Union is facing has focused on the handling of the flow of refugees into Europe. One of the main ways the flow has been handled by the EU is through the relocation of refugees between the member states. The Council's first decision concerning the relocation of 32,256 refugees from Greece and Italy was passed on 20 July 2015. An agreement was also struck to increase this amount to 40,000 by December 2015. The Council's decision to relocate 120,000 migrants from Greece and Italy amongst the rest of the member states over a period of two years was passed during the meeting of ministers of the interior (Justice and Home Affairs Council) on 22 September 2015. This latter decision was, in contrast to the previous decision, controversial and strongly criticized by the Visegrad group (V4) consisting of Slovakia, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic. All of the V4 members voted against the Council's relocation directive with the exception of Poland. Finland was the only other member state sceptical to the directive and consequently abstained from voting.

The purpose of this thesis is to test Rovny's theory on the left-right spectrum of Eastern European states regarding the issue of migration policy by conducting a two-part study testing his findings both quantitatively and qualitatively. His findings include that some Eastern European states, (Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania and Romania) have a reversed political system, where left-wing political parties hold a negative stance towards immigration and ethnic minority rights, while the right-wing political parties tend to support these issues. The structure of the political systems can be described as reversed in comparison to the West and in Eastern European states such as Croatia, Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia. In Western democracies and the previously mentioned states, left-wing parties are often found to be more tolerant and open to immigration and ethnic minority rights, while political parties on the right often hold a negative stance towards these issues. Rovny uses quantitative data collected by the Chapel Hill Expert Survey (1999-2010) to support this claim. The purpose of this thesis is to test Rovny's the statistical results of through regression analysis by introducing an alternative measurement of the left-right scale, that is an overall-ideology left-right scale and compare it to the left-right ideological measurement on economic issues used by Rovny. Both of these left-right scales are in the CHES datasets. In the main part of this thesis, the purpose is to study party positions through a detailed qualitative analysis through the categorization of the arguments of members of parliament (MPs) speeches in a parliamentary debate (n. 54) at the National Council in Slovakia.
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regarding the issue of migration policy. The purpose of conducting a qualitative study with a type of material such as parliamentary speeches is to establish party position on an issue, in this case immigration. Compared to traditional materials such as party programs, or manifestos, in parliamentary speeches, the MPs reveal a more detailed and updated account of their political party's position regarding an issue. MPs' speeches can also reveal intraparty contestation as well as interparty disagreements between political parties regarding an issue. Another strength of qualitative argumentation analysis of debate(s) is that the political parties are measured within the same time frame, rather than over a long time span such as in the CHES expert surveys. This is a strength as it makes the political parties more comparable as they are measured during the same time period. In comparison, the CHES research survey is conducted over a period of one year during which positioning of an issue can change. Party manifestos and programs have a similar weakness, in that they often contain general positions that provide little detail information regarding how the positions are applied in reality. In addition, these types of materials are rarely updated.

Why should one study immigration and why should a study be conducted on a critical case such as Slovakia? The migration crisis that the EU is collectively facing provides a unique scenario and opportunity to study how political parties position themselves regarding the issue of immigration in a parliamentary setting. Slovakia has been chosen as a critical case to study migration for multiple reasons. It is of interest to better understand the Slovak government's negative position concerning immigration, specifically regarding the JHA's directive to relocate 120,000 refugees amongst EU's member states. It is also of interest to understand the argumentative process and what arguments are behind Slovakia's position. It is also of interest to find out how the rest of the political parties position themselves regarding immigration. Slovakia is also a critical case to test Rovny's theory and results as it has been categorized of having a reversed left-right position (negative relationship) regarding the issue of immigration. In addition, Slovakia's left-wing government consisting of a single political party, SMER-SD - Direction, Social Democrats, and its seemingly strict immigration position specifically regarding the EU relocation directive, appears to fit Rovny's description of a typical reversed structure regarding the issue of immigration, if it can be shown that right-wing political parties are for immigration in Slovakia.

From a methodological standpoint the purpose of selecting the Slovak Republic as critical case/most likely case is to test Rovny's hypothesis and empirical evidence of a reversed structure of political parties position regarding the issue of immigration. As the thesis's focus is to qualitatively study and to provide a detailed account of parliamentary speeches/debate in order to establish party positions
regarding immigration, it is only possible to study a single case in both the qualitative and the quantitative sections of the thesis, due to constraints of time and space. It was therefore essential to identify a critical case to test Rovny's findings, as that would allow us to generalize the results to a certain extent. The study of a Slovakia as a most likely case is motivated by the lack of research in the area of the reversed structure in immigration policy in Eastern Europe, and as Slovakia according on Rovny's findings has this structure in place, Slovakia appears to be a good choice to test Rovny's theory qualitatively and quantitatively. Finally it should be noted that one should reserve some caution from drawing conclusions beyond the case of Slovakia, nevertheless this critical case study still allows for some generalizations to be made regarding Rovny's theory from the results of the thesis.

Research Questions
This thesis will particularly focus on the reversed political structure observed by Rovny in the critical case Slovakia. The quantitative section of the thesis, Part I, will compare two independent variables “Left-Right ideological Stance on Economic Issues” and “Left-Right overall Ideological Stance” by testing them on same dependent variable “Immigration Policy” separately. Both independent variables can be found in the same CHES datasets. By testing Rovny's results with an alternative independent variable provides an opportunity to test reversed structure observed by Rovny and to discuss the consequence and legitimacy of drawing conclusions from the results. This part of the thesis will focus around the following research question.

- Does the reversed (negative) relationship between political party position and immigration hold also when the ideological left-right measurement on the economic issues is replaced by the overall-ideology left-right position of parties?

In Part II of the thesis, the main study is conducted. This part of the study is a qualitative study in which a parliamentary debate concerning the topic of immigration is studied in detail. The following are the research questions that will be in focus in this section of this thesis.

- In what ways do parliamentary political parties argue around the issue of immigration? What types of arguments are presented by the MPs representing their party regarding immigration?

- Are parliamentary political parties which are categorized as left-wing positioned as against immigration in Slovakia? Are parliamentary political parties which are categorized as right-wing positioned as being for immigration?
Theoretical Framework

The aim of the following section is to present and discuss the theoretical framework of that will be applied on the case study of political party’s positions in Slovakia regarding the issue of immigration. In the first section, the discussion will revolve around Rovny’s theoretical framework where the relationship between socialist heritage, federalism, and ethnic minorities will be discussed in relation to the left-right economic dimension of party competition in democratic states in Eastern Europe. Both the quantitative and qualitative sections of this thesis share this theoretical framework.

In his research Rovny has studied political party position in Eastern Europe with a particular focus regarding the issue of migration. Eastern Europe has had a significant experience of emigration to the West both during and after the fall socialism in each respective state. The wave of democratization and the increase of economic prosperity have together formed a situation where some states in Eastern Europe are for the first becoming attractive for migrants. Rovny argues that this shift is already taking place and goes as far as claiming that the influx of migrant workers is changing Eastern European states from emigrant to immigrant societies.

Listed below is Rovny’s theoretical framework on which factors and what mechanisms form party positions in Eastern Europe regarding migration.

-A political party’s position on ethnic minority rights is interlinked with the party’s position on migration. Migration positions of a political party is informed by views of ethnic minority rights.

-Socialist heritage that includes a center-periphery cleavage, structures party competition in post-communist states. (I) In periphery states (countries that were not the center of the federation), where the significant ethnic minority originates from the center of the federalist state, the left supports multiculturalism, ethnic minority rights and migration. (II) In periphery states where the ethnic minority originate from elsewhere than the center (i.e. Slovakia), the left does not support multiculturalism, ethnic rights and migration, the support for these issues is instead found on the right. (III) In unitary states (non-federal states), non-peripheral states/center states, reformation of the left in post-communism affects the left's

---
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and right’s position on multiculturalism, ethnic rights and migration. A non-reformed left does not support these issues, while a reformed left does. (IV) Religion counterbalances ethnic minorities’ tendency to hold a liberal position and tolerance of other ethnicities. The interaction between religion and politics affects party positions in Eastern Europe. Religion has a particular strong effect on politics, due to its suppression during socialism and its political role during the democratization process in many Eastern European states.

Rovny’s research suggests that partisan and voters’ position on migration in Eastern Europe are “significantly ideologically structured” through experience with ethnic minorities during socialism. The structure of the political system appears to be affected by this socialist heritage with a substantial effect on party position on the left-right dimension in party competition. This effect is suggested to be ideological. In the traditional western left-right dimension, parties on the left are more tolerant of multiculturalism and generally more positive to immigration and ethnic minority rights, while political parties on the right are often more reserved on this issue. In Eastern Europe however, the political left’s association with socialism and the decades of totalitarianism, has led to the left to associates itself to nationalism in order to distinguish itself from its socialist past. It is therefore not uncommon for a left government coalition to include a nationalist political party, an otherwise unthinkable scenario in the West.

Rovny suggest that depending on the Eastern European state’s relationship with ethnic minorities during socialism, states from this region can be categorized into two main categories, countries that have a western party structure and countries where this structure is reversed. The former category includes countries such as Estonia, Croatia, Latvia and Slovenia. These states were established out of the ruins of federalist communist states (Yugoslavia, USSR) where majority of the inhabitants were ethnic minorities within the federation during socialism. Rovny has found that in this category of states, political parties on the left (operationalized as communist, socialist, or social democratic) follow the western model of political structure, whereas in states such as Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, with “politically insignificant ethnic minority populations or where the main ethnic minority comes from other nations, left parties have no particular ethnic affinities” and therefore hold a conservative stance. The right side of the political spectrum
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(operationalized as parties that are either Christian democrat, liberal and conservative)\textsuperscript{18} this category of states has consequentially established a social liberal stance capturing a position that is more liberal in rights of ethnic minorities and is more positive on its position on immigration and integration of migrants.

Rovny research suggests that depending on a state’s socialist heritage i.e. whether or not ethnic minorities were excluded in the political power (intraparty contestation within the Communist party), this heritage has structured the party competition through positions of political parties on ethnic minority rights and where on the political dimension ethnic minorities seek representation.\textsuperscript{19} If excluded as in Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Romania, Bulgaria, the ethnic minorities identify with liberal preferences on the right, while the opposite is true in Estonia, Croatia, Latvia and Slovenia, in these states, ethnic minorities find political representation on the left, where they have found representation in the past. \textsuperscript{20}

The heritage of socialism, heterogeneity of the population, inclusion of politically significant minorities in the Communist party, are factors that produce opportunity structures for party competition in post-communist states. Rovny argues that an additional factor plays an important role in the region today, that is to say the competition between the federal center and the periphery during federalism.\textsuperscript{21} In federalist states that where a part of the periphery, states that broke away from the Communist federation such as Croatia, Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia, harbour ethnic minorities from the center of the federation, that is to say Russians from USSR and Serbs from Yugoslavia. In these post-communist countries, the dispersa ethnics often identify with the former center of the federation, and the left is often more positive to multiculturalism, minority rights, and immigration.\textsuperscript{22} In these states, ethnic majorities of federation became ethnic minorities as a consequence of the collapse of the federalist state, and this has formed the party competition structure of these post-communist states of today.\textsuperscript{23} In former peripheral states such as Slovakia, Bulgaria, Lithuania, and Romania, the ethnic minorities became ethnic majorities as a consequence of the collapse of federalism. In these countries the left is not associated with ethnic minorities, as the dominant ethnicity does not originate from former federalist center.\textsuperscript{24} Due to this lack of association between today’s ethnic minorities and political power during socialism, these minorities do not seek representation or feel represented by the left. Instead the
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party competition structure in these types of states is affected by ethnopolitics. Ethnopolitics becomes a template for inclusion and exclusion in the competition for power, Stein: “Thus ethnopolitics fills the ideological and institutional vacuum left by the collapse of the party-state.”

