

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет

**Шведчикова Мария Владимировна**

**Тематическая база и идеологическая  
маркированность в общественной дискуссии в  
США (на материале форумов по иммиграции)**

Выпускная квалификационная работа

Направление подготовки 45.04.02 «Лингвистика»

Образовательная программа «Лингвокультурология  
Великобритании и США»

Научный руководитель: д. ф. н., доц., проф. Толочин И. В.

Рецензент: к.ф.н., доц. Лукьянова Е. А.

Санкт-Петербург  
2017

## ОГЛАВЛЕНИЕ

<b>ВВЕДЕНИЕ.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>ГЛАВА 1 Теоретические подходы к анализу общественной дискуссии: взаимосвязь и взаимодействие жанра и ценностей.....</b>	<b>6</b>
1. Краткий обзор литературы, посвященной общественной дискуссии.....	6
2. Теории текста и дискурса.....	11
3. Отражение ценностей в языке: когнитивное моделирование.....	20
<b>Выводы по ГЛАВЕ 1.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>ГЛАВА 2 Семантический анализ гражданских форумов.....</b>	<b>29</b>
1. Краткая история иммиграции в США: почему это является вопросом общественной значимости?.....	29
2. Семантическая структура двух форумов по иммиграции.....	31
2.1. Тематическая база форумов и идеологические модели.....	32
2.2. Сценарии и их виды.....	57
3. Анализ взаимодействия в двух форумах.....	79
3.1. Динамические элементы дискуссии.....	79
3.2. Анализ взаимодействия в форуме в Джорджтауне.....	90

3.3. Анализ взаимодействия в форуме в Сидар-Рapidсе.....	96
<b>Выводы по ГЛАВЕ 2.....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ.....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ.....</b>	<b>108</b>
ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ I. Транскрипт форума в Джорджтауне.....	112
ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ II. Транскрипт форума в Сидар-Рapidсе.....	145

## ВВЕДЕНИЕ

Эта работа посвящена изучению тематической базы и идеологической маркированности общественной дискуссии США. **Материалом исследования** служат два гражданских форума (public deliberation forum) по проблемам иммиграции, которые были проведены в двух городах: Джорджтауне (штат Делавэр) и в Сидар-Рапидсе (штат Айова). Эти форумы входят в серию форумов высокой общественной значимости (NIF forums). Они проводятся некоммерческими организациями с целью вовлечения гражданского населения в обсуждение проблем государственного масштаба. Результатом обсуждений на гражданском форуме часто являются некоторые предложенные пути решения проблем. Как правило, перед обсуждением участники знакомятся со специальными брошюрами, которые выпускаются некоммерческими организациями, чтобы дать представление о проблеме. Также в брошюре предложено несколько подходов к решению обсуждаемой проблемы, что служит для того, чтобы задать определенное направление дискуссии.

**Предметом** исследования являются гражданские форумы как отдельный текстовый жанр, а также роль идеологических моделей в отражении культуры народа. **Объект исследования** - транскрипты живой общественной дискуссии в США.

**Актуальность** работы связана с возрастающим интересом исследователей к анализу живого диалога и взаимодействию людей в живой дискуссии. Актуальность исследования определяется также его связью с когнитивно-коммуникативной парадигмой современных лингвистических исследований, основанной на учете преобладающей роли человеческого фактора во всех областях человеческой деятельности. Более того, в лингвистике существуют расхожие мнения о том, как отдельные элементы значения складываются в единый смысл текста форума, а также существуют разногласия в методах определения смысла, поскольку анализируются отдельные части текста, а не текст как одно смысловое целое.

**Новизна** данного исследования заключается в том, что в работе (1) текст дискуссии анализируется как единый связный текст, (2) показано, как ценности отражаются в тексте дискуссии, (3) создана аналитическая модель, позволяющая анализировать текст дискуссии как единое смысловое целое, (4) выявлены динамические элементы дискуссии.

**Целью исследования** является изучение и анализ гражданских форумов по иммиграции посредством выделения трех уровней смысла дискуссии: Тематической базы, Идеалов (идеологических моделей) и Сценариев. Главные вопросы исследования: каким образом смысл дискуссии реализуется, через какие элементы он выражен, а также каким образом ценности людей отражаются в тексте форума. Чтобы ответить на эти вопросы, необходимо выполнить ряд **задач**:

- дать краткий обзор теоретической литературы в направлениях дискурс-анализа и когнитивной лингвистики, которые связаны с данным исследованием;
- установить критерии для определения семантических уровней текста как диалогического взаимодействия;
- определить темы в двух гражданских форумах по иммиграции, а также идеологические модели и сценарии, которые находятся в рамках этих тем;
- проанализировать идеологическую маркированность текста форума.

При решении поставленных задач в ходе исследования применялись следующие методы: метод анализа фреймовых структур, сравнительно-сопоставительный метод, метод контекстного анализа.

**Методологической базой** исследования служат работы в направлении когнитивной лингвистики таких авторов, как Ф. Бартлетт, М. Бахтин, Т. Ван Дейк, Р. Водак, В. И. Карасик, Г. Лакофф, Е. А. Лукьянова, И. В. Толочин, Ч. Филлмор, Г. Фоконье, М. Фуко, Н. Фэйрклаф и другие.

**Основные положения, выносимые на защиту:**

- 1) смысловая цельнооформленность дискуссий опирается на стабильную ценностную базу, включающую в себя два структурных компонента – Тему и Идеал;

- 2) Тема - ценностный императив, являющийся универсальным для определенного сообщества и обеспечивающий возможность взаимопонимания;
- 3) Идеал (Идеологическая модель) – ценностное суждение, формулирующее принципы реализации тематического императива с точки зрения распределения ответственности между агентами, вовлеченными во взаимодействие;
- 4) Конкретный смысл дискуссии определяется характером взаимодействия участников, исходящих из различных Идеалов в рамках определенной Темы, и конкретными Сценариями, которые позволяют участникам сформулировать их видение и понимание актуальных проблем в рамках Темы дискуссии.

**Теоретическая значимость** работы определяется вкладом полученных результатов в разработку методов лингвистического анализа текста жанра публичной дискуссии.

**Практическая значимость** заключается в том, что результаты исследования могут быть использованы в качестве материалов курсов в рамках таких научных направлений, как дискурс-анализ, когнитивная лингвистика и семантика текста.

**Объем и структура диссертации.** Настоящее исследование общим объемом 111 страниц печатного текста (из них 106 страниц основного текста) состоит из введения, двух глав и заключения. Описание проведенного исследования в работе иллюстрируется 6 таблицами. К работе прилагается список использованной литературы, включающий 3 наименования на русском и 29 на иностранных языках, а также 11 ссылок на электронные ресурсы. В качестве дополнительного и приложение.

## ГЛАВА 1

### **ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ПОДХОДЫ К АНАЛИЗУ ОБЩЕСТВЕННОЙ ДИСКУССИИ: ВЗАИМОСВЯЗЬ И ВЗАИМОДЕЙСТВИЕ ЖАНРА И ЦЕННОСТЕЙ.**

Глава 1 представляет собой обзор литературы в следующих направлениях: общественная дискуссия, теория текста и когнитивное моделирование. В первом параграфе говорится о том, как устроена общественная дискуссия как отдельный жанр: дается информация о том, кто организует такие форумы, для чего и в каких условиях они проходят. Во втором параграфе анализируется литература по теории дискурса. В третьем параграфе представлен краткий обзор когнитивных методов анализа смысла в тексте.

#### **1.1 Краткий обзор литературы, посвященной общественной дискуссии.**

Гражданский форум или форум публичного обсуждения (*deliberation forum* or *forum for public deliberation*) – это встречи, организуемые различными некоммерческими организациями, где разные представители гражданского населения собираются для того, чтобы обсудить определенные социальные и/или политические вопросы. Гражданские форумы широко распространены в США, Канаде и в ряде других Европейских стран. В целом, данные форумы вовлекают в участие людей разных профессий, возрастов и полов для того, чтобы в ходе форума прошла разносторонняя дискуссия. А для этого важно, чтобы люди разного социального окружения смогли высказаться и обменяться мнениями по вопросу.