If ethnicity is successfully politicized in the structure of the political party competition from the very beginning of the democratization process, the risk for marginalization is high in a political system that is structured by this concept. The left-right spectrum is thus affected by ethnic minorities and their relationship with the political power in the Communist party during the Federalism. Rovny's research suggests that the left-right economic dimension remains the intact; however the dimension concerning issues and views of multiculturalism, minority rights, and position on immigration is affected by the previously mentioned factors.

Rovny's findings are significant in that his research identifies a correlation between historical and cultural factors and the political position in Eastern Europe. Rovny extends these findings to political party position in the issue of migration and minority rights. The experience with minorities is the mechanism that causes according to Rovny a ‘reversed’ party position in Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Romania, opposite to that of and in Estonia, Croatia, Latvia, Slovenia, and Bulgaria where these states follow a traditional Western European party position. Homogeneity or heterogeneity of the population of a state during socialism forms the post-communist state in such a manner that it determines the structure of the political system through ideology, “Views on ethnic minority rights are thus a strong determinant of preferences over immigration and immigrant integration.”

Rovny suggests that political parties established position on ethnic minority rights and influences their position on immigration and integration of immigrants, issues that have over time become of increasing relevance due to that fact that Eastern European states are becoming immigrant nations.
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Part I – Quantitative Study

Methodology and Material

The following section contains a presentation and discussion of the methodology of the quantitative study of the thesis as well as a discussion of the material. This part of the thesis is a quantitative study of the critical/most likely case Slovakia, with the purpose to see whether or not an alternative independent variable (left-right scale) changes Rovny's results regarding immigration policy in Slovakia.

Rovny's quantitative research regarding the trend 'reversed political party position' described in the previous section 'Theoretical Framework' was conducted using large-N quantitative cross-country statistical (OLS) linear multivariate regression analysis. The regression (OLS) analysis that will be conducted here is however bivariate, the independent variables, that is to say the selected scales, the “left-right ideological stance on economic issues” and the “left-right overall-ideological stance” are tested separately against the dependent variable, immigration policy. The purpose of conducting bivariate regression analysis is to show a negative/positive relationship or zero correlation between the two independent variables and the dependent variable. Will the relationship remain reversed (negative) as Rovny's results demonstrate when the economic left-right scale is replaced by the overall-ideological scale and will the results be statistically significant? The results will be presented in the form scatter plot diagrams where each plot represents a political party and a line of best fit will be included to demonstrates the relationship of the data. A total of 6 graphs will be presented in the results, with each graph categorized chronologically (2006, 2010, 2014) and by the type of left-right scale used. It should be noted that the correlation between the two different independent variable with the dependent variable will be tested without any control variables, in other words no control variables will be introduced in the regression analysis, with the motivation that this thesis main purpose is to conduct a qualitative study. Controlling for other variables simply does not fit the scope and purpose of the thesis.

The motivation of conducting regression analysis in a single state is two-fold. Firstly, the due to the thesis's qualitative focus, a large-N study would take up too much space in the magnitude of the thesis. Secondly, the purpose of the quantitative section is to provide an overview of Slovak political parties position regarding immigration using two different scales “left-right ideological stance of on economic issues” and “left-right overall-ideological stance” and demonstrating a basic relationship (positive or negative), before conducting an in-depth qualitative study to test Rovny's hypothesis and empirical findings, thereby both replicating and challenging Rovny's results at the same time.

The purpose of conducting OLS linear regression analysis is to replicate Rovny's methodology in his
research thereby allowing a comparison between Rovny's results and the results of this study.\textsuperscript{27} The goodness of fit measurement $R^2$, coefficient of determination, that will be used, is the most conventional measure to determine correlation between two variables and is also used by Rovny.\textsuperscript{28} The statistical significance of the result will be tested at 95 % confidence level (P-value 0.05) to determine the significance of the results of the OLS regression. In other words, if the P-value is above 0.05, the correlation between the independent and dependent variable will be rejected. A rejection in turn means that the relationship between the two variables cannot be statistically supported using this method and at this level of confidence. Without statistically significant results it is not possible to determine a positive or negative relationship between the data, thereby forcing the conclusion that there is no correlation between the variables.

The following is a presentation and discussion of the data that is used in this section of the thesis. The Chapel Hill Expert Surveys (CHES) is expert based survey data set that “estimates party positioning on European integration, ideology and policy issues for national parties in a variety of European countries”\textsuperscript{29} between 1999 and 2014. During this period, the survey has been conducted in 1999, 2002, 2006, 2010, 2014. The latest survey includes all 28 EU member states. Over the course of this time period, the survey has been modified and expanded, however all surveys have included questions regarding political parties' position on: general Left-Right, economic Left-Right, social Left-Right, European integration and multiple EU policies.\textsuperscript{30} The aim of the survey is for experts to position political party on a numeric scale on each issue. The magnitude of the scale varies depending on the question. The following issues are highlighted for the purpose of this thesis:

**The general/overall ideological Left-Right:** “We now turn to a few questions on the ideological positions of political parties in [country] in 2010. Please tick the box that best describes each party's overall ideology on a scale ranging from 0 (extreme left) to 10 (extreme right).”\textsuperscript{31}

**Economic Left–Right:** Parties can be classified in terms of their stance on economic issues. Parties on the economic left want government to play an active role in the economy. Parties on the economic right emphasize a reduced economic role for government: privatization, lower taxes, less regulation, less government spending, and a leaner welfare state. An 11-point scale ranges from 0 (extreme left) to 5 (center) to 10 (extreme right).”\textsuperscript{32}

**Position on immigration:** An 11-point scale ranges from “0: (fully opposed to a restrictive policy on immigration) to 10: Fully in favour of a restrictive policy on immigration)”\textsuperscript{33} This scale includes an “Don't know” option.
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Bakker et al discuss the reliability and validity of the data in an article on the CHES dataset. The material used by the experts in order to answer the surveys includes a variety of sources such as party manifestos, parliamentary speeches or roll-call voting, television debates, Bakker et al argue that the combination of public position and party behaviour are both accounted in the sources and therefore provide a valid and more 'complete' position of the party.\textsuperscript{34} Furthermore, the reliability of the data in each country can be easily tested by evaluating the standard deviation of the responses provided by the experts.\textsuperscript{35} The data was then cross-validated with public opinion polls, questionnaires with members of parliament, and party manifestos. The public opinion poll \textit{European Election Study} dataset was compared with the CHES, resulting with a correlation of 0,62 regarding the general left-right position, concluding that the variance can be explained by a single factor by 0,77.\textsuperscript{36} Marks et al, conclude that when the expert surveys were compared to public opinion polls and surveys of members of parliament, the positioning of parties were very similar, while a comparison with party manifestos showed diverging results.\textsuperscript{37}

There are several issues worth discussing regarding the methodology and data collection of CHES. Firstly, there is an complete reliance of the abilities experts for the data. There is however no data available regarding how the experts acquire their data in order to answer the surveys. This is problematic due to Bakker et al findings that party manifestos deviate significantly from party positions established by experts or survey data from members of parliament.\textsuperscript{38} This finding suggest that party manifestos are an inaccurate source for establishing party positions, and should arguably be excluded as material when researching party position. So to what extent have experts used party manifestos to answer the survey in the CHES studies? Unfortunately there is no way of providing an answer at this point in time (although CHES is currently researching this aspect and will release a more “complete” dataset in the near future)\textsuperscript{39}, what can however be concluded is that it manifestos have been used to a certain extent as sources in CHES.

At this point, the following can be established, firstly, expert surveys are a popular method of collecting data to establish party positions, secondly, these expert based surveys provide a similar data to that of surveys conducted with members of parliament, thirdly, a major weakness in the data provided by expert survey is the use of party manifestos as source for party positioning. What we also know is as
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\textsuperscript{39} Personal correspondence with Seth Jolly, Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science at The Maxwell School of Syracuse University. Jolly works with the Chapel Hill Expert Survey.
Proksch & Slapin argue that the content of parliamentary speeches have until recently been an understudied source for determining party position and party ideology. In their study on party position in the European Parliament, Proksch & Slapin, determine party positions through the actions of members of parliament through roll-call/votes on legislative proposals and through analysis of parliamentary speeches.

Results

The results presented below in figures 1-6 are were produced in SPSS using the 1999-2014 Chapel Hill Expert Survey dataset. Data from 2006, 2010, and 2014 were the only usable years as the expert surveys were not conducted in 1999 in Slovakia and the position of political parties on the issue of immigration policy was not measured until 2006, thereby forcing the exclusion of data from 2002. Rovny's published work has so far not included data from 2014.
Figure 1. Slovakia, year 2006, political parties positions on economic left-right scale on the x-axis, the issue of immigration policy and the y-axis.

Figure 2. Slovakia, year 2006, political parties positions on the overall ideological left-right scale on the x-axis, the issue of immigration policy and the y-axis.
Figure 3. Slovakia, year 2010, political parties positions on economic left-right scale on the x-axis, the issue of immigration policy and the y-axis.

Figure 4. Slovakia, year 2010, political parties positions on the overall ideological left-right scale on the x-axis, the issue of immigration policy and the y-axis.
Figure 5. Slovakia, year 2014, political parties positions on economic left-right scale on the x-axis, the issue of immigration policy and the y-axis.

Figure 6. Slovakia, year 2014, political parties positions on the overall ideological left-right scale on the x-axis, the issue of immigration policy and the y-axis.
Two different measurements of the independent variable X were included, the first being the “left-right ideological stance on economic issues” and the second being the “left-right overall ideological stance”, producing two sets of graphs for each measured year. The independent variables (IV) are measured on a scale 0-10, where 0 = extreme left, 5 = center, and 10 = extreme right. The dependent variable (DV) Y, immigration policy, is measured on a scale of 0-10, where 0 = fully opposed to a restrictive policy on immigration, 10 = fully in favour of a restrictive policy on immigration. Producing two sets of graphs for each year is essential in order to show the difference in a left-right scale based on an economic criteria and overall ideological criteria.

The results show that depending on which IV used, the relationship with the immigration policy variable differs. When the economic variable is used to place political parties on the left-right scale, Rovny's results are provided empirical support, the relationship between the IV and DV is negative – the left's immigration policy position is more restrictive, while the right's is less restrictive. When the overall-ideology variable is used, however, the opposite relationship is supported through the data, the relationship between the IV and DV is positive - the left's immigration policy position is less restrictive than the right's. A comparison of the two independent variables shows the impact of the type of independent variable has on the dependent variable, the seemingly similar independent variables produces reversed results - positive and negative relationships. In his work, Rovny uses the economic left-right as an independent variable to support his hypothesis of reversed political position regarding immigration in some Eastern European states.41 The results presented here however show that in all the years measured with the exception of 2014, the overall-ideology variable has had a stronger correlation $R^2$ to the dependent variable immigration policy compared to the independent variable economic left-right and its relationship with the dependent variable position (see Table 1. below). This comparison provides support for the notion that the overall-ideology is a more suitable independent variable for placing political parties on the left-right scale as it fits the data in a better manner due to its overall higher correlation $R^2$. However the higher correlation $R^2$ could alternatively be caused by an overlap between the independent and dependent variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>IV - Economic</th>
<th>IV - Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.00863$</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.161$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.019$</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.114$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.209$</td>
<td>$R^2 = 0.0559$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Correlation comparison

41 Rovny, 2014, 641, A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Statistical Significance IV Economic</th>
<th>Statistical Significance IV overall Ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>0.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.498</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2. Statistical significance of the data, p-value*

The results in Table 2 show the results of the linear regression models from figures 1-6. As none of the results are smaller than the P-value, \( P < 0.05 \), it can be concluded at a 95 % confidence level that the results are not statistically significant and do not support the results of either independent variables: left-right ideological stance on economic issues or the left-right overall ideological stance are correlated with the dependent variable immigration policy. It should however be noted, that due to the small sample size, that is the number of experts who have answered the survey, this result is not surprising. It is suggested that future CHES datasets should include answers from more experts.

**Part II – Qualitative Study**

**Methodology**

The operationalization of immigration policy and how a variation of it will be measured qualitatively in this study will now be presented and discussed. As this part of the thesis is not quantitative, the operationalization of immigration policy will not be placed on a numeric scale, instead the variation of political parties regarding the topic of immigration (immigration policy) will be studied through an analytical framework that is developed using an inductive approach using the existing material (parliamentary debate). The analytical framework enables the observation and categorization of the types of arguments MPs use when they present their own and their party’s views on the topic of immigration.

The analytical framework was as already mentioned created inductively through reading and analysing the material - parliamentary debate n.54. The reason behind the developing of specific framework for the given material, was the lack of a suitable and existing analytical framework for the purpose of positioning political parties on issues in the literature. van Dijk (1997) work of political discourse analysis perhaps comes closest to a suitable framework of analysing type of issues.\(^4\) In his work, Dijk developed a framework for analysing speeches in parliamentary debates to analyse the strategic tactics of politicians from both a semantic and rhetorical perspective as well as the content of the speeches.

\(^4\) Van Dijk, 1997
and arguments presented by the speakers. Furthermore his framework is focused on immigration and racism. However despite the expected suitability of Dijk's framework, it was quickly found that it was not appropriate for the positioning of political parties on the issue of immigration, due to the frameworks overall linguistic rather than content based focus. Due to these fundamental issues, it became clear in the research process, that a specific analytical framework will need to be developed in order to be able to position the political parties on this specific issue given the material of parliamentary debates. However before the inductive process of analysing the material began, the development of categories of arguments was to the first step that need to taken. These categories of typical arguments were developed from general research (editorials, media appearances/interviews, televised party debates etc.) regarding how political parties 'typically' argue on immigration issues. Once the commonly occurring arguments were documented the general categories were taken into account as the analysis of the debate material began. During the course of analysis and the documentation process, the framework was developed into the list of categories that are presented and discussed below.

The variation of a political party position will be measured through the following analytical framework. The framework consists of a list of categories that constitute common/typical types arguments that are often associated with the issue of immigration and that are likely to be present in the MPs speeches in a parliamentary debate. Each of these categories listed below will be elaborated. The analytical framework will then be applied to each political party separately and the results will allow a measurement of interparty and intraparty variation regarding the positions on immigration. The positions are as follows: “For Immigration”, “Neutral Stance”, “Against Immigration” and “Strictly Against Immigration”. The purpose of the two levels positioning of against immigration, is to highlight a difference in the intensity that may be present between the political parties regarding to what extent they are against immigration. A presentation of what criteria are used to rank the political parties will be discussed after the list of categories are presented. A qualitative study such as this provides an opportunity to analyse the content of MPs speeches, data which is unavailable through quantitative studies such as CHES. A qualitative study of this measure provides not only the possibility to identify a political party's position regarding immigration, but also to uncover the reasoning behind their position through the analysis of their argumentation in parliamentary debates. In parliamentary debates, political parties have the opportunity to present their strongest and most important arguments regarding their position of an issue in a compressed time span, creating a good opportunity to study the essential arguments that a political party has for or against an issue, and thereby uncovering where the party stands.
The latest dataset from CHES (2014) is used in order to establish the left-right spectrum of the political parties in parliament (see figure 5.). More specifically the “left-right ideological stance on economic issues” is used to establish the party position of the political parties that are studied in this thesis. Although it is alternatively possible to use the “left-right overall ideological stance” (also featured in the CHES 2014 dataset) to position the political parties, however, as this thesis seeks to test Rovny's findings, it is therefore essential to use the same scale as was used in his studies. Furthermore using an economic left-right scale is arguably the most common and generally accepted scale used to research political party's positions.

**Analytical Framework**

- *Security*

- *The Economy, The Labour Market, and Welfare*

- *EU and National Sovereignty*

- *Humanitarian*

- *Integration*

**Security**

Migration is viewed as a security issue. The concept of security is defined broadly in that it encompasses both an understanding of the concept in terms of physical or military threat such as terrorist activities, but also a softer conceptualization that incorporates the threats towards political stability both at a national level and at an EU level such as the interior borders of Schengen. The relationship between these two issues is often viewed in a negative manner, as the former poses a threat to the security of the nation. An example of how migration is viewed as a security issue is that “the Schengen is at stake”\(^43\) as the Minister of Foreign Affairs Lajčak stated in his speech when he spoke of the threats that the migration crisis poses. Perceived threats to Slovakia or EU at large, are categorized by the security indicator. There are endless possibilities, migration can be perceived as a threat to the population, the state, or the EU. Examples include fear of violence, terrorist attacks, medical threats and the fear of a systemic collapse. The security type of argumentation can also be criticized. A critique towards a security argument is identified as a reversed security argument and is included within the category of security arguments. An example of a reversed security argument is that an MP criticizes another MP for inciting fear in the general population through the use of conventional security

\(^43\) Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p1
The Economy, The Labour Market, and Welfare

Migration affects the labour market, this can be viewed in both a negative or a positive manner. Migration can be viewed as a threat in that it jeopardises a state's labour market because “nationals” lose their jobs to immigrants or that there are fewer jobs to available due an increase in the population. It can also be viewed in a positive manner in that the immigrants increase the demand of labour through an increase in consumption of goods and services. A functioning Schengen with open borders is an essential part of the economy in Slovakia. The migration crisis can be viewed as a threat to the economy due to Slovakia's high manufacturing and export based economy – Slovakia is the highest per capita producer of cars in the world. Migration also has an influence on the welfare system of a state. A high influx of immigrants into a state can certainly strain the capacity of a welfare system in terms of cost and required logistics. Given that immigrants are “new” citizens in a state, the idea of providing welfare to these new citizens can cause political debate as welfare systems are often funded through taxation of the citizens in the given state. Immigration can be in other words viewed to have a negative effect on the welfare system as migrants can be perceived to be a burden to its status quo.

EU and National Sovereignty

The migration crisis has transformed migration and asylum issues from the national level to both a national and EU level. The forced quotas EU directive of relocating 120 000 immigrants can be considered a threatening to national sovereignty of EU member states. Scepticism towards the EU does not only concern the issue of national sovereignty, it also concerns the agenda itself. The decision-making process is considered to be west-centric, where western leaders form the agenda which is then forced upon the rest. This perceived exclusion of the interest of Eastern EU states, can best be exemplified the by the close cooperation of the Visegrad Group (V4) which meet regularly to discuss the possibility of a common EU position. In the parliamentary debate, this perceived injustice can be exemplified through the referral to western states with examples of injustice and hypocrisy in connection to the issue of migration. “Germany told the Syrians “you're welcome [here]”...Germany now calls for joint action [relocation of refugees], then why didn't they discuss this together with the rest of Europe and with us whether or not we should ask for such a wave of immigrants and if we can manage it?” These type of comments, where it is perceived by MPs/political parties that Slovakia's position or opinion regarding the influx of immigrants in Europe is ignored is an example of how the ownership (sovereignty) of migration and asylum politics of countries is perceived as being under threat. An opposite type of argument can of course also be presented, where the view that a state

44 The Slovak Spectator, 2015, A
45 Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p60
should respect a decision that is made at the EU level. Ultimately arguments that fall into this category are in one way or the other a discussion the federalism and intergovernmentalism.

**Humanitarian**

Migration can also be viewed as a humanitarian issue. In this sense, it is viewed as an act of solidarity to help refugees who flee war torn states by welcoming them to Slovakia. A humanitarian argument can be presented in the manner that it is the duty of Slovakia to assist people who need to be helped, often in reference to the Article 14. the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.\(^{46}\)

**Integration**

Migration can also be perceived as causing an issue of integration and it can be manifested through xenophobic remarks or arguments. These views can be expressed directly by the MPs or indirectly through a filter of political correctness. When the arguments are discussed through the latter manner, immigrants are often categorised as Christians, Muslims, economic immigrants, or illegal immigrants. Integration is used as a key word to describe the perceived issue that immigrants cannot integrate into Slovak society (culturally or religiously) – the argument is often that it immigrants cannot be incorporated into Slovakia at the rate that they are coming into Europe. An example of this is the following “Integration of a larger group of refugees from a different cultural, ethnic and religious environment requires a long term project with that particular country and its society. It is not discrimination or selection, it is instead about the integration and the prevention the creating ghettos.”\(^{47}\).

The following is a presentation of how and under what criteria political parties are positioned as being “Strictly Against Immigration”, “Against Immigration”; “Neutral Stance” and “For Immigration”. The criteria for the positioning of the political parties was developed after the initial analysis and categorization. The reason for this approach is that a party's positions needed to be taken into account relative to the other political parties before it could be positioned on the issue of immigration. The criteria for placing a party in each position is based on the types of arguments present in their speeches and to what extent a category dominates the overall presented arguments in the debate. However it is also of importance to identify what category of arguments that are missing from the speeches, as it is an equally important criteria for positioning a political party. For example, if the majority of the arguments presented are conventional security and integration arguments and there is a complete lack of humanitarian arguments the political party will be identified as as strictly against immigration. In order for a party to be classified as against immigration, the conventional security arguments and

---

\(^{46}\) Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1951, p4

\(^{47}\) Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p6
integration arguments also have to be a dominant categories, however at the same time the presence of some humanitarian arguments lower the level of intensity of how much the political party is against immigration. A neutral stance is obtained when the mixture of arguments presented are highly contradictory such as conventional security arguments, reversed security arguments and humanitarian. A political party falls into this position as it can neither be categorized as being for or against immigration. Finally, in order for a political party to be categorized as being for immigration the requirement is the absence of conventional security arguments and a dominance of humanitarian and reversed security arguments.

**Material**
The following is a list of political parties in the National Council *Narodna Rada* (parliament) of Slovakia during the 6th parliamentary period 2012-2016. The parties are in descending order of the parliamentary election results of 2012. Total number of parliamentary seats are 150. The threshold into the National Council is 5.0%. Length of term is 4 years. Given the fact that the government party SMER-SD represents more than half of seats in parliament, the party naturally has the largest portion of speeches during the parliamentary debate. Consequentially, the portion of this thesis devoted to SMER-SD in the results and analysis sections will be larger in comparison to the rest of the political parties participating in the parliamentary debate.

-(SMER-SD) Direction – Social Democracy, SMER - Sociálna Demokracia
44.4%, 83 seats. 48

-(KDH) Christian Democratic Movement, Krest’anskodemokratické Hnutie
8.8%, 16 seats. 49

-(OľaNO) Ordinary People and Independent Personalities. Obyčajní Ľudia a Nezávislé Osobnosti
8.6%, 16 seats. 50

-(MH) Bridge, Most - Híd
6.9%, 13 seats. 51

-(SDKU-DS) Slovak Democratic and Christian Union, Slovenská Demokratická a Krest’anská Únia
6.1%, 11 seats. 52

-(SaS) Freedom and Solidarity, Sloboda a Solidarita
5.9%, 11 seats. 53

---

48 NSD, 2016
49 NSD, 2016
50 NSD, 2016
51 NSD, 2016
52 NSD, 2016
53 NSD, 2016
The parliamentary debate n. 54 took place between September 16 - October 7, 2015. During this debate, the topic of migration in connection to the relocation of 120,000 migrants, together with a permanent relocation mechanism were discussed on 16-17 September. During these two days, a total of 142 speeches were made by MPs on the topic of migration. SMER-SD conducted the majority of the speeches: 43, followed by OLANO: 40 speeches, KDH: 26 speeches, SaS: 16 speeches, MH: 9 speeches, SDKU-DS: 8 speeches. The results presented below are categorized by political parties. For each political party, arguments presented by the MPs were selected from their speeches and translated from Slovak into English. The arguments are then categorized using the analytical framework into different categories of types of arguments. Not only will this type of analysis allow a positioning of a political party's position on immigration, but also uncover the variation between the types of arguments present and the reasoning behind their stance on the issue.