Гражданский форум – это лишь один из трех существующих форумов с общественной дискуссией. Другие два форума – это Форум по решению споров с участием всех заинтересованных сторон (*Multi-Stakeholder Dispute Resolution*) и Форум по совместной выработке жителями решения актуальной проблемы (*Community Problem Solving*) (Amsler, 2007; Henton et al., 2006). Важно отметить, что в отличие от других видов форумов, целью гражданских форумов не является полное согласие среди участников, как и нахождение выхода из

сложившейся ситуации или решения обсуждаемой проблемы. Гражданские форумы нацелены на то, чтобы идентифицировать гражданские позиции участников, а также узнать их мнение, повысить образованность населения в обсуждаемых вопросах, способствовать развитию духа сотрудничества в обществе и поощрять социальное взаимодействие (Henton et al., 2006: 10-16). Сотрудничество и коммуникация – самые важные аспекты гражданских форумов.

Гражданские форумы, анализ которых проведен в данной работе, являются частью серии форумов по вопросам высокой общественной значимости (NIF forums). Форумы NIF созданы для того, чтобы обозначить конфликты ценностей, существующие в американском обществе. Форумы по вопросам высокой общественной значимости (NIF forums) – это серия общественных дискуссий, которые принципиально организуются без привлечения политических партий. Они проводятся на всей территории США, однако спонсируются на местном уровне. Форумы по вопросам высокой общественной значимости являются формой структурированного диалога граждан. Благодаря участию общественности, появляются новые идеи, новые точки зрения, что важно для исполнительных органов власти. Рекомендации для органов местного самоуправления и единственно верное решение проблемы не является обязательным результатом NIF форума. Главная задача форума – помочь общественности (как на уровне отдельных индивидов, так и целого коллектива) сформировать их мнение и понять, какой существующей точки зрения они придерживаются.

NIF форумы организованы при содействии Благотворительного Фонда Кеттеринг (Kettering Foundation) в качестве инструмента реализации демократических принципов американского общества. На своем официальном сайте (<https://www.kettering.org>) фонд обозначил основные задачи проведения форумов, среди них:



- структурировать обсуждение проблемы таким образом, чтобы были предложены меры по её устранению, а также указаны положительные и отрицательные стороны каждого подхода к решению проблемы;

- поощрять коллективное стремление к получению информации по проблеме, поскольку это поможет предпринять шаги к решению проблемы;

- принимать осознанные коллективом решения, а именно – взвешивать все «за» и «против», для того, чтобы превратить поспешные высказывания в здравые суждения.

Существуют и другие организации, которые участвуют в организации форумов по вопросам высокой общественной значимости: National Issues Forums Institute ([www.nifi.org](http://www.nifi.org)), Center for Deliberative Democracy (<http://cdd.stanford.edu>), Collaborative Democracy Network ([www.csus.edu/ccp/cdn](http://www.csus.edu/ccp/cdn)), International Association for Public Participation ([www.iap2.org](http://www.iap2.org)). Более подробный список организаций, занимающихся организацией форумов, можно найти в работах Амслера (Amsler, 2007: 21) и Хэнтон (Henton et al., 2006: 36 – 41).

Основными источниками информации о гражданских форумах являются веб-сайты организаторов и модераторов, особенно сайты Благотворительного фонда Кеттеринг (Kettering Foundation) и Форумов по вопросам высокой общественной значимости (NIF). Фонд Кеттеринг также издает специальные материалы для проведения форумов (брошюры для участников форума, где они могут найти общую информацию или справку по обсуждаемому вопросу, а также некоторые подходы к решению проблем, которые будут обсуждаться в рамках форума), как и исследования, посвященные форумам, например “Democratizing Deliberation: A Political Theory Anthology” (Barker et al., 2012), где автор высказывает свое мнение по поводу совещательной демократии и её эффективного внедрения через гражданские форумы.

Существует ряд работ, анализирующих гражданские форумы. Например, часть их публикуется в журнале «Public Deliberation», который находится под контролем «The International Association for Public Participation» (IAP2). Этот журнал находится в открытом доступе онлайн, и его публикуют в формате PDF.

Он выходит дважды в год, начиная с 2007 года. Согласно информации, публикуемой на официальном сайте (<http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd>), журнал стремится к тому, чтобы собрать в одном месте исследования и проекты ученых, их мнения и опыт, а также результаты экспериментов в сфере совещательной демократии (deliberative democracy).

Теоретические работы, посвященные дискуссии, уделяют большое внимание процессу принятия решения в гражданских форумах, в то время как лингвистический анализ речи участников и анализ их взаимодействия в дискуссии остается в стороне. Результаты обсуждений на гражданском форуме не всегда доходят до законодательных органов и чаще всего не влияют на принятие законов, однако это не уменьшает их значимости.

Несколько исследователей изучали взаимодействие участников в форуме и обратили внимание на обучающий аспект гражданских форумов. Н. Гудовский и Ю. Бехтольд (2013) приводят аргументы в пользу того, что одним из основных результатов форума является социальное обучение. Т. Амслер (Amsler, 2007: 3) пишет о том, что «эффективная дискуссия развивает сознательность общественности и делает её более активной, поощряет участие в политической деятельности, укрепляет веру в правительство и пробуждает больший энтузиазм к участию в политическом процессе» ('effective deliberative processes create a more knowledgeable and active public, and encourage political participation, trust in government and greater enthusiasm for the political process'). П. Левин наряду с другими исследователями (Levine et al., 2005: 5) делает упор на то, что дискуссия обретает значимость и ценность тогда, когда участники начинают понимать причины несогласия, и когда во время дискуссии создаются условия для рефлексии, обсуждения вопроса и углубления в него, смены точки зрения, если это требуется, и закрепления полученных знаний по обсуждаемому вопросу. Дэвид Мэтьюз из фонда Кеттеринг определяет дискуссию как попытку к духовно-нравственному рассуждению (Barker et al., 2012). Он ссылается на Аристотеля и развивает эту идею: он считает, что иногда невозможно прийти к одному верному решению проблем, обсуждаемых на форумах, потому что эти

проблемы обычно задевают ценности участников дискуссии. К. К. О’Доэрти (O’Doherty, 2013: 2) подчеркивает важность следующих аспектов дискуссии: взаимное уважение участников, поддержка и критика позиций участников (другими участниками), организованность дискуссии и отсутствие манипуляции со стороны модератора или самих участников дискуссии.

В анализируемых дискуссиях эти аспекты соблюдались, однако, некоторые участники были более активны по сравнению с другими участниками и иногда модераторы не могли регулировать переключение тем обсуждения. Несколько участников форумов поменяли свою точку зрения, в одном из случаев под влиянием других участнице пришлось скрыть свою идеологическую принадлежность (Элла в форуме в Джорджтауне).

Самое сложное в организации гражданских форумов – составление плана дискуссии и её структурирование. Хорошо организованная дискуссия – это такая дискуссия, во время которой участники могут услышать аргументы за и против, оспорить разные точки зрения или согласиться с ними и обсудить возникающие противоречия (Levine et al., 2005: 3). Чтобы достичь этих целей, как правило, организаторы нанимают модераторов (или кого-то, выполняющего эту функцию), которые задают направление дискуссии. Важно, чтобы модератор был беспристрастен: не склонялся ни к какой из точек зрения и не поддерживал никакие предложенные решения обсуждаемой проблемы (Amsler, 2007: 17). Паоло Спада и Джеймс Р. Вриланд исследовали поведение модераторов и сделали выводы о функциях модераторов, отметив трудности их профессии (Spada, Vreeland, 2013). Предполагается, что модератор должен следить за тем, чтобы активные участники, порождающие множество реплик, не доминировали и не возглавляли дискуссию, и таким образом способствовать развитию справедливой, равноправной групповой дискуссии. В идеале, участники не должны чувствовать какого-либо неравенства или давления в группе, и любые смены позиций участников должны происходить в результате аргументированной дискуссии, мнение участников не должно быть подвержено агрессивному влиянию со стороны авторитетного участника.

Часто при обсуждении на гражданских форумах участникам уже заранее предложены несколько подходов к решению обсуждаемых проблем – участникам нужно только выбрать подход, который ближе всего к их позиции. Исследователи считают, что в процессе обсуждения брошюры с описанными подходами к решению помогают структурировать дискуссию, а также помогают участникам выразить свою точку зрения и предпочтения (O’Doherty, 2013; Niemeuer, 2004). В идеале, список подходов к решению проблем не должен каким-либо образом ограничивать дискуссию, наоборот, предполагается, что он станет отправной точкой рассуждения: новые решения и новые точки зрения со стороны участников приветствуются.