Results

SMER-SD: Direction – Social Democracy
SMER-SD was at the time of the Parliamentary Debate n. 54 the only political party in the government of Slovakia after winning the parliamentary elections in 2012 with a 44.4% share of the vote leading to 83 seats, a clear majority, of the 150 available seats in the parliament. The SMER-SD government was led by prime minister Robert Fico.

In Slovakia the political party system consists of very few political parties that are located on the left side of the economic scale. In fact there are only two political parties featured in the CHES in 2006 and 2010 that can be positioned as leftist parties: the Communist Party of Slovakia, (KSS), and SMER-SD (see figures 1-4). In the 2014 CHES study, KSS was excluded from the dataset (see figure 5.). As the material in for this thesis is a parliamentary debate and because the KSS failed to enter parliament in 2012, the party is excluded from the study. This means that the only leftist political party that can be studied is SMER-SD. However, as this political party in particular received such a high results in the parliamentary elections, the large quantity of material available for SMER-SD ensures that this party is not understudied in this thesis.

The position of SMER-SD on the issue of migration is based on a total of 43 speeches presented by the MPs, including the prime minister Robert Fico, the minister of foreign affairs Miroslav Lajčak, and

54 Sociálna Demokracia
55 The Economist, 2012
56 Komunisticcká Strana Slovenska
the minister of interior Daniel Lipsic of the SMER-SD government (2012-2016). SMER-SD MPs not only held the most speeches, the party also dominated the debate through the length of the speeches.

The quotations listed below are listed in descending order. The most frequently occurring type of argument in the speeches of SMER-SD MPs are the security arguments followed by the EU and national sovereignty, integration, the economy, the labour market, and welfare.

**SMER-SD's Position on Migration**

**Security**

The results demonstrate an established view within SMER-SD that the immigration crisis is considered to be a threat to the national security of Slovakia. The security type of argumentation is the most common type of argument raised by MPs when speaking against forced quotas. The minister of foreign affairs, Lajcak, makes a security argument when he refers to chaos he observes on the continent “When we today look at Europe, what do we see?...We see a de facto non-functioning Schengen and tens of thousands of people who are moving within the boundaries of the EU and doing so without any monitoring.”. Lajcak's argument focuses on the uncertainty of the situation – his argument does not categorize the people he is referring to as refugees, instead they are categorized as unknowns, people who need to be monitored. When phrasing it in this manner, the migrants are presented as being a potential danger as they have disrupted the previously functioning Schengen zone, through their actions. Lajcak continues “We can see violations of basic rules of the Schengen and the Dublin Protocol.” in this similar argument, again the movement of the migrants is presented as an illegal act in that rules/laws are being broken. Lajcak continues “Strengthening the protection of external borders of the EU is unavoidable in order to preserve a functioning Schengen. For us this is the most important priority.”. Here the foreign minister presents the importance of the dialogue regarding the Schengen calling it the most important priority and thereby linking the migration of immigrants to having a negative effect for the future of the Schengen. Furthermore the reference to the Dublin Protocol stipulates a critique towards the migrants as the majority of the migrants do not seek asylum in the first EU member state they enter thereby violating regulation. This type of representation of the situation is focused on the issues migration is causing and how to solve it “Lets focus on how to solve the whole problem....and at the same time secure our external borders.”. The immigrants are viewed as

57 Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p1
58 Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p1
59 Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p5
60 Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p2
violators of the external borders of the EU, the Schengen, and the Dublin Protocol. The prime minister, Robert Fico, strengthens the notion that the migration crisis is a security issue. “...this country is to a certain extent in danger and everyone of us is in danger, whether you are sitting in the chair of an MP of KDH or SMER or if you are a person who lives in eastern Slovakia, or in the middle or the west.”61 A statement such as this sets the tone of what a threat the prime minister believes migration is towards Slovakia - no one within the borders of the nation is safe because of the rapid immigration into Europe. Fico continues by linking migration to being a threat to the stability and influence of the EU of being a strong international actor “It has been shown that the EU does not have a secure and guarded border, this has weakened the prestige [of the EU] as a serious international actor that is capable of enforcing rules that it has put down.”62 Together with these statements, Fico suggest that migration is threatening both at a national and EU level. The prime minister elaborates “...When there are thousands of people entering through the Schengen borders, no one is stopping them, no one is even asking for basic information, “where are you from?”, “What do you want”, “give us your fingerprints”, “show us your passport”...This threatens the EU as a global power.”63 Fico clearly states the implications the influx of immigrants has on the EU, migrants are considered a security threat. The prime minister goes on and presents his view of what kind of effect migration has on the political stability of EU nations as well as the stability of the EU itself: “There is a danger that traditional pro-European parties...will be replaced by nationalistic xenophobic and anti-European populist groupings, so that European integration will lose its political support leading to a crisis in the EU.... Slovakia does not want another serious crisis in the EU.”64 Again this type of argumentation falls into the security category in that migration is perceived to lead to a rise of the extreme right (nationalistic) forces that could destabilize the EU project. Fico goes as far as referring to the situation as being the “...worst internal crisis of the EU since our entrance...”65 further demonstrating the perceived threat of the situation. Furthermore there is also a view within SMER-SD that migrants may physically threaten the EU through terrorist activities: “We cannot ignore our own intelligence and information from the media... For example in Germany there are 11 500 Salifists, who are seeking to recruit amongst the young immigrants, or British media reports that in the flow of refugees the Islamic State sent our 4000 of their own agents, who are suppose to establish new cells in the EU.”66 Fico also argues how allowing migrants to enter the external borders directly finances the activities of the Islamic State, thereby posing a physical threat to the citizens of the EU: “...it is mainly the Islamic State that is organizing the trafficking of people, and is gaining huge resources. It isn't a secret that a travel

61 Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p17
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65 Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p19
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ticket...can sometimes cost from 3-5 thousand euros or dollars and that these financial gains can be used by the Islamic State for its activities in Europe, something that is extremely dangerous."67. The prime minister elaborates the perceived danger of migrants “Amongst the statistics of those who have come in this wave into several member states in the EU, there can be several thousands of potentially very dangerous people, there is no reason to be naïve and lose our alertness just because we feel sorry for the difficult fate of many families who have been forced to leave their homes due to war. We feel for them and want to make their situation easier, however there is no reason that we should neglect the safety and the defence of our people, the citizens of the Slovak Republic.”68. This statements together with the previous one form the idea that migration poses a physical threat to both Slovakia and the EU and have therefore been categorized as security arguments.

MP Susko from SMER-SD is very direct in his speech regarding migration debate “…There are security risks from different points of view. Its more than a question of protecting us from terrorism, there are lots of different kinds of security risks, this encourages the goal that we want to reach, and that is to consistently protect the Schengen zone…”69. Susko does not just imply security risks, he directly refers to them as security issues in his speech. MP Madej also warns of the security issues and is also direct concerning his belief of what the migration crisis will lead to “Ladies and gentlemen if we do not secure the exterior border of the Schengen... Schengen will end.”70. Another MP, Kolesik, questions the migrants intentions in Europe “What do they all have in their luggage? Yes of course most of it are basic thing like food, survival things, blankets, however what if amongst these kind of objects there are weapons, explosives, other material that could be used in terrorist attacks in Europe?”71. Kolesik’s argument is a simple one, as the migrants do not pass through security checks, they are all potentially armed and dangerous and thereby pose a security risk.

**EU and National Sovereignty**

The EU and national sovereignty type of argumentation is the second most common type of argumentation. This type of statement revolves around the notion that any decision made at the EU level concerning migration has to be approved at a national level by the government of Slovakia. Migration is a national issue foremost and the every decision made at the EU level has to be compatible with the government's view on the issue. Foreign minister Lajcak presents this kind of viewpoint: “Who will make sure that those [migrants] who are allocated to Slovakia also end up staying in this country?...Logically those who this decide this should be the ones who are leading the country, the ones
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who understand its capabilities and are responsible for it.... it is the legitimately chosen government and not the administration of the European Commission [who should choose which migrants should be relocated to Slovakia].”

Here Lajčak clearly presents the view that he believes that the EU is acting as a superstate, that the national sovereignty of Slovakia is being threatened by the EU. Lajčak continues “It seems as though that we [the EU] have abandoned the principle of consensus, we are missing a discussion, a unified desire to look for a solution, where no individual member has the capacity to determine 100 percent of what it desires, however at the same time where no [member state] completely loses.” The key word here is consensus, Lajčak presents a view of that Slovakia's interests are being ignored and that a member state's knowledge of how many migrants its society can absorb is an important aspect that is not taken into account. Prime minister Fico elaborates on Lajčak's reasoning “Every country, every country, including Germany, Austria, and others, has the right, sovereign right to solve its demographic situation through the invitation of refugees....It isn't possible to force other sovereign states, who and under what conditions they must accept on their territory.” Fico adds that and EU decision on the issue of relocating migrants is unacceptable unless the government of Slovakia approves such a decision. Fico then highlights his message “Nobody is going the forces us or dictate what the Slovak Republic should or shouldn't do.” MP Blaha adds to the legitimacy of the government's position on migration and quotas by linking it to the citizens of Slovakia “We are protecting our sovereignty...because we know that 90% of the Slovak population rejects compulsory quotas.” The aim of this type of argument is to demonstrate that the EU does not respect the Slovak people and thereby questioning the legitimacy of forced quotas. MP Jarjabek adds to the perceived severity of the situation “This is a fight for Slovakia, this is a fight for the existence of Slovakia, this is a fight for the position of Slovakia in the EU...” Jarjabek introduces the notion that migration is endangering Slovakia's sovereignty and its relationship with the EU.

**Integration**

The third most common type of argumentation is integration. This type of argument often overlaps with security arguments as integration is often implicated to cause or lead to a security issue that is in some way perceived as threatening to Slovakia. Furthermore this category of arguments can vary in its intensity – some arguments can be understood as genuinely concerning the issue that can arise in the integration of immigrants into a foreign society, while others types of arguments can be identified as xenophobic. It is important to maintain neutrality in this thesis, and it is sometimes difficult to

---
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categorize the arguments in one category or the other. This is an important issue to acknowledge, however as with any category of argumentation in this thesis there are always trade-offs when defining the boundaries of a category, namely – how broad or how specific should a indicator be?

Foreign minister Lajčak “We know how to judge who has the best integration potential and the best chance to start a new life. Integration of a larger group of refugees from a different cultural, ethnic and religious environment requires a long term project with that particular country and its society. It is not discrimination or selection, it is instead about the integration and the prevention of creating ghettos.”

In this argument, Lajčak emphasizes the issues related to integration of migrants into Slovak society. Here the perspective is that with the rate at which immigrants with foreign cultures and religions are flowing into the EU it is problematic for them integrate without the negative consequence of creating ghettos. The immigrant will in other words not integrate successfully as the key word 'ghetto' suggests, they will instead be isolated from the rest of society. Lajčak continues “...the Slovak Republic does not discriminate, we want to focus on the most vulnerable groups and people with the highest integration potential. We do not want to create ghettos of excluded groups of the population.”

In this citation, Lajčak insists that Slovakia's intentions are good, that it does want to help immigrants as long as it can choose the migrants that it believes will integrate best into society. This brings forth the question of which groups are considered most vulnerable, and who has the highest integration potential? Considering the fact that the Slovak government in December 2015 flew in 149 Christian Assyrians refugees this is perhaps clear statement of what group of refugees that it considers most vulnerable and best suited for integration.

The prime minister elaborates on the government's view of who the migrants entering the EU are “90 % of the people who are coming into Europe are economic migrants, they are people who are trying to find work in Europe. We cannot say that 100 % of the people who are coming here are people who are looking for a safe haven from for example dangers of war or hunger.” The argument here is that that the majority of the migrants are not genuine refugees, but are instead categorized as economic migrants. The insinuation here is that these type migrants do not need help (as they are migrating for economic reasons) and Slovakia should therefore not be required to take in any people. The categorization of immigrants in this manner is rhetorical technique to justify SMER-SD's position concerning the forced quotas proposal, as the majority of the immigrants are viewed as economic and therefore do not have the right be helped.
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The Economy, The Labour Market, and Welfare

The economy, labour market and welfare category of arguments is a broad and inclusive category. The idea is to capture arguments that concerns the financial aspects of migration. While migration is typically associated with costs for the state the migrants immigrate to, and this is often viewed negatively, the association can also be positive, in that in the long term aspect, the immigrants can benefit the economy, the labour market, and the welfare through working and taxation.

MP Blaha from SMER-SD presents his view of the economic effects of migration “....A refugee needs care for 15 years. Social integration, that means giving courses, help him/her finding work, help him/her to integrate. The state has to invest a lot into this.”\textsuperscript{82} This type of argumentation suggests the taking in migrants to Slovakia will require economic investments, it does not however present a view of the benefits of migration. Consequently the argument implies a negative consequence of migration. The foreign minister Lajčak also speaks about the costs associated with immigration “I would like to make it clear that amongst these migrants are people who are threatened by war...The Slovak Republic has to show its clear solidarity and help these people. We do not have to help the economic migrants. It bothered me a little when I heard about the allowance that the economic migrants are suppose to get, for example 650 euros per month. How are we suppose to explain this to our pensioners?\textsuperscript{83} In this argument there are two points that stand out, the first being that Slovakia is not obligated to help economic migrants, the second point is that helping migrants is unfair to the pensioners. In the first point, Lajčak makes the points to the established view within SMER-SD that the 90% of the migrants are economic migrants, justifying the governments opposition to the forced quotas directive. The second point presents the notion that it is unfair to help economic immigrants, when pensioners have low pensions.

Summarized Position of SMER-SD

The majority of the arguments presented by SMER-SD MPs have been categorized as security arguments, however as it has been shown there are three other categories of argumentation were also present in the speeches of the MPs. From the arguments presented in the debate it can be concluded that overall SMER-SD is strictly against immigration. This can be concluded from the absence humanitarian arguments and by the content of SMER-SD MPs security and integration arguments, that the party is only willing to accept immigrants if they are Christian and refugees who are fleeing a zone of conflict under the condition (number of refugees) that SMER-SD believes Slovakia is capable of handling. Furthermore as the party is also strictly against the EU-directive of forced quotas, this further

\textsuperscript{82} Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p153
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cements the position that SMER-SD is strictly against migration.

**KDH: Christian Democratic Movement**

The Christian Democratic Movement\(^{84}\) was during the period 2012-2016 the second largest political party in parliament. During the election period of 2012, KDH received 8.8 % resulting in 16 seats in parliament. In the 2016 parliamentary elections, however, the party received 4.96%\(^{85}\) of the total votes and thereby did not to pass the threshold of 5% and failed to enter parliament. According to the CHES 2014 dataset (see figure 5.), KDH is position to be a center-right political party, more specifically, the party is the closest to the center out of all the political parties measured in this study. The position of KDH on the issue of migration is based on a total of 26 speeches presented by MPs.

The results in the following section show that KDH and its MPs vary significantly in their views on migration (intraparty variation). The MPs arguments can be placed in the following categorises: security, integration, the economy the labour market and welfare, and humanitarian. The security and integration categories together account for the majority of the types of arguments presented in the debate. The humanitarian type of argument is also a common type of argument, followed by the least occurring categories: the economy the labour market and welfare, and EU and national sovereignty. As it will be shown, the MPs within KDH follow a varied argumentative style suggesting that there are mixed positions within the party concerning this topic.

**KDH's Position on Migration**

**Security**

The category of security arguments presented by the MPs is dividable into both an argument where migration is viewed a threat to the security of at a national or EU level, and also as a critique towards this type of argument. In this latter form, the security argument is criticized through an argumentative process by an MP. In this process, the MP often reveals their standing on migration.

MP Figel, the party leader of KDH, presents the security challenges he believes the EU is facing “This crisis will be much harder and difficult even for us. It has security, and humanitarian aspects, it is already a political one, because it is a crisis of trust and relationship between the EU states, as well as the functioning of the EU. The Schengen has stopped working, or it has stopped to a large extent...”\(^{86}\).

---
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type of argumentation follows the softer conceptualization of security, migrants are viewed as causing of security issues and essentially threatening established institutions such as the Schengen as well as the political stability of the EU. Although the humanitarian aspect is also mentioned, the emphasis on this argument revolves around security. Figel continues “What is the most primary role of the state, and state authority... and that is security and fairness. If the state fails in this aspect, what do you replace it with? We need to restore and preserve the Schengen rules, and that is the defence of territory, security of the citizens.”\textsuperscript{87} in this argument, the security aspect is presented at a national level, Figel also presents a link between migration threatening both the cooperation between the member states, and how migration can be a threat to the nation state directly. The solution to this issue is presented as restoring the Schengen. MP Muransky presents a security argument in which he describes an infiltration of Islam into Europe “Europe is becoming Islamic and establishing those values which they [immigrants] bring, unfortunately..they will conquer.”\textsuperscript{88} Muransky's argument is that if migration is allowed, it will transform Europe's cultural and religious foundations entirely. MP Brocka presents a security argument in which he discusses the consequence of migration to the EU project “Europe is simply being threatened at its foundations. It isn't just a problem for Angela Merkel or Italy or Greece, it is also a problem for Slovakia. Europe is also at stake, which we are a part of. I believe this is not only a test of cohesion. It is a test of whether or not the EU will continue to exist in such a manner that we recognize.”\textsuperscript{89}. Identifying migration as a test rather than a threat to the EU, demonstrates Brocka's mild use of the concept.

In contrast to Figel, MP Brocka presents a reversed security argument in which he criticizes the prime minister for focusing primarily on security in his speech “I agree with most of his [prime minister] speech....however what bothers me about your speech, prime minister, is that you once again frighten. Once again you scare the citizens of Slovakia.”\textsuperscript{90} Brocka's argumentation process presents a viewpoint that the migration crisis is not as much as a security threat as it is claimed by SMER-SD. Brocka continues “I would like to add a few words to one problem that has come up in connection to the refugee crisis, and that is the fear of Islam. That Islamic culture can....enter into Europe. This fear is taking people to the streets, demonstrating their despise of Islamization. Is this fear legitimate?”\textsuperscript{91} Here the MP presents a view that the fear of Islam in Slovak society and question whether this fear has any merit to it. When connecting these two citations, the point Brocka makes is that the prime minister is adding more fear into society through these kind of speeches. MP Miskov presents a even more critical argumentation against migration being a security issue “I am embarrassed for the politicians who are
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not shy to take advantage of this humanitarian crisis...in order to incite fear and hatred for the sole purpose of gaining political capital. I am for political competition, but let it be a competition of ideas and solutions....not...who can scare people more – invasions, Islamism, or terrorism.”

**Integration**

The integration category of argumentation is as common amongst MPs as the security category. Applying the analytical framework on this category and on the given material, that is to say KDH, is particularly problematic. The integration and humanitarian categories have some overlapping issues in that on the one hand most KDH MPs argue through the use of a humanitarian argument to accept refugees however only if they are Christian. Furthermore although some MPs elaborate and explain why Christians are viewed as more 'suitable' refugees, with the argument often being that they are expected to integrate better into Slovakia’s Christian society, others simply do not go into detail. The latter category of MPs make the categorization process difficult as they simply provide too little information to make the distinction between the integration and humanitarian categories. This dilemma ultimately raises complex questions, what counts as a humanitarian act? Is it humanitarian to provide assistance on the basis of religion? Although these questions will cannot be answered in this thesis, it is important to bare them in mind.

MP Miklosko raises the issue of integration of immigrants “We accept people, who are culturally close to us, religiously... and also values, opinions...that's how it should be.”, here it is clear that the type of people that are welcome to Slovakia are Christians migrants. It is implied through the argumentation that Slovakia does not need to accept people who follow the other religions, and this leads us to the question of why this distinction matters. Although the MP does not elaborate, it can never the less be concluded that this argument fits the integration category rather than humanitarian. MP Lipsic makes in contrast to Miklosko makes a very clear statement regarding the integration of Muslims in Europe “I'm not saying that all Muslims, however a significant part of Muslim communities in Europe misbehave...”4. It can be concluded from such a statement, that Lipsic perceives an increase of Muslims in Europe as an issue of concern. It also implies that Muslims form communities that do not integrate into society. Miklosko continues “There were already 4 million Turks [in Germany in 1970], since then it has become even more packed and so on, the first generation was okay, however the second generation started to become bad. That second generation realizes that it doesn’t have the same chances as the “domestic citizens”, that they have to only work and so on...they start becoming radical and dissatisfied. They are now experiencing this in Germany, in France, and in Great Britain....non-

---
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integrated parts of cities.”⁹⁵ Here the MP claims that in the case of the mention states, there is no integration of Muslims into society, and also claims that the second generation immigrants radicalise. This type of argument can therefore be categorized as an integration argument. MP Miklosko explains why Christians migrants are preferred over other religions “Of course, amongst asylum seekers we want people who want to stay, I believe that these [Christian] families are better than these young people with laptops and mobile phones, who really just want to go somewhere to work or whatever they want to do, to for example Germany or Scandinavia.”⁹⁶ Here there is a subtle implication that the non-Christian migrants are economic migrants who have their material needs to some extent satisfied (laptops and mobiles) and have entered Europe in order to work. In contrast, the Christians are presented as genuine refugees. MP Brocka holds a different view regarding the integration of non-Christians than his colleague “If we go back to the roots, to our values upon which Europe and our states are based on, then there is no reason to fear. We will convince them [refugees] that our culture and life style is better.”⁹⁷ Brocka's view is that European values are superior to that of non-European ones. Brocka believes that integration is possible and will occur.

Humanitarian
As it has been previously mentioned, the humanitarian type of argument overlaps to some extent with the integration category. The following results have been placed in the humanitarian category. The party leader Figel presents a humanitarian argument “...[The] Slovak people are prepared to accept more than is mentioned in the media or government documents, they are prepared to take in primarily Christians families from Syria...because these communities in the Middle East are exposed to GE-NO-CI-DE.”⁹⁸ MP Figel encourages an expansion of the amount of refugees, be it exclusively Christian. This argument could appear in the integration section, however, it has been categorized here due to its focus on helping migrants, rather than having a focus on integration difficulties of non-Christians.

MP Pridal “...we accept those who fit our conditions. I and a lot of my colleagues are refusing quotas because of solidarity... To accept, or offer to accept 100 refugees out of 40-thousand isn't human, or generous, or Christian. It is an embarrassment.”⁹⁹, here Pridal focuses on the humanitarian aspects of migration calling it an embarrassment to accept so few migrants. MP Brocka argues in a similar fashion “Slovakia accepts one-hundred Syrian Christians, who are fleeing from war? It is a shame and sad that our country which isn't in any way in danger from the refugee crisis, is losing face in European
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countries...Slovakia has to capacity for more.”. MP Miskov also argues using a humanitarian argument “Most of the people who are arriving from conflicts and war destroyed areas are refugees and not economic migrants and have by international law the right to request asylum whether we like it or not.”. The idea here is to refocus on the obligation Slovakia has to help refugees from a humanitarian perspective. MP Hrusovsky argues in a similar fashion “It is our duty, my friends, to help these people [Christians in Syria], in any way that we can. It is our not only our duty as citizens but also as Christians.”. Party leader Figel makes a similar point “I dare to say that Slovakia can take in more than the mention hundred or two-hundred refugees.”.

**EU and National Sovereignty**

Arguments that fall into the category of EU and National sovereignty are few. Party leader Figel provides an argument that fits this category when he explains why KDH is against forced quotas “We reject forced quotas...Slovakia has the right to choose who to help and prioritize and who to provide shelter....a future, and integration.”. MP Lipsic makes a similar type of argument. “So when it comes to economic migrants we don't have any obligation to take in economic migrants. Of course, every country has a right to decide to take in economic migrants, however in such a case, the state may decide from what country and how educated migrants it wants to accept.”.