Однако, как показал наш анализ, брошюры, в том виде, в каком они существуют, не воспроизводят актуальные формулировки проблем. Люди, например, при обсуждении разделяют экономическую сторону вопроса и проблемы взаимоотношений между агентами (Темы), в то время как в брошюре эти два аспекта не имеют четкого разграничения. Более того, брошюры не помогают структурировать обсуждение, поскольку они дают лишь отправную точку обсуждения, так как каждый участник говорит прежде всего о своем личном опыте и о том, что его беспокоит. Чаще всего, если участник не слышал о проблеме раньше, то брошюра не помогает развить диалог на эту тему и приводит к недопониманию (например, обсуждение проблемы «утечки мозгов» в форуме в Сидар-Рэпидсе).

Хичкок (Hitchcock et al., 2001) и Мак Берни (McBurney et al., 2007) предлагают аналитическую модель, состоящую из 8 стадий или действий (Открытие, Информирование, Предложение, Рассмотрение, Повторение, Рекомендация, Подтверждение, Закрытие), которая помогает реконструировать шаги, благодаря которым происходит конструктивный диалог, который является основой жанра публичной дискуссии. Эти стадии так или иначе проявлялись в ходе дискуссии в обоих форумах: в обоих случаях было вводное слово и заключение (открытие и закрытие); в вводном слове давалась информация о всех подходах к решению проблемы (информирование); в форумах предлагались

пути решения, и они тут же рассматривались другими участниками (предложение и рассмотрение); многие участники ссылались на мнение других (повторение), в некоторых случаях участники приходили к общему мнению, шагам дальнейших действий (рекомендация и подтверждение).

Однако, анализ форумов показывает, что существующие принципы организации форумов не соответствуют реальной структуре дискуссии. Аналитическая модель из 8 стадий лишь схематично указывает на содержание дискуссии, не анализируя процесс формирования смысла в ходе обсуждения. Не учитывается динамика дискуссии, и не выделены элементы, благодаря которым мы можем о ней судить. Также не существует инструментов для модераторов, которые помогли бы им структурировать дискуссию.

## **2. Теории текста и дискурса**

М. Бахтин внес большой вклад в теорию текста. Он ввел понятие речевых жанров и говорил о «диалогичности» текста.

В своих работах М. Бахтин не различал понятия «текст» и «высказывание». Как отмечал Бахтин, если в широком смысле текст можно понимать, как любой связный набор знаков, тогда все произведения искусства можно считать текстом. Он также утверждал, что у каждого текста есть автор, однако, он также отмечал, что существует несколько форм авторства (Бахтин, 1986: 104). В рамках данной работы мы предлагаем различать текст и высказывание в связи с жанровой спецификой общественной дискуссии. Мы анализируем живую дискуссию, состоящую из нескольких высказываний, образующих связный текст. В нашей работе, «высказывание» - это единичный речевой акт, произведенный участником форума, ему предшествуют другие речевые акты участников, а также после него тоже следуют высказывания других участников. Бахтин пишет, что «высказывание – это семантическое целое» (Бахтин, 1986: 122), и «высказывание не может быть рассмотрено в качестве составной части текста» (Бахтин, 1986: 125). Однако, в форуме цельное значение высказывания может быть проанализировано только в рассмотрении с предыдущими

высказываниями, и высказывания являются единственными составляющими текста форума.

Понятие «диалогизм», о котором говорится в работах Бахтина, означает следующее: любой текст в определенной сфере основан на текстах, которые ранее были написаны. Диалогизм – одна из характеристик форума как текста. Таким образом, в нашей работе, весь форум (или транскрипт) рассматривается как текст, где несколько говорящих порождают высказывания, которые тесно взаимосвязаны друг с другом; понять и проанализировать каждое высказывание можно только в контексте предшествующих или последующих высказываний форума.

Вторым важным понятием, которое затронуто в работе М. Бахтина, является понятие «речевых жанров». Бахтин определил речевые жанры как относительно устойчивые типы высказываний (Бахтин, 1986: 61). Все разнообразные сферы человеческой действительности задействуют и используют язык. Формы языка и особенности употребления зависят от сфер человеческой деятельности. Согласно М. Бахтину, определенная сфера коммуникации определяет тематическую составляющую, стиль и структуру высказывания (Бахтин, 1986: 60). Высказывания могут порождаться в разных сферах человеческой деятельности. Сферы человеческого общения определяют типы высказываний или речевые жанры.

Бахтин подчеркивает, что литературные жанры изучались ещё с времен античности, однако, в основном изучались средства выразительности и вербальные модели (*verbal patterns*). И так было, пока Соссюр и американские структуралисты не обратили внимание на повседневную устную речь и самих говорящих.

Границы высказывания определяются сменой субъектов, то есть сменой говорящих. Смену говорящих можно четко отследить в диалоге. Взаимодействие реплик – отношение вопрос-ответ, утверждение и ответ, утверждение и возражение, утверждение и согласие, предложение и его принятие и так далее –

является характеристикой речи, а не отдельных языковых элементов, поскольку данное взаимодействие требует другого участника коммуникации (Бахтин, 1986: 71). Диалог, происходящий в реальной жизни, является самой простой и базовой формой речевого общения.

Выбор речевого жанра определяется типом речевого общения, его тематической составляющей, ситуацией общения и участниками (Бахтин, 1986: 74). На основе того, как сами участники описывают правила проведения гражданских форумов, можно предположить, что гражданские форумы (public deliberation forums) представляют собой отдельный речевой жанр, отличный от других речевых жанров.

М. Бахтин называл диалогизм основной характеристикой любого текста. Диалогические взаимоотношения существуют как между разными текстами, так и внутри одного текста. В текстах говорящие самовыражаются (высказывают свое мнение). Это создает главную проблему, связанную с интерпретацией текста: как человек, который не является автором, может понять текст в полной мере и провести его анализ. М. Бахтин пишет, что понимание всего высказывания всегда диалогично и человек, который понимает его (включая исследователя), становится участником этого диалога (Бахтин, 1986: 125).

М. Бахтин не изучал диалоги в реальной жизни, как и не выделял специального жанра для них, поэтому его работ недостаточно для методологической базы данного исследования. В нашей работе мы используем идею диалогичности, также мы считаем важным при анализе текста обращать внимание на личность говорящего, участника дискуссии.

В современных исследованиях термин «дискурс» встречается чаще и имеет сходное значение с термином «жанр» в интерпретации М. Бахтина.

Большой вклад в дискурс-анализ внес Мишель Фуко. Он определяет дискурс как «совокупность высказываний постольку, поскольку они принадлежат к одной и той же дискурсивной формации» (Foucault, 1972: 117). Это определение вносит путаницу, поскольку М. Фуко определяет дискурс через дискурсивную формацию. Это определение тавтологично, и его часто

критикуют. Несмотря на это, его работу часто берут за основу другие исследователи. В частности, М. Фуко предложил включить исторический контекст в дискурс-анализ, что привело к появлению и развитию Discourse Historical Approach (ДНА) (Clarke et al., 2012).

М. Джоргенсен и Л. Дж. Филлипс пишут о том, что дискурс – модный и распространенный термин, который часто используется в литературе, хотя его определение не приводится автором, в связи с чем, этот термин становится размытым. Они считают, что в основе дискурса лежит идея о том, что когда люди принимают участие в общественной жизни, их речь структурирована так, что их высказывания соответствуют сфере употребления и язык подстраивается под них, известные примеры: «медицинский дискурс», «политически дискурс», и так далее (Jorgensen, Phillips, 2002: 1). В этом смысле дискурс значит то же самое, что и речевой жанр. В нашей работе мы предпочитаем этот подход к определению термина «дискурс» и приравниваем его с понятием «жанр» при анализе текстов форума. В дальнейшем мы будем пользоваться термином «жанр».