**The Economy, The Labour Market, and Welfare**

This type of argumentation is also rare amongst KDH MPs, Miklosko however presents an argument concerning the demographic issues Slovakia is facing in the future “I would like to make a note of something that we all know. There is a demographic crisis, there are more and more old people, children aren’t being born, sooner or later we are not going to have enough people to work... Here the migration is viewed in a positive manner, it is viewed as a positive force that has the potential to solve the expected demographic crisis Slovakia is facing. MP Miskovs makes a similar type of argument raising the same issues “Immigration policy is a much larger problem, and lets not fear to say that for example today we do not have enough doctors or other professions that we will have to somehow find.”.
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Summarized Position of KDH

Describing the overall position of KDH on the topic of migration policy is not as clear cut in comparison to other political parties. The following can be concluded from presented results. KDH's official position regarding forced quotas is that the party rejects the notion all together\(^\text{108}\), furthermore it can be concluded that the security arguments are the most commonly occurring type of arguments. The security arguments appear both in the conventional form and reversed form. Integration arguments and humanitarian arguments are also common forms of argumentation. These latter two categories in particular present a contradictory position on the party. The contradiction is also presented in the economy, the labour market and welfare category in that migrants are viewed as a solution to the predicted demography crisis in Slovakia. Together all these contradictory arguments suggest that KDH has a contested position on migration policy within the party or what can be identified as intraparty variation. There are however views that are not contested and they as follows. KDH supports the assistance of Christian migrants as they are expected to integrate best into society. Non-Christian migrants are considered difficult if not impossible to integrate in society (with the exception of MP Brocka's view). It can also be concluded that migration crisis is considered to be a threat the to the stability of Slovakia and the EU. It can there for be concluded that the overall and official position of KDH is that it is against migration, however there are some voices within the party that are more open to it.

OľaNO: Ordinary People and Independent Personalities

Ordinary People and Independent Personalities\(^\text{109}\) received 8.6% (16 seats) in the 2012 parliamentary elections and was the third largest political party in parliament. During the 2016 parliamentary elections OľaNO ran jointly in a coalition with New Majority, Nová väčšina. This thesis will however only focus on OľaNO as NOVA was not in parliament at the time of this parliamentary debate. According to the CHES 2014 dataset (see figure 5.), OľaNO is positioned on the right in the “Left-Right Ideological Stance on Economic issues” scale. The party can neither be identified as a center or conservative party as it is positioned in between.

The results presented below are based on a total of 40 speeches in the debate. OľaNO MPs are the second most frequent speakers in the debate, it should however be noted that the actual speaking time is significantly lower than SMER-SD.
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OľaNO's Position on Migration

The security type of argumentation is the most common type of argument raised by the MPs' of OľaNO. The majority of the arguments in this category consist of security arguments in which migration is viewed as a security threat, that is threatening the political stability of either Slovakia or the EU or both. There are however also reversed security arguments that criticize this type of argumentation. Other categorises of argumentation were also identified and include integration, EU and national sovereignty, and humanitarian categories. There is no clear cut secondary type of argument, instead, it should be stated that the result is mixed, however it can be claimed that integration is a frequently occurring category of arguments.

Security

MP Kaduc raises a security type of argument in that his focus is on the potential dangers migrants pose to Slovak citizens “...they [doctors] do not have the right to force a migrant to take their blood. I would like to once again make that point that this should be fixed legislatively, so that it will be similar to a criminal case, so that if it is necessary, then blood can be taken.” The presumption here is that some migrants may have dangerous diseases that may spread within the borders of Slovakia and that their rights regarding the blood samples should be that of an accused criminal. MP Kaduc argues in a manner in which immigrants are presumed to be a security risk.

MP Hlina describes the effect of migration also through a security type of argumentation “Yes, if you want to destabilize Europe, send them, bring them, allow hundreds of thousands of refugees.” Similarly migration is viewed as posing a security threat to the general stability of Europe. MP Hlina continues with another argument “What is the systematic solution to all this? That all of Libya moves here? That all of Syria moves here?...how much can the system handle? It cannot handle this [migration]. The system can't handle this.” Although there is no outline of what exactly the “system” is, the argumentation process is the same, Europe and Slovakia cannot handle the amount of migrants flowing into the EU. MP Hlina continues with an argument regarding stability and introduces a perspective regarding religion “Europe fought about God 500 years ago... Let Europe be as it is. It is more or less peaceful to live here, and our task, the task of Europe is to be stable.” Here the MP views the migration of people of non-Christian as a threat towards the dominantly Christian Europe of today. However at the same time, MP Hlina does not view Europe as stable continent in its current form “When we are stable, when Europe is stable, then we can help the world more. If we are unstable
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it doesn't help Eritrea. If this breaks us, we cannot help Syrian Christians.”\(^{114}\). MP Kuffa also argues using a security type of argument on behalf of his party “We have to of course defend ourselves, because if there are criminals amongst these people, who would destroy our social systems, we cannot allow this. I believe that we have lost our control over these people and this can really lead to chaos.”\(^{115}\). Migrants are once again viewed as threatening the safety of Slovakia.

MP Kaduc also presents a reversed security argument when he criticizes the prime minister Fico of invoking fear of migrants in Slovakia “You claim that the majority or 90% of migrants are economic migrants. In my opinion this is not a fact, unless you provide a source...Give us a source! Because if you don't give it...you are only going to scare people in order to reach your political goals.”\(^{116}\). MP Huba makes a similar argument as Kaduc “…the position...our prime minister chose from the beginning has a severe problem...which I believe is harmful and ultimately dangerous and counterproductive for Slovakia. And I don't mean this is in a geopolitical sense concerning our relationship with our partners in the EU, but also from the mental future for the citizens of Slovakia, because he [prime minister] has invoked even more fear and xenophobia [amongst Slovaks].\(^ {117}\).

**Integration**

Regarding the argumentation category of integration, there have several arguments identified that fit this categorization. MP Hlina makes the following argument “I would say that we have the same problem with the Romani, we simply have enough to work on already.”\(^ {118}\). Through this statement, Hlina makes the argument that the Slovak government and society does not have the capacity to integrate immigrants because of the segregation of the Romani people in Slovakia. This argument acknowledges the integration issues Slovakia currently and historically has had, however at the same time this type of negative framing of the Romani people and of the immigrants is problematic. MP Kuffa also presents a integration argument on behalf of OľaNO “…they [migrants] have to follow laws, but they don't know them. Why don't they learn them? How many of people in our country and in Europe don't know the laws of their own country? But we request it from people. When we say that maybe there are teachers, engineers, amongst the refugees, it isn't that way. I don't believe it...Many times they are simple people. And they have learned to live in a different country with different law with different tradition and different culture.”\(^ {119}\). Here Kuffa presents a negative image of migrants, as a people who brake the laws of Slovakia and the EU, and are described as 'simple' people who will have
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problems integrating into Slovak society due to their different culture and traditions. Kuffa continues “This is the danger...we are our own enemies. We are laughing at Christians values, Europe is made of Christian values. We disrespect them. Now other people [migrants] are about to take over this country.”. Migrants are viewed as unwilling to integrate and are instead viewed as people who will occupy Slovakia and force Slovaks upon non-Christian values.

**EU and National Sovereignty**

There are also arguments that fall in this category of argumentation. MP Micovsky argues as follows “These quotas, that we should have long ago decided by ourselves. Quotas that are not dictated by Brussels, but by our humanity...We know the set capacity of Slovakia for refugees from war zones to a set number.”. The is notion that migration and asylum laws as well as migration policy of Slovakia is a national matter and ought not to be decided in Brussels. Micovsky's argumentation is that of defending the sovereign right of Slovakia in these issues. MP Kaduc argues that taking in migrants into Slovakia is not a question of capacity but rather that the EU does not respect the wishes of Slovakia regarding this issue “...we really have a huge capacity to take in those who are fleeing from war and their families. We truly have the capacity for that...What I would like to disagree upon, is the rhetoric of those Western European leaders who are pushing us into a corner...saying that we do not have solidarity. For this reason I cannot agree with quotas.”

**Humanitarian**

MP Vasecka makes a humanitarian argument in what he views is an issue regarding the focus on only helping Christian migrants “Many times it has been mentioned...that we should help only Christians. This is discrimination...if someone asks for my help and the person can be helped and he says that he isn't Christian, and I then say that I won't help him, now this is inhumane logic.”

**Summarized Position of OľaNO**

From the arguments presented in the debate it can be concluded that OľaNO is strictly against immigration based on the combination of security and integration arguments and the almost non-existing humanitarian argumentation. The majority of the arguments presented by OľaNO's MPs have been categorized as security and integration arguments. Another contributing factor to this summarized position of OľaNO is the party's position that it is against forced quotas.

---
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MH: Bridge

The political party Bridge\textsuperscript{124} received 6.9\% (13 seats) in the 2012 parliamentary elections and was the fourth largest political party in parliament. According to the CHES 2014 dataset (see figure 5.), MH is a political party that can be placed on the right on the “Left-Right Ideological Stance on Economic Issues” scale. More precisely MH is positioned between KDH and OfaNO. MH is a political party that represents Hungarian minority issues with a focus reconciliation and cooperation between Slovaks and Hungarians.\textsuperscript{125} In reference to Rovny's article on ethnic minorities and migration policy (2014)\textsuperscript{126}, this political party in particular fits the characteristics (focus on ethnic minority issues) to the notion that party's that focus on ethnic minority issues are found to be more positive towards immigration.\textsuperscript{127} To support this claim, it is expected that MPs representing MH will primarily argue using humanitarian category arguments and arguments that are critical of the security type of argumentation - reversed security arguments.

MH's Position on Migration

Humanitarian

The humanitarian category of argumentation is the most frequently occurring form of argument. MP and party leader of MH, Bulgar's speeches during this debate are characterized by this form of argumentation. MP Bulgar “...we have what it takes, even without quotas, to take in voluntarily 700 refugees. We can manage without any problems and with the highest certainty most of them would probably not want to stay.”\textsuperscript{128} Bulgar presents a humanitarian argument as he proposes Slovakia to take in seven times more immigrants than SMER-SD is proposing. The MP does not make a distinction between the refugees based on religion, adding to the humanitarian aspect of the argument. MP Bulgar continues “What we are not doing is through initiatives offer asylum to refugees. I have already mentioned that it would only denote to providing temporary residence on the property of the Slovak Republic. I have already mentioned that every refugee views us only as a transit country.”\textsuperscript{129} here the MP makes the argument that the majority of this debate and the policy of the government is focused on other aspects of the migration crisis and should instead focused on providing asylum to the migrants. MP Bulga continues “It is important that we physically show our help, so that we can refer [to

\textsuperscript{124} Most - Hid
\textsuperscript{125} Mihalik & Zaborova, 2016, p190
\textsuperscript{126} Rovny, 2014, B
\textsuperscript{127} Rovny, 2014, p700, B
\textsuperscript{128} Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p36
\textsuperscript{129} Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p37
the fact] that we can help even without quotas, without someone [EU] dictating something to us.”

Once again the argumentation type is humanitarian, due to its focus on providing assistance to the migrations crisis. Another aspect of this argument falls into the category of EU and National Sovereignty, in that there is a form of scepticism towards the EU.

MP Sebej also argues using a humanitarian type of argument “We cannot act as a country that is refusing to help those who come to our doors in a time of urgency...my critical position of the doctrine of Islam is well known, I don't need to explain it, however I would like to return to the notion that we cannot refuse a person who is being persecuted, who is in need of help and comes to our doors with his/her family, we cannot refuse them just because they're Muslim.”

Sebej argues that it is essential to not discriminate, to only accept Christians as the government is has suggested is discriminatory against Muslim refugees.

Security

The arguments that have been categorised into this category are for the most critical of the security argumentation form, that is that they are reversed security arguments. Party leader Bulgar criticizes the government for invoking fear in the Slovak people “Dear Colleagues, I am criticizing our government...that they have failed to communicate to the citizens, frightening them with security risks of their [refugees] possible arrival, linking the refugees with terrorism of course this invokes fear.”