После Фуко, следующим важным витком развития теории текста и речевых жанров стал новый подход Нормана Фэйрклафа – критический дискурс-анализ (КДА). В рамках этого подхода было написано много работ, он получил поддержку среди современных исследователей. В конце своей работы Н. Фэйрклаф предлагает список терминов. Он ссылается на М. Фуко, когда дает определение дискурса, и определение не уточнено, как и нет точного определения текста. Н. Фэйрклаф только упоминает, что тексты – это элементы социальных событий и явлений ('elements of social events') (Fairclough, 2004: 41). Такое определение слишком общее и не применимо к нашему исследованию. Также в работе Н. Фэйрклафа говорится об «интертекстуальности», при этом определение «текста» не дается.

Впервые термин «интертекстуальность» был введен в работах Ю. Кристевой. Любой текст, который являлся результатом взаимодействия других текстов и кодов, являлся интертекстом. В понимании Ю. Кристевой любой текст



становился интертекстом. Причем интертекстуальность, на ее взгляд, распространяется не только на литературные тексты, но и на все остальные системы знаков.

Термин «интертекстуальность» сходен с термином «диалогизм» М. Бахтина. «Интертекстуальность» - это присутствие в тексте элементов других текстов (Бахтин, 2004: 218). Некоторые тексты могут входить в содержание других текстов, поэтому необходимо знать фоновый контекст ('background context') текста (Fairclough, 2004: 47). Тексты существуют во взаимодействии: один текст порождается как реакция и ответ на другой, который, в свою очередь, дает почву для создания новых текстов, и так далее. Тексты всегда предполагают какую-либо реакцию, ждут ответа, а это приводит к созданию новых «реактивных текстов» ('reactive texts'). «Реактивные тексты» включают в себя элементы других текстов, которые могут открыто проявляться в тексте, либо подразумеваться. Эта идея напоминает рассуждения М. Бахтина, который приравнивал термины «текст» и «высказывание». По Н. Фэйрклафу, эксплицитная (явная) интертекстуальность в тексте может встречаться в форме реферирования, ссылок и цитат (Fairclough, 2004: 48) Имплицитная (скрытая) информация тоже важна при анализе текста. Получатель сообщения (устного или письменного) делает предположения по поводу имплицитных элементов текста или речи, и предположения могут быть верны только в том случае, если автор текста и читатель/слушатель имеют в виду одно и то же значение. Общение невозможно без точек соприкосновения, общности взглядов, наличия у участников коммуникации, устной или письменной, базовых знаний ('common ground') (Fairclough, 2004: 55). Базовые знания (common ground), которые помогают людям понимать друг друга, и разные тексты важны для нашего исследования. В нашей работе показано, что говорящие склонны к тому, чтобы поддерживать друг друга в коммуникации и высказывать мнение только тогда, когда они разделяют идеи – или на уровне идеологии, или на уровне обсуждения фактов, или когда они описывают ситуации и предлагают пути решения проблемы.

Фэйрклаф предлагает 3 вида смысла, которые всегда сосуществуют в тексте (Fairclough, 2004: 225): действие (как текст принимает участие в социальных явлениях и событиях), репрезентация (как мир отражен в тексте) и идентификация (как идентичность людей описана в тексте). Текстовый анализ включает в себя определение этих видов смысла.

Внимание исследователей было направлено не только на анализ смысла текста и изучение интертекстуальности, но и на анализ базовых суждений, выраженных в тексте. Фэйрклаф выделяет разные типы базовых суждений, которые можно выделить на основании лингвистических признаков (Fairclough, 2004: 56): экзистенциальные базовые суждения (маркированы определенными артиклями и указательными местоимениями), фактические базовые суждения (маркированы каузальными глаголами - I realized, forgot, remembered), ценностные базовые суждения (маркеры указывают на то, что что-либо является желательным и подходящим, либо не подходящим). Ценностные базовые суждения важны для рассмотрения, когда мы анализируем идеологию говорящего. В этой работе, идеологии участников мы будем называть Идеалами (или Идеологическими моделями), которые можно определить с помощью маркеров, которые указывают на то, что важно, желательно и правильно с точки зрения участника.

Определение *жанра*, которое предлагает Фэйрклаф, ещё менее проясняет смысл термина, чем определение Бахтина, так как Фэйрклаф определяет жанр через *дискурс*, определение которого, в свою очередь, также является размытым: «это особый дискурсивный аспект способов действия и взаимодействия в рамках социальных явлений» (“the specifically discursival aspect of ways of acting and interacting in the course of social events”) (Fairclough, 2004: 65, 215). Определение не вносит ясности и требует уточнений, а также оно не подходит для использования в лингвистическом анализе. Становится легче понять использование терминов «жанр» и «дискурс» в его работе, когда Фэйрклаф приводит пример интервью: собеседование при приеме на работу – это жанр

интервью, где интервью – форма текста. Однако, это не помогает выделить критерии, по которым Фэйрклаф разделяет понятия «жанр» и «дискурс».

Изучая явление интертекстуальности, выражение смысла в тексте и имплицитность текста, Норман Фэйрклаф создал новый подход к анализу текста – критический дискурс-анализ или КДА, который получил широкую поддержку среди исследователей, и в рамках этого подхода все ещё ведутся исследования. Тем не менее, у дискурс-анализа всё ещё есть слабые места.

Карлотта С. Смит отмечает, что главная проблема, связанная с дискурс-анализом – нахождение уровня для анализа, который был бы более продуктивен и принес бы результаты. По этой причине она предлагает «Дискурсивные модусы» как наиболее удачные элементы для анализа. Она вводит термин «Дискурсивный модус» для обозначения различных видов отрывков текста (абзацы). Важно отметить, что под «дискурсом» она подразумевает устную и письменную речь, а «текстом» она считает только письменную речь. Это приводит к появлению парадокса: только в письменной речи можно найти Дискурсивные модусы. Автор выделяет 5 модусов: повествование, описание, репортаж, информация, аргумент (Smith, 2003: 8). Внутри этих модусов К. С. Смит предлагает анализировать временные и пространственные изменения (*temporal and spatial progressions*), экспрессию (*expression*), субъективность (*subjectivity*) и текстовую структуру.

В нашей работе мы также выделяем несколько уровней анализа, но элементами анализа являются слова и словосочетания, образующие текст высказывания и маркирующие тот или иной уровень анализа смысла (Тема, Идеал или Сценарий). К. Смит отмечает, что она не анализирует живую дискуссию ни в одном из модусов, следовательно, она не предлагает методов анализа живого диалога. Необходимо отметить и то, что она фокусирует своё внимание на поверхностных синтаксических структурах во время анализа.

Не существует общего разработанного подхода, с которым бы согласились все исследователи, работающие в рамках КДА. Современные исследователи при анализе дискурса выходят за пределы текстового анализа. В рамках одного из

новых подходов в рамках КДА, Исторического дискурс-анализа (ДИС), исследователи выделяют 4 уровня анализа текста (или, точнее, контекста). Уровни анализа описаны в деталях учеными И. Кларк, В. Квон and Р. Водак (2012). Первый уровень анализа или уровень контекста – это анализ самого языка, внутри-текстовый анализ. На этой стадии лексические и синтаксические элементы подвергаются анализу. Второй уровень включает в себя анализ интертекстуальных и межжанровых отношений. На третьем уровне исследователи задействуют социальный контекст при анализе текста. На четвертом уровне текст помещается в более широкий социально-политический и исторический контексты. Метод исторического дискурс-анализа близок в какой-то степени к методу анализа текста, примененному в нашей работе, поскольку для того, чтобы проанализировать семантическую структуру форумов, нужно обратиться к социальному контексту (кто является агентами в форуме) и иногда к историческому контексту (понять, почему иммиграция является проблемой в США).

Кинч и Ван Дейк предлагают модель понимания связного текста, состоящую из нескольких элементов. Первый элемент – сенсорный регистр, с помощью которого человек воспринимает информацию (органы чувств). Второй элемент – долговременная память понимающего, которая основана на общих знаниях и личном опыте. Третий элемент – конструируемая репрезентация памяти, эпизодическая текстовая память, а также модель ситуации. В эпизодической текстовой памяти выделяется поверхностная память, пропозициональная текстовая база (семантическим представлением воспринимаемого текста в эпизодической памяти) и макроструктура.

Основное свойство модели – предположение, что понимание текста подразумевает не только представление текстовой базы в эпизодической памяти, но также активацию, обновление и другие способы функционирования так называемой ситуационной модели в эпизодической памяти: это когнитивное представление событий, действий, лиц и вообще ситуаций, о которых говорится в тексте. Ситуационная модель может инкорпорировать предыдущий опыт и,

следовательно, предыдущие текстовые базы, связанные с такими же или похожими ситуациями.

Предложенная модель имеет свои недостатки: она применима только для определения среднего уровня припоминания прочитанного ранее рассказа, а также отличается сложностью. Однако, как и в нашей работе, подчеркивается важность диалогичности – не только внутри самого текста, но и вне его – связь с другими, ранее прочитанными/услышанными текстами. Понятие Ситуационной модели сходно с термином Сценарий, который мы предлагаем. В работе Кинча и Ван Дейка ситуационная модель – абстрактный термин, не подкреплённый примерами из текстов. В нашей работе мы предлагаем четкую структуру Сценариев, приводим их классификацию на основе текста форума.

Косравиник (Khosravinik, 2010) в своей работе стремится показать, как текст связан с макроэлементами, глобальными элементами текста (идеологией, темами и тд). Также, как и в нашей работе, он выделяет 3 уровня анализ текста (но другие) и стремится показать их взаимодействие. Уровнями анализа являются социальные агенты (actors), социальное действие (action) и аргументация. Благодаря этому взаимодействию, по его мнению, можно проследить, как лингвистические составляющие (микроэлементы) могут влиять на идеологию социума (макроэлементы) и наоборот: он считает, что макроструктуры социума (идеология) проникает в речь (дискурс) через лингвистические формы. Таким образом, получается треугольник – «идеология-дискурс-идеология», благодаря которому дискурс становится основным совещательным инструментом, с помощью которого происходит обмен мнениями в социуме.

Однако, он анализировал тексты английских и иранских газет, а в нашей работе мы анализируем тексты форумов. Также его интересовала репрезентация противопоставления «свой» - «чужой» в текстах, в то время как мы изучаем роль идеологических моделей в отражении культуры народа и смысловую цельнооформленность текста. Идея макро- и микроструктур близка нашему исследованию, так как в нашем анализе Идеалы (Идеологические модели)

сформулированы в рамках Тем – более глобальных структур. Также при формировании Сценариев (проблемных ситуаций и путей решения), важно обратить внимание на социальных агентов – кто является виновным, кто – виноватым, а кто – жертвой в понимании говорящего. Таким образом, понятие социальных агентов полезно для нашего исследования для понимания сути проблемной ситуации.

Среди всех подходов, описанных в этом параграфе, КДА и анализ социальных агентов являются самыми близкими к этому исследованию. В нашем исследовании текст понимается как языковой продукт, который можно описать на основе выявления его жанровой специфики. Форум, в частности, мы рассматриваем как целостный текст, состоящий из высказываний участников дискуссии. Высказывания взаимосвязаны и взаимозависимы, а значение одного отдельного высказывания может быть проанализировано только в контексте целого текста (форума) и предыдущих высказываний, которые привели к образованию этого высказывания как реакции на них.

## **2. Отражение ценностей в языке: когнитивное моделирование.**

Существует много споров о том, как культурные ценности могут быть представлены в тексте. Многие ученые утверждают, что язык и культура тесно переплетаются, и мы можем увидеть культуру через текст, где культурные ценности вербализуются. В. И. Карасик определяет ценности как «наиболее фундаментальные характеристики культуры, высшие ориентиры поведения» (Карасик, 2002: 2). П. С. Гуревич утверждает, что система ценностей основана не только на знании и информации о мире, но и также на человеческом опыте (Гуревич, 1995: 120). Ценности всегда субъективны: мы не можем найти объект/предмет под названием «красота», «доброта» или «человечность» в объективной реальности. Когда мы читаем эти слова, мы всегда думаем о нашем личном опыте, связанным с «красотой», «добротой» и «человечностью»; мы вспоминаем людей, некоторые ситуации, эмоции, связанные с этими словами.

Когда человек использует эти отдельные слова, он всегда имеет собственное представление красоты, доброты и человечности. Поэтому ценности не могут быть представлены одним отдельным словом – они представлены ценностным суждением, потому что люди формулируют свое мнение в форме суждений, говоря о том, что хорошо и правильно, а что плохо и неправильно для них самих. В нашей работе мы будем использовать термин «ценностное суждение», исходя из того, что это «подвергающееся сомнению предположение об эмоциональном опыте в будущем, набор гипотетических ожиданий, касающихся сущности опыта» ('value judgement' presuming that it is 'a falsifiable prediction of a future emotional experience, a set of hypothetical expectations about reality') (McShea, 1999: 312). Ожидания гипотетические, поскольку реальность существует в человеческом сознании, она всегда субъективна.

С помощью системы ценностей, люди выстраивают суждения о мире, как они его воспринимают и представляют. В. И. Карасик разделяет ценности на внутренние и внешние, имея в виду то, что внутренние ценности персонально-обусловлены, а внешние ценности сформированы под влиянием общества/социума. Он не проводит четкой границы между ними, но совершенно ясно, что эти два класса ценностей не могут существовать отдельно друг от друга, так как каждый индивид живет в обществе. Таким образом, в нашей работе мы понимаем культуру как набор ценностных суждений, разделяемых конкретным сообществом.

Исследования, посвященные лингвистическому анализу текста, находятся в рамках когнитивной лингвистики. Когнитивная лингвистика оперирует разными терминами, которые обозначают единицы смысла, такие как когнитивные области, идеализированные когнитивные модели, ментальные пространства и фреймы.

Рональд Лангакер ввел термин «когнитивные области». Это структуры знания, ментальные репрезентации того, как организован мир, которые служат «контекстами для характеристики семантических единиц» ('contexts for the characterizations of a semantic unit') (Langacker, 1987: 147). Лакофф использует

термин «когнитивные модели» в том значении, в котором Лангакер говорит о когнитивных областях (Lakoff, 1987), в то время как Фоконье (Fauconnier, 1985) использует термин «ментальные пространства», а Филлмор предлагает термин «фреймы» (Fillmore, 1976).

В нашей работе предложены методы когнитивного структурирования смысла двух форумов, которые прошли в США. Один из уровней анализа – анализ Идеалов (Идеологических моделей). То, что мы подразумеваем под «Идеологическими моделями» основано на исследованиях Филлмора, а именно на том, как он раскрывает значение термина «фрейм»: «во фреймах заключен человеческий опыт, он структурирует взаимоотношение людей и устанавливает связь между объектами и событиями внутри этого опыта» ('the frame identifies the experience as a type and gives structure and coherence to the points and relationships, the objects and events, within the experience') (Fillmore, 1976: 25).

В современных исследованиях термин «фрейм» широко обсуждается. Понятие «фрейм» основано на следующей идее: люди имеют запас ментальных схем в их памяти, которые структурируют, классифицируют и интерпретируют человеческий опыт, полученный в реальной жизни [Bartlett, 1932; Schiffrin, 1994; Minsky, 1975; Schank, 1982, Mandler & Johnson, 1977]. Понятие «схема» впервые появилось в работе 'Запоминание' ('*Remembering*'), британского психолога Сэра Фредерика Бартлетта. В ней он определяет «схему» как «активную организацию реакций в прошлом и предыдущего опыта» ('an active organization of past reactions, or of past experiences') (Bartlett, 1932: 201). Также Бартлетт объясняет, как работает память. Он утверждает, что запоминание (память) – это творческий процесс и люди реконструируют прошлый опыт, используя ментальные схемы. Согласно недавним исследованиям схем, «ментальные схемы являются посредниками между восприятием, пониманием, интерпретацией и памятью; они являются иерархическими структурами (или «фреймами»), которые организуют знание» ('perception, comprehension, interpretation and memory are mediated by mental schemata - hierarchical structures (or 'frames') for organizing knowledge') (Daniel Chandler, 1995: 5). С помощью



ментальных схем человек может сделать предположения, на основе которых сможет понять новые ситуации при получении нового опыта. Если мы говорим о чтении, ментальные схемы служат ментальными рамками, которые помогают читателю, словами Джерома Брунера «постигать смысл глубже, чем только в рамках информации, данной в тексте» (go ‘beyond the information given’) (Bruner, 1966).

Термин «фрейм» был впервые упомянут в работе Марвина Ли Минского. Он определяет фрейм как структуру (представление), которая изображает стереотипную ситуацию (Minsky, 1996). Минский проводил исследования в области компьютерных технологий и искусственного интеллекта, поэтому его определение термина «фрейм» также не применимо к нашему исследованию.