Bulgar’s analysis is that SMER-SD’s does not adequately handle the immigration crisis. MP Bulgar continues “We have authorities, of course we have a very strict asylum system, [however] just as we didn't have to fear during our 22 years of the existence of the Slovak Republic, we have had 58 thousand migrants [come to Slovakia], we don't need to need to fear now either, we can manage it.”

Once again, Bulgar criticizes the common security argumentation, by arguing that migration is not a threat to Slovakia, as it has handled migrants in the past.

MP Sebej also presents a reversed security argument “It has been said several times, it has been said...if something serious is threatening our society at this moment, it isn't the wave of migrants, they are are not even close to threatening us at the moment, however there are emotion connected to this perspective, emotions that are dangerous and disrupt the normalcy of togetherness encompassing fear and hatred... Fear and hatred can manage to dissemble any kind of human community, any kind of
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state, any kind of nation.”134 Here Sebej argues in a similar manner in which other MPs presenting security type of arguments, however instead of implying that migrants are threatening Slovak society, he instead argues that it is the fear and xenophobia that is destabilizing the Slovakia. Sebej continues “And my next remark is about the public debate...xenophobia...that simply everyone who is arriving wants to outwit us, drink our sour sheep's milk, eat our halusky (gnocchi type dish), they just want to empower themselves...they are also mostly terrorists, as well as the fact that we simply don't want them here. This is...xenophobia...that is embarrassing the country, and unfortunately there are some politicians make a living out of this, who are simply feeding this fear. Fear is a very poor adviser.”135 Here MP Sebej broadens the criticism towards public debate, thereby criticizing the media, politicians and other influential people due to the manner in which they debate. This is once again categorised as a reversed security argument.

There was one example of a security type of argumentation amongst the MH's MPs, MP Simon “We need to ensure the defence of the Schengen border, [and] the border of the EU. However prioritizing the Schengen border, because with this exodus isn't just about what is happening now it is also about what is on its way.”136 Simon makes the argument that migration is threatening the EU and the Schengen and the migration crisis is just the beginning.

**EU and National Sovereignty**

There is one type of argument that can be identified of falling into the category of EU and National Sovereignty and that is the following “Yes, all of us refuse quotas and I believe that this is correct, because it would look as though it was dictated from Brussels.”137 Here the party leader Bulgar, reveals the main argument against why MH refuses to accept the forced quotas from the EU, and that is that it is threatening the national sovereignty of Slovakia regarding migration policy.

**Summarized Position of MH**

From the arguments presented in the debate it can be concluded that the most frequently occurring type of arguments are humanitarian and reversed security arguments. The results match the predicted results predicted by Rovny's hypothesis, that ethnic minority focused political parties are expected to be more open and positive towards migration related issues.138 There appears however to be a some contradiction between the expected results and the actual results in MH position regarding forced quotas. It was expected that the party would hold a positive or neutral position regarding forced quotas,
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given the focus on humanitarian and reversed security arguments, however the party is in fact officially against quotas.\footnote{Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p37} This finding is surprising, however, it suggests that a negative stance regarding forced quotas is possibly viewed as a stance regarding sovereignty in migration and asylum issues, rather than a stance for or against migration. From the results presented above it can be concluded that the position of MH is that the party is for immigration.

**SDKU-DS: Slovak Democratic and Christian Union**

The Slovak Democratic and Christian Union\footnote{Slovenská Demokratická a Kresťanská Únia} was as a result of the 2012 parliamentary elections the fifth largest political party in parliament receiving 6.1\% of the votes and thereby 11 seats in parliament. According to the CHES 2014 dataset (see figure 5.), SDKU-DS is positioned to the right of KDH, MH, and Of'aNO, and left of SaS, making it the second most conservative political party in parliament. The position of SDKU-DS is based on the “Left-Right Ideological Stance on Economic Issues” scale. The position of SDKU-DS on the topic of migration is based on a total of 8 speeches in parliament.

**SDKU-DS's Position on Migration**

**Security**

This category of security arguments once again features both types of security arguments. Migration is viewed by some MPs as a threat towards the security or stability of Slovakia or that of the EU, while other MPs present arguments that are critical towards this type of argument, thereby producing reversed security arguments. The majority of the arguments are categorized as the former.

MP Kanik from SDKU-DS presents a security argument in that there is presumption that migration is threatening Slovakia's national security “It has been clear that we can't manage this crisis – I find this clear even today –...Because the solution will take years and maybe even armed intervention, however we need answer to the refugees crisis now. And it can only be solved by protecting borders, rigorous implementation of asylum policy, rigorous control of refugees and a return policy.”\footnote{Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p12}. This argument is then followed by another security argument by MP Kanik “Quotas are bad, because they do not solve the problem [migration], they only distributes it on everyone [member states], and instead as many have said, I'm not going to say anything new, only that [quotas] are an invitation for an increased and stronger migration wave.”\footnote{Parliamentary Debate, 2015, p175}. In this example MP Kanik is expecting what he views as a deterioration
of the situation, an increase of immigration, meaning that the argument against quotas is that migration will at least not increase if forced quotas are not implemented. MP Kanik continues “And of course we don’t want the result of this kind of uncontrolled invasion [of immigrants] in which Europe doesn’t help anyone, instead damages everyone, damages its own citizens, and hurts even those who need help because we simply can’t help them...Europe seizes to be an oasis of safety, economic stability and prosperity. This is something that nobody wants.” Kanik clearly views the migrant crisis as a conflict-like scenario or security issue, where migrants are invading Europe threatening Europe economically and of its political stability. MP Kanik continues “We cannot inflate the EU, neither can we inflate the countries, and that is why I believe we can't relocate millions of people from Africa, millions of people from Asia, and expect everything to be alright, that we can manage it. It cannot be managed.”

As previously mentioned there are also a number of reversed security arguments presented by SDKU-DS. MP Novotny “I would like to suggest that this discussion that is occurring today and tomorrow in the National Council [parliament]... would be about reducing the panic and disinformation in Slovakia. That it should be about the cooperation between the government and the National Council, and it is very good that the government wants to solve the problems together with the National Council that this huge migration wave is bring forth.” The MP openly criticizes the public debate and the public opinion regarding the topic of migration. Novotny is critical of the perspective that migrants are threatening Slovakia – instead this type of information is presented as disinformation. MP Novotny continues “Let us talk about how to solve this problem [migration], I have no doubt that amongst the huge wave of migrants, there could exist also Islamic extremists...However I would be afraid of stating any numbers. Novotny's perspective is clear, the discussion in the parliament is too focused on security issues and should instead focus on what the next steps are in solving the migration crisis.

Humanitarian

The humanitarian category of argumentation is also present in SDKU-DS views concerning the immigration policy of the political party. MP Novotny presents this type of argumentation “It is truly important that we help refugees fleeing from wars, we have to be humane, we need to stop spreading panic and disinformation in Slovakia, which is unfortunately being spread by extremists and many times
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by so called mainstream politicians...”\textsuperscript{147}. This argument is mainly humanitarian, however it also partially overlaps with the reversed security form of argumentation, in that Novotny criticizes the security type of argumentation that he believes invokes only fear in the public. This argument is nevertheless categorized as humanitarian as its focus is of providing assistance to refugees for humanitarian reasons. MP Novotny continues “These people are arriving in a horrible state. Horrible state, ladies and gentlemen! With bloody feet, and starving and many are sick, children with fevers, they need immediate humanitarian help.”\textsuperscript{148}. Novotny’s focus here is once again that refugees need humanitarian assistance. MP Novotny provides a third humanitarian argument “War fleeing refugees need help and according to the Geneva Convention we need to help [them]. We can either express no solidarity and leave it to the Hungarians and Greeks or Italians, or we can show solidarity and help them by accepting refugees.”\textsuperscript{149}. Finally Novotny provides one last argument and behalf of his party that is categorised into this category “These are war refugees, and they come in this [horrible] state. Maybe amongst them there are economic migrants who underestimate the journey, however they are also arriving in this state. They need our humanitarian help in the EU.”\textsuperscript{150}.

**Summarized Position of SDKU-DS**

From the arguments presented in the debate, it can be concluded that the most frequently occurring type of arguments are security, reversed security, and humanitarian. The arguments presented by the MPs do not fall under any other category. Although the party is officially against forced quotas\textsuperscript{151}, MP Novotny provides a positive stance to the notion in the parliamentary debate “Or should solidarity be expressed through what the European Council said last Monday in its proposals and what we are discussing at the moment, that we should introduce some kind of reallocation of asylum seekers?”\textsuperscript{152}. Simultaneously, there are however a number of security arguments that point to the dangers of increased immigration poses. Taking into account all the arguments and the contradiction between the types of arguments suggests that similar to KDH, the SDKU-DS does not have a clear cut migration policy and that there is a significant amount of intraparty variation regarding the position concerning this issue. What can be concluded is that the party does not focus on religious aspects of migrants, despite the fact that SDKU-DS is a Christian party and in contrast to KDH. In fact, religion is not even mentioned in security arguments. The secular aspect in the argumentation can perhaps partially explain the milder position the party holds in its migration policy, in that the party does not focus on the
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differences between people’s religious belonging but rather holds a more general humanitarian position. An overall analysis of SDKU-DS positions the party as a party that holds a neutral stance in migration.

**SaS: Freedom and Solidarity**

Freedom and Solidarity\(^{183}\) became as a result of the 2012 parliamentary elections the 6\(^{th}\) largest political party in Narodna Rada. The party’s election results were 5.9% amounting to to 11 seats in parliament. According to the CHES 2014 dataset (see figure 5.), SaS is the most conservative political party in parliament according to the “Left-Right Ideological Stance on Economic Issues” scale. The position of SaS on the issue of migration is based on a total of 16 speeches presented by the party's MPs.

**SaS's Position on Migration**

**Security**

The majority of the arguments can be categorized into both security and reversed security arguments. The former of type of arguments will now be addressed. MP Poliacik “Because you are talking about refusing quotas, I agree, because the result of quotas can be that, of which my colleague Blaha spoke about previously, that extremism is growing in certain countries and it can also happen in Slovakia as well.”\(^ {154}\). The impact of the increased migration into Slovakia is perceived as having a negative effect on the nation. Migration is linked to the notion of the rise of extremism and MP Poliacik expects it to occur in Slovakia. The style of argumentation here can be categorized as a security type of argument in that, Poliacik perceives migrations as a threat that will cause the extreme nationalists to gain support, which in turn he believes is threat towards Slovakia. MP Galko also perceives migration as a threat, however in his argument the migrants themselves pose a threat to Slovakia “Through the existence of the Islamic State, growing religious intolerance, personified by Islamic radicalism, refugees and immigrants from Africa and Asia represent a certain security risk for our citizens.”\(^ {155}\). MP Galko continues “Refusing forced quotas of refugees which is not a solution to the problem. On the contrary, the situation will only get worse, because they are an invitation for traffickers to send more and more people into Europe.”\(^ {156}\). In this argument, Galko explains why his political party is against forced quotas, he proposes that idea that supporting the quotas will only support organized crime. Furthermore the increase of migration is viewed negatively by MP Galko.
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Galko also presents a reversed security argument “Mr prime minister, you have said that there exist a
general political consensus consisting of the whole political spectrum. It’s a shame that the political
consensus doesn't exist within your own party SMER [referring to MPs in the EU parliament]. I would
like to say now, that you are contributing to the rise of fear and unrest, which we are witnessing in
Slovakia.” 157. Galko presents a critique towards the prime minister and SMER-SD regarding what he
observes as 'scare tactics' to frighten public. MP Poliacik presents a similar argument and points to
concrete security arguments that the prime minister and SMER-SD are using in their speeches “I would
like to add, that it is not enough to calm [the situation down], I believe that from the position of the
prime minister and the position of the ministers, that they should make their voices heard when false
statements are being presented...This means that the prime minister should avoid [statements] that are
pointlessly scaring people, 50-thousands [potential migrants being allocated to Slovakia] and building
mosques...these are things that no one can postulate, whether or not these things will happen or not,
and whether or not these people will stay here, and the selection of only Christians, which is
absurd...” 158.