Чарльз Филлмор и Ван Дейк предлагают теорию фреймов для анализа смысла. Чарльз Филлмор предлагает описание фреймов (когнитивных и интеракционных): это что-то, с помощью чего тот, кто использует язык, интерпретирует «объективный мир» и создает «собственную модель мира в своем сознании» (‘an internal model of his world’) (Fillmore, 1976: 23). Тён Ван Дейк определяет фрейм как «конвенциональное знание» о мире. Он утверждает, что «общая связность дискурса <...> устанавливается с помощью рамочного знания (фреймов) о типичных ситуациях, событиях и действиях» (‘global coherence of discourse <...> is established with frame knowledge about typical situations and events and actions’). И люди используют эти «фреймы», когда они взаимодействуют друг с другом, потому что они помогают им понять друг друга. Таким образом, в его работах фрейм – это то, что используют люди, когда они выстраивают коммуникацию (van Dijk, 1977: 4). Именно в таком значении термин «фрейм» используется в критическом дискурс-анализе (Fairclough, 1995; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009; Wodak, 2009; Wodak & Chilton, 2005).

Филлмор отмечает, что взаимопонимание между людьми может быть достигнуто только тогда, когда они разделяют одни и те же фреймы. Филлмор пишет: «Объекты, люди и человеческий опыт организованы в сознании с помощью фреймов относительно того, поддерживают ли они интересы людей и

помогают в жизни и улучшают её, или наносят вред людям и их интересам» ('Many objects, persons and experiences in the world are framed in terms of their potential role in supporting, harming, or enhancing people's lives or interests'). (Fillmore, 1976: 28). В нашей работе то, что человек считает идеальным положением вещей, желательной, подходящей ситуацией мы называем «Идеалами».

Существуют и другие трактовки термина «фрейм»: он используется в лингвистике, чтобы описать синтаксическое окружение определенной синтаксической категории (Harris, 1954). В своих исследованиях Харрис делал акцент на анализе синтаксических структур, поэтому его трактовка «фрейма» не подходит для нашего исследования.

В работах Фоконье, «ментальные пространства» – это образы или репрезентации человеческого опыта: конструкции, с помощью которых человек думает и оформляет свою речь. Фоконье в своих работах упоминает, что «ментальные пространства» являются ничем иным, как «идеализированными когнитивными моделями», о которых пишет в своих исследованиях Лакофф. Однако, в понимании Лакоффа ментальные пространства являются меньшими единицами, чем когнитивные модели; по его мнению, идеологические модели структурируют и организуют ментальные пространства. Лакофф считает, что «посредством ментальных пространств человек мыслит и концептуализирует мир. Ментальные пространства заключают в себе понимание существующего положения вещей, зафиксированное в человеческом разуме» ('A mental space is a medium for conceptualization and thought. Mental spaces represent fixed or an ongoing state of affairs as a human conceptualizes it') (Lakoff, 1987: 281). Однако, если посмотреть на определения Фоконье и Лакоффа, сложно понять, существует ли принципиальная разница между терминами «ментальные пространства», «фреймы» и «идеализированные концептуальные модели», или они обозначают одну и ту же единицу когнитивного анализа.

Однако ни в одном исследовании термин «фрейм» не применяется для текстового анализа. Очевидно, что смысл не определяется только «фреймами».

«Фреймы закодированы в лексике или в грамматических категориях языка» ('Frames are codified in the vocabulary and in the grammatical categories of the language') (Fillmore, 1976: 23); их обычно ассоциируют с конкретным словом, речевой формулой (speech formula) или конкретной грамматической структурой, но в ходе исследований не показано, как эти фреймы работают в тексте и определяют его смысл. Следовательно, фреймовая семантика не предусматривает анализа смысла как глобальной связной структуры, так как она бессистемно сопоставляет «лингвистический материал». Термин «фрейм» объясняет, как структурирована семантическая память, но не показывает, как «конвенциональное знание» ('conventional knowledge') проявляет себя в тексте, какую роль оно играет и какие функции оно имеет.

«Сценарий» - другая важная категория смысла в рамках когнитивной лингвистики. «Сценарии» в работах Лакоффа являются подтипами когнитивных моделей, которые состоят из первоначального состояния (отправная точка), последовательности событий (путь), и конечного состояния (пункт назначения) (Lakoff, 1987: 285). В Сценарии вовлечены люди, вещи, характеристики, отношения и проблемы. Все эти элементы начинают взаимодействовать разными способами и вступать в отношения: причинно-следственные, отношения тождества и тд. (Lakoff, 1987: 286). Как правило, смысл Сценария отражает цели и замыслы агентов, вовлеченных в этот Сценарий.

Хилари Путнам добавляет, что Сценарии обладают стереотипической природой, так как они основаны на конвенциональных утверждениях и личных предположениях, ожиданиях, даже если опытным путем доказано, что они неверны (Putnam, 1975: p. 148, 249–250).

Андрефс Мусолфф обобщает подходы к изучению сценариев и предлагает определение сценария, как «ряда утверждений, сделанных компетентными членами дискурсивного сообщества по поводу «типичных» аспектов ситуации-источника, например, по поводу участников ситуации и их ролей, неожиданных сюжетных поворотов и следствий, и конвенциональных оценок: считают ли они ситуацию удачной или неудачной, нормальной или выходящей за рамки,

допустимой или неподобающей и тд.» ('set of assumptions made by competent members of a discourse community about "typical" aspects of a source-situation, for example, its participants and their roles, the 'dramatic' storylines and outcomes, and conventional evaluations of whether they count as successful or unsuccessful, normal or abnormal, permissible or illegitimate, etc.')

(Musolff, 2006: 28). Важно отметить, что Мусолфф изучает метафорические сценарии, в то время как наша работа не рассматривает сценарии, в которых задействована метафора.

Таким образом, можно отметить, что в когнитивной лингвистике не существует единообразного, всеми используемого языка, в котором бы один термин использовался всеми лингвистами в одном значении. В то же время, не существует четкой структуры анализа смысла текста. Должна существовать аналитическая модель, показывающая несколько уровней смысла текста и способная их определить и продемонстрировать, доказывая, что текст является одним смысловым целым. Определения, приведенные выше, связаны с ценностным моделированием реальности и приближаются к определению ценностного суждения как основной единицы сознания, обеспечивающей человеку возможность выбора в проблемных ситуациях. Наше определение ценностных суждений как набора ожиданий о сущности опыта опосредовано понятиями фрейм, сценарий, ментальные пространства, когнитивные модели, поскольку каждое из них содержит в себе человеческий опыт или представление о шаблонных ситуациях, помогающих людям взаимодействовать и понимать друг друга.

Принимая во внимание существующее разнообразие подходов, невозможно пользоваться термином без его четкого описания и понимания, то есть, не дав ему определение. В нашем исследовании мы опираемся на понимание «фреймов» Ч. Филлмора и на основе этого предлагаем термин Идеал (Идеологическая модель), который обозначает идеальное (для отдельных индивидуумов или группы людей) положение вещей, где ответственность за указанные действия распределена между агентами. Также уровень

Идеологических моделей в нашей работе связан с идеологическим уровнем понимания текста.

Другая аналитическая составляющая работы – сценарий. У Лакоффа Сценарий – это шаблонная ситуация (например, «посещение ресторана», «коммерческий обмен», «игра в бейсбол»), где цели участников общения определены и их отношения регулируются «схемами связи». В нашей работе Сценарий – это конкретная проблемная ситуация, разворачивающаяся в процессе диалога. В Сценариях представлено несоответствие между идеалом (показанным в Идеологической модели) и действительным положением вещей. Типичный сценарий, как правило, содержит проблему, предложение по её решению, ответственных агентов, которые выполняют свои обязанности хорошо и безответственных агентов, которые не выполняют свои обязанности так, как должно быть в рамках желаемой ситуации.

В нашем исследовании мы вводим новый термин, который раньше не использовался в рамках когнитивной лингвистики – Тема. Темы представляют собой нормативные ценностные установки говорящих, касающиеся определенных областей человеческого опыта, то есть они отражают то, что воспринимается говорящим как реальность, непререкаемая, не подвергаемая сомнению истина. Термин «Тема» удачно объединяет в себе конвенциональное знание о мире (Ван Дейк «фрейм»), представление о стереотипических ситуациях (Минский «фрейм»), базовое знание (Фейрклаф) и ценности (Тема выражена через ценностное суждение), что помогает понять, что есть общего у всех участников дискуссии, что они не ставят под сомнение, а что – является личным мнением и вариантом решения проблемы. Темы являются обязательным условием взаимопонимания и возможности диалога.

В заключении отметим, что в исследовании мы предлагаем аналитическую модель анализа смысла текстов (форумов), состоящую из трех уровней: уровень Тем, уровень Идеалов (Идеологических моделей) и уровень Сценариев.

## Выводы по ГЛАВЕ 1

1. Гражданские форумы или форумы по вопросам высокой общественной значимости (NIF) нацелены на то, чтобы сформировать мнение общественности по социо-политическим вопросам, а также на то, чтобы воспитать ценности в гражданах США. Эти форумы организуются Благотворительным Фондом Кеттеринг, который продвигает идеи совещательной демократии.
2. Форумы по вопросам высокой общественной значимости являются объектом изучения многих исследователей, однако существует мало работ, посвященных гражданским форумам в рамках лингвистики. Большинство исследователей обращают внимание на политическую и социальную значимость, не рассматривая публичную дискуссию как отдельный речевой жанр.
3. Краткий обзор литературы по теории текста и речи показали, что существующая терминология имеет свои недостатки. Определения жанра и дискурса вводят в заблуждение, также нет четкого разграничения между этими понятиями. Более того, не дано четкого определения дискурса и текста, как и нет единого подхода к анализу текста и речи, признаваемого всеми исследователями в этой сфере.
4. Наиболее популярные подходы к анализу речи – критический дискурс - анализ и исторический дискурс-анализ. Исследователи, работающие в рамках этих подходов, ещё не пришли к общей терминологии и методам анализа речи.
5. Когнитивная лингвистика быстро развивается и является популярным научным направлением. Направление появилось сравнительно недавно, поэтому существует много понятий, которые обозначают одно и то же, а также существует много научных подходов, которые нуждаются в доработке.

6. Два из трех ключевых понятий, используемых в нашей работе (фрейм и сценарий) не имеют единого определения. В нашей работе предложены конкретные определения.
7. В нашем исследовании мы предлагаем новую единицу семантического анализа – Тему. Темы отражают то, что говорящий воспринимает как непререкаемую истину в определенной сфере человеческой деятельности.

## ГЛАВА 2

### СЕМАНТИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ ГРАЖДАНСКИХ ФОРУМОВ.

#### 2.1 Краткая история иммиграции в США: почему это является вопросом общественной значимости?

Иммиграция на протяжении всей истории США всегда считалась положительным явлением, так как способствовала как экономическому, так и культурному развитию страны. Однако, всегда существовали и споры в экономической (вопрос распределения рабочих мест), социальной (повышение социальной мобильности, рост уровня преступности среди иммигрантов) и политической сферах по поводу иммиграции.

После смягчения иммиграционной политики в 1965 году, число иммигрантов первого поколения, живущих в Соединенных Штатах увеличилось в четыре раза (Parademetriou, D., Terrazas A., 2009): с 9,6 миллиона в 1970 году до примерно 38 млн в 2007 году (Elliott, Mayadas, Segal, 2010). С 2000 по 2010 год в США около 14 млн иммигрантов прибыло в страну (Center for Immigration Studies, 2011). В 2006 году Соединенные Штаты принимали самое большое количество легальных иммигрантов в качестве постоянных жителей, чем все другие страны мира ([http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-10/17/content\\_5215770.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-10/17/content_5215770.htm)).

В настоящее время в США самая большая доля иммигрантов из Мексики, Индии и Филиппин. Также в США прибывает все больше мигрантов из Китая (Lee, Rytina, 2009).

Несмотря на то, что приток населения из других стран и культур вызывает некоторые проблемы, «Америка постоянно набирает силу и дух от новых волн иммигрантов, идущих одна за другой», - сказал президент Билл Клинтон в 1998 году. Ежегодно семьи иммигрантов воссоединяются и это составляет примерно 2/3 легальной иммиграции в США (McKay, 2003).

Иммигранты получают гражданство и с помощью различных виз (например, виза L-1 - самый быстрый способ получить Грин-Карту). За



последнее десятилетие иммигранты получили около 33 миллиона Грин Карт (Batalova, 2008). L-1 выдают учредителям и менеджерам иностранных компаний, планирующих открыть филиал своего бизнеса в Америке. После года работы филиала компании в США, учредители и менеджеры, в также их семьи получают постоянное место жительства. Раньше только крупные компании могли это сделать, но в последнее время, Америка способствует развитию среднего и малого бизнеса. Процент отказа на получение этой визы составляет всего около 18 % с 2010 (<http://travel.state.gov>). А уже в 2015 году, на саммите «SELECTUSA» Президент США Барак Обама заявил о том, что в ближайшее время процедура получения виз L-1 (Kagerat, 2015) будет упрощена. Данные изменения в иммиграционной политике, как утверждают некоторые исследователи, будут способствовать увеличению потока иммиграции в США.

Как известно, Америка с самого основания была страной иммигрантов, и именно поэтому в современной Америке при попытке решить проблему нелегальной миграции возникает множество разногласий. С одной стороны, иммигранты сформировали культуру страны, поэтому запрет на их въезд разрушил бы один из основополагающих принципов организации жизни США. С другой стороны, нелегальные иммигранты нарушают закон, что, конечно же, вызывает возмущение коренных граждан Америки. Проблема осложняется тем, что за последние 15 лет число иммигрантов, как легальных, так и нелегальных сильно увеличилось.

Если к началу 90х годов число нелегальных иммигрантов в США достигало 4 млн. чел., то к 2012 году оно увеличилось до 11.7 млн. Администрация Б. Обамы объявила о разработке проекта реформы иммиграционной политики Америки, в котором говорилось о том, что все нелегалы смогут законно обосноваться в США в ходе долгой процедуры, а финансирование новой системы контроля на границах должно остановить поток мигрантов. Но, несмотря на то, что за 2012 год было депортировано рекордное число нелегалов – 400 тыс. чел, а затем средства, выделяемые на усиление

контроля на границах, увеличились до 18 млрд. долл., численность нелегальных иммигрантов не уменьшается.

В то время, как представители разных партий спорят о том, как следует провести реформу иммиграционной политики, появляется все больше жертв тех, кому не удалось пересечь границу США незаконно через пустыню Аризоны. А «койоты» (те, кто за денежные вознаграждения незаконно переправляет иммигрантов через границу с США) тем временем зарабатывают все больше денег (речь идет о миллиардах долларов). Экономике США действительно нужны рабочие руки в некоторых отраслях (в сфере услуг, сельском хозяйстве), но многочисленные амнистии не помогают решить проблему нелегальной иммиграции. После амнистии число нелегальных иммигрантов уменьшается, но лишь на некоторое время, потому что затем нелегалы снова устремляются к границам США. Более того, амнистия уравнивает положение тех, кто долгое время добивался получения гражданства и тех, кто нарушил закон и пересек границу страны нелегально. Это ставит под сомнение справедливость амнистии.

## **2.2. Семантическая структура гражданских форумов по вопросам иммиграции в Джорджтауне и Сидар-Рапидсе.**

Мы предлагаем аналитическую модель, которую можно применить для анализа смысловой структуры общественной дискуссии. Данная модель основана на выделении трех компонентов смысла в общественно-политической дискуссии. На основании этой модели можно определить, какой структурой обладает сам диалог, как участники динамически взаимодействуют и как, являясь представителями разных социальных групп и представляя разные ценности, они порождают единый целостный текст дискуссии.

Оба гражданских форума по проблемам иммиграции прошли в США в 2004 году. В обоих случаях это была двухчасовая дискуссия на местном уровне – одна проходила в городе Джорджтаун, штате Делавэр (первая), другая в городе Сидар-Рапидс, штат Айова (вторая). В первой дискуссии участвуют 20 человек,

а во второй – 17 человек, которые принадлежат к разным социальным группам (половые, возрастные, профессиональные, расовые, экономические). Всего участники первого форума, включая модераторов, произвели 238 высказываний, а участники второго форума – 182 высказывания.

В ходе анализа будет показано, как трехуровневая система анализа поможет определить целостный по своей природе смысл дискуссии. Также данный анализ поможет понять, как устанавливается взаимопонимание в процессе речевого взаимодействия. Будет показано, что существует разная степень взаимопонимания между участниками дискуссии, а также будет проведен анализ динамики дискуссии.

### 2.2.1 Тематическая база форумов и идеологические модели.

Мы проанализировали высказывания участников форума и выяснили, что, высказывая свое мнение или комментируя уже сказанное ранее, участники дискуссии регулярно воспроизводят в своей речи слова и словосочетания, которые маркируют непререкаемые параметры тех ситуаций, в рамках которых участники высказывают суждения о ценностях и идеалах, в результате чего происходит столкновение мнений. В анализируемом форуме мы выделяем две группы таких единиц.

Первая позволяет установить базовую модель, служащую для взаимопонимания участников, представляющую естественное для всех участников дискуссии отношение к иммиграции и общее для всех восприятие американской нации. В первом форуме она маркируется следующим рядом слов и словосочетаний: *we are a nation of immigrants; we're a country of immigration; diversity; we welcome all immigrants; our tradition of tolerance; open and an accepting community; they can live a better life; people pretty much accept them (immigrants); nation of opportunity; equal opportunity; the notion of independence and free choice; America's a melting pot; immigrants keep this nation vibrant and adaptable; what made this country great; immigration built America; hard work; a viable part of the community (immigrants), etc.*

Во втором форуме она маркируется следующим рядом слов и словосочетаний: ***we are a nation of immigrants**; our values as **an immigrant nation**; diversity of the **community**; we've had lots of **opportunities**; the position of the United States in front of the world as the **open country**; **opening the doors wider to people** to who are seeking to improve their lives; to seek to improve themselves by moving; to seek **a better life** and to find some stability; overseas the United States to some of these **immigrants is a shining star**; to have a better life; the Declaration of Independence talks about rights, given by a Creator to everybody. Life, liberty, **pursuit of happiness**; the **rights and the freedoms**; democracy; cultural independence; **this tough salad that we have that's America**; I see that really immigrants embody those Iowa values of **hard work**, people coming here are **hard workers**, etc.*

Жирным шрифтом выделены слова и словосочетания, которые повторяются в обоих форумах, а именно – *we are a nation of immigrants, diversity, opportunity, open (country or community), independence, free/freedom, a better life, community*. Также сходны маркеры ‘America's a melting pot’ и ‘tough salad that we have that's America’.

Маркеры можно объединить в смысловые группы и тогда станет ясно, что они совпадают по смыслу и функции в тексте в обоих форумах. Для наглядности мы объединили маркеры в таблицу:

Таблица № 1.

Форум № 1	Форум № 2
1. <i><b>we are a nation of immigrants</b>; we're a <b>country of immigration</b></i>	<i><b>we are a nation of immigrants</b>; our values as <b>an immigrant nation</b></i>
2. <i><b>we welcome</b> all immigrants; our tradition of tolerance; <b>open</b> and an accepting <b>community</b>; people pretty much <b>accept</b> them (immigrants)</i>	<i>the position of the United States in front of the world as the <b>open country</b>; <b>opening the doors wider to people</b> to who are seeking to improve their lives</i>

3. <i>they can live a better life</i>	<i>to seek to improve themselves by moving; to seek a better life and to find some stability; overseas the United States to some of these immigrants is a shining star; to have a better life; the Declaration of Independence talks about rights, given by a Creator to everybody. Life, liberty, pursuit of happiness</i>
4. <i>nation of opportunity; equal opportunity; the notion of independence and free choice</i>	<i>we've had lots of opportunities; the rights and the freedoms; democracy; cultural independence</i>
5. <i>America's a melting pot; diversity</i>	<i>this tough salad that we have that's America; diversity of the community</i>
6. <i>immigrants keep this nation vibrant and adaptable; what made this country great; immigration built America; hard work; a viable part of the community (immigrants)</i>	<i>I see that really immigrants embody those Iowa values of hard work; people coming here are hard workers</i>

В первой строчке таблицы маркеры полностью повторяют друг друга. В строчке 2 таблицы маркеры выражают мысль о том, что Америка – открытая (open community/country), толерантная страна, которая принимает иммигрантов (our tradition of tolerance, accepting community, people pretty much accept them, opening the doors wider to people). Как показывают маркеры в строчке 3, иммигранты приезжают для того, чтобы сделать их жизнь лучше, что соответствует ценности американской нации, выраженной в Декларации Независимости США ('Life, liberty, pursuit of happiness'), поскольку они стремятся к счастью. Маркеры в строчке 4 также формулируют ценностное суждение, характерное для обоих форумов: Америка – страна возможностей, где каждый человек независим и свободен выбирать, что он захочет. В 5 строчке таблицы заключена идея о том, что в Америке существует культурное разнообразие и многие национальности уживаются вместе, дополняя друг друга. И, наконец, в 6 строчке маркеры выражают мысль о том, что иммигранты воплощают ценности Американской нации (hard work) и являются важной частью американского общества.

Все эти слова и словосочетания позволяют определить у участников дискуссии общую ценностную базу. Ценностная база - это словесное суждение, характеризующее отношения между гражданами Америки и иммигрантами, которые носители культуры считают естественными, не подвергающимися сомнению в данной культуре. Такие базовые ценностные императивы мы предлагаем называть *Темами* и рассматривать их в качестве семантической базы дискуссии. Выделение Тем является первым этапом анализа текста. Темы обеспечивают саму возможность взаимопонимания и ведения дискуссии, так как люди должны иметь что-то общее, чтобы вести диалог. Поскольку маркеры либо полностью совпадают, либо совпадают по смыслу, можно сказать, что они показывают одно и то же ценностное императивное суждение, которое можно сформулировать следующим образом:

#### **Тема 1.**

*America is a nation of immigrants: generations of immigrants have made this country great by hard work and dedication, maintaining the traditions of openness and tolerance on the basis of the belief that all people are created equal and 'are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness'.*

В форуме в штате Делавэр 94 высказывания сформулированы в рамках Темы 1, в то время как во другом форуме в штате Айова было найдено 71 высказывание в рамках Темы 1.

Вторая группа маркеров переносит участников в другую, смежную с первой, ситуацию, основывающуюся на не подвергаемом сомнению принципе, согласно которому для реализации взаимоотношений иммигрантов и граждан Америки необходимы определенные материальные ресурсы, обеспечение. В первом форуме эта группа маркеров включает в себя следующие слова и словосочетания: *we learn, we grow, and we expand; American taxpayers; Citizen's wages; jobs; work; immigrants are a part of this economy; somebody comes here and wants to work; infrastructure; the county is booming and jobs are here; economic benefit; businesses, wave of export of jobs; decent wages; we are a nation of cheap,*

*cheap food, cheap products, cheap gas; It's just part of the same economic growth of the country; economic cost; take jobs; pay taxes; to pay costs, etc.*

Во втором форуме группа маркеров включает в себя следующие слова и словосочетания: *work; business; trade; money; economics; economic model; the system; a net cost; to meet our jobs needs; to maintain current jobs; minimum wage positions; higher paid jobs; the wage floor; livable wage; workers; economic costs; direct expense; make their own contribution to our greater society's growth; migrant labor; spending money; competition; wage pools; working conditions; they pay taxes; invest in the community; cheap labor; economic power; some taxes were collected; to have jobs that need to be filled, etc.*

Следующие слова и словосочетания встречаются в обоих форумах: *jobs, work, economy, wages, economic cost, business, cheap, growth, pay taxes*; также слова *the structure* и *infrastructure* имеют сходное значение.

В обоих форумах маркеры выражают одну и ту же ценностную модель. В обоих случаях Америка считается великой страной (*American prosperity/the greatness of America*), экономика которой является сильной и конкурентоспособной (*strong free economy/ a strong and competitive free economy*). Поэтому в Америке всегда есть рабочие места (*which constantly creates jobs for citizens/ that creates jobs for the people*), что позволяет поддерживать инфраструктуру, поскольку рабочие платят налоги (*each person earns decent wages and pays taxes to support American infrastructure/allows citizens to be responsible taxpayers*).

Данная группа маркеров позволяет