Integration

The integration type of argument has also been identified in the speeches of SaS, both of which are
credited to the same MP Galko.“...Slovakia has not managed to integrate even the Romani people in the
long-term...It is simply not possible to integrate thousands or tens of thousands of people with a
completely different culture and with different habits. Additionally, we know, that a couple of weeks
months ago, forced quotas appointed to Slovakia was only 800 people, now its going to be more than
2000 people and in a couple of weeks it will be a completely different number.” 159. The argument
presented is that because of the integration issues of the Romani people in Slovakia how could it be
then possible to integrate migrants in the present. There is an assumption in this argument that it is
difficult (if not impossible) to integrate persons who MP Galko views as being different culturally and
religiously from Slovaks, and thereby leading to the conclusion that accepting migrants into Slovakia is
not a desired situation. MP Gelko continues “That is why I would say that as long as immigrants are
coming here, and this can happen, and they are going to make a mess or not adhere to laws...then I will
stand behind the police and stand behind the soldiers as long as they will defend the Slovak Republic, as
long as they protect the law.” 160. This argument also fits into this category as migrants are viewed as
people who do not adhere to rules and laws, thereby making it impossible for them to integrate into
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EU and National Sovereignty

The EU and National Sovereignty types of arguments also appear in the speeches of SaS MPs. MP Galko “It is our duty to refuse forced quotas...because it is the sovereign right of the Slovak Republic to independently decide, who and who isn't allowed to enter [into the country].”161 This is a clear argument that falls into this category of argumentation, Galko argues that forced quotas if implemented are a violation of the sovereign right of Slovakia to decide its migration policy. MP Chren also presents a reversed EU and national sovereignty argument, the only of its kind in the parliamentary debate “You have said have that the largest issue is that rules and laws are not being followed. To date, your prime minister of Slovakia has proclaimed that he will under no condition respect the decision of the EU council and summit because no one will dictate to us...You know, these are rules and laws. So from now on we will not respect the majority voting results in the parliament, and we will not respect the results of future parliamentary elections because no one will tell me what to do.”162 In this argument, MP Chren argues the opposite of what is typically argued, that is that the EU holds sovereignty over migration policy, not Slovakia.

Summarized Position of SaS

The arguments that have been presented in the debate fall into two types of categories, security, and EU and national sovereignty. Furthermore the security arguments can be divided into two different forms, the conventional security argument and the reversed security argument. The argumentation regarding migration is mixed as the combination of security and reversed security arguments show. Both arguments are approximately equally present. However the integration arguments in combination with the conventional security arguments result in an overall negative stance towards migration. Furthermore the lack of humanitarian arguments also supports this interpretation of the data. Taking into account all of these factors, and the fact that the party is officially against forced quotas,163 it can be concluded that an overall position of SaS is that the party is strictly against immigration.

Discussion

Through a large-scale quantitative and statistical analysis using data from the CHES datasets, Rovny has found empirical evidence that categorizes Eastern European states into two distinct categories, states with Western left-right scale, where left-wing parties are positive to immigration while right-wing
parties are negative and a second category of states where left-wing parties are negative to immigration and right-wing parties are positive to immigration. In the former category, the relationship between the IV and the DV is positive according to Rovny's hypothesis. In the latter category of Eastern European states (Slovakia's category), the left-right scale the relationship is reversed. This is essentially the hypothesis that has been tested in this thesis through quantitative and qualitative data on the most likely case Slovakia.

In the quantitative section of the thesis, the bivariate regression analysis demonstrated that depending on which IV was tested “left-right ideological stance on economic issues” or “left-right overall ideological stance” the relationship between the party position and stance on immigration differed. When the economic scale was tested the relationship was negative however when the overall-ideology scale was tested, the relationship was positive. The tests showed the same results in all the years tested, 2006, 2010, and 2014. The regression analysis showed a stronger correlation between the IV “left-right overall ideological stance” and “immigration policy” in comparison with the “left-right ideological stance on economic issues” and “immigration policy” in all years test with the exception of 2014. It should however be noted that all the results failed to reach statistical significance at 95 % confidence level, suggesting that there is no correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variable. It can therefore be concluded that the quantitative results do not support Rovny's hypothesis or the alternative overall-ideology scale relationship with immigration policy. The results therefore indicate that further research is needed to find support or evidence to disprove his hypothesis that states such as Slovakia have a reversed left-right political scale when it comes to the issue of immigration.

The following is a discussion of the qualitative section of the thesis. The positioning of the six political parties that were in parliament during the 6th parliamentary period 2012-2016 was based on argumentative analysis of the parties speeches in the parliamentary debate n. 54 in September of 2015. The results show that SMER-SD, OľaNO, and SaS, are all strictly against immigration, KDH is against immigration, SDKU-DS holds a neutral position regarding immigration, and that MH is for immigration. The results show that the variation between parliamentary political parties regarding migration policy in Slovakia is low, with the majority of the parties falling in the positions of strictly against immigration or against immigration and with only two parties falling in the neutral and for immigration positions, respectively.

MH's positive stance towards immigration can best be described as an outlier when compared to the overall results of the qualitative study. The party's stance is perhaps one of the results worth
highlighting the most in this thesis as it points and connects us to the very core of this thesis, that is if a political party is for immigration it will be found on the right of the left-right economic scale rather than on the left as it would be in Western Europe. This result should be viewed as support of Rovny's hypothesis and findings. This is perhaps the most important finding of the thesis, in that it shows that Rovny was to some extent correct in his hypothesis. However despite MH's positive position regarding immigration the party is surprisingly against forced quotas. This is an unexpected result, and it implicates perhaps that a stance for or against forced quotas reveals not so much a political party's general position regarding migration policy but rather indicates its position on sovereignty of migration policy represented by the EU and national sovereignty category in the analytical framework. When looking at the overall results of the political parties with the exception of SDKU-DS, the category of EU and national sovereignty is a frequently occurring type of argumentation. Arguments in this category suggest criticism towards superstate behaviour by the EU rather than criticism of immigration itself. The prevalence of arguments fitting this category supports the notion that sovereignty is a sensitive and important issue in the context of the migration discourse but does not directly affect the positioning of parties in regard to immigration policy. This result does however increases the understanding of how and in what way the topic of migration is debated in the Slovak parliament, migration is considered national matter regarding the relocation of migrants, however it is considered an EU matter in other areas of cooperation regarding “solutions” to the migrations crisis such as ending the civil war in Syria, and protecting the external borders of the EU.

The results show that the most critical parties towards migration are the following: SMER-SD, SaS, and OĽaNO as these three parties have been positioned as being strictly against immigration. This also an important result, as it shows that political parties on both the left and right side of the “left-right ideological stance on economic issues” scale are strictly against immigration, going against Rovny's hypothesis. KDH's results are also important because of its critical position towards migration (against immigration) and its center-right position. This result shows that parties which are critical towards immigration can be found at different positions of the economic left right scale. SDKU-DS's neutral stance regarding immigration is a result of intraparty variation regarding migration. This political party's MPs have provided contradicting arguments where the majority have been conventional security arguments and humanitarian. This is also a significant result, as it demonstrates how migration policy can be a very controversial issue not only between parties (interparty variation) but also within a party (intraparty variation). In the context of Rovny's hypothesis, this result provides some support in that a party which was neutral was found on the right rather than the left.

To summarize, the results from the qualitative section of this thesis show that majority of the
parliamentary parties are against immigration, with only one party being for immigration, MH, and one party holding a neutral stance, SDKU-DS. Returning to Rovny's hypothesis, a general reversed western structure is not supported in the qualitative results of this thesis, as examples of political parties that are against immigration are observed at the left, center-right, and right dimensions of the left-right economic scale. However, the results of MH, an ethnic minority political party that is found on the right dimension of the left-right economic scale, supports Rovny's claim that political parties that are for immigration in countries such as Slovakia can be found on the right dimension of the left-right economic scale and not the left. SDKU-DS's neutral position regarding immigration is also a significant finding, as the party is also located on the right. This result provides some support to Rovny's hypothesis, due to the party's neutral stance, however one should be careful to derive any strong conclusions from the results regarding SDKU-DS.

Conclusion
This thesis set out to investigate the Slovak Republic's migration policy in the context of the ongoing migration crisis in Europe and the European Union. More specifically, this thesis's focus was to test Rovny's theoretical claim and empirical supported notion that in a category of Eastern European states (Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Romania), the left-right scale is reversed regarding the position of immigration when compared to western democracies. In order to test this claim, the critical case/most likely case of the Slovakia was selected. The results from the quantitative section of this thesis show that Rovny's claimed negative relationship between these variables was only negative if left-right economic stance variable was selected. If the left-right overall ideological stance was selected, the results showed a positive relationship between the variables. A positive relationship result indicates that left-wing parties are more positive towards migration than right-wing parties. The results also demonstrated a higher correlation $R^2$ in all the tested year with the exception of 2014. It can therefore be concluded from the statistical results that the reversed left-right scale regarding the position of migration needs further research in order to support Rovny's hypothesis, as the results show support for both types of relationships.

The qualitative section of the thesis was the main focus of this thesis. The parliamentary debate which provided the material for this section of the thesis was framed by the migration crisis and the relocation quotas of 120,000 refugees among the EU member states. The context provided a unique opportunity to study a parliamentary debate in Slovakia concerning the topic of migration, however it simultaneously raised some issues. It is the very uniqueness of the crisis that give merit to the investigation of this study, it can be argued that the material and most significantly the amount of detail
would not have existed without the controversy that surrounded the crisis. Simultaneously there is a possibility that the positions of the political parties were skewed negatively, because of the magnitude of the migration crisis. If the political parties were studied before the migration crisis began, it is possible that the results of this thesis would have been different, however it is also possible that the material would have lacked the depth and detail to position the parties, in that migration as topic would not have been discussed in such detailed manner. This section of the thesis also focused on the same theoretical context of Rovny's hypothesis and empirical support. The results did not support the notion of a reversed left-right scale, as the majority parliamentary political parties were positioned as strictly against immigration: SMER-SD, SaS and OľaNO. KDH was positioned as against immigration. 4 out of 6 parties are at the minimum positioned as against immigration. Most significantly this result shows that 3 out of 5 right-wing parties are negatively positioned towards immigration, one party, MH, is for immigration, and one party, SDKU-DS holds a neutral position. In the context of Rovny's theory, the results of qualitative section are mixed regarding the support or disapproval of his hypothesis. On the one there is not enough evidence to support the reversed left-right scale in the Slovak Republic, however the only political party that held a positive position regarding immigration, MH, and only party that held neutral position, SDKU-DS were both found the the right dimension of the left-right economics scale, providing merit to the notion that right-wing parties are more likely to be positive in regard to immigration.

Further Research

The results of this study indicate that more research is needed regarding migration policy in Slovakia and in Eastern Europe overall in order to better understand the reversed left-right scale observed by Rovny. The CHES dataset and similar surveys are important sources of information regarding political parties views on issues, however they provide limited insight into the reasoning behind the position behind each issue. It is important stress that more qualitative research is needed in order to unveil the argumentation behind political parties migration policies in order to better understand the reasoning regarding an issue. In the selected case, Slovakia, it was a critical to unveil detailed information regarding the argumentation in order to set a position for the political parties regarding immigration, without the detailed qualitative analysis of parliamentary speeches, it would have difficult to unveil MH's positive position and SDKU-DS's neutral position regarding immigration. Furthermore, more comparative qualitative research is needed between a reversed left-right states such as Slovakia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Lithuania, Romania and a “western type” category of Eastern European states such as Croatia, Estonia, Latvia and Slovenia, in order to provide more solid conclusions regarding the existence of a reversed left-right scale regarding the issue of immigration.
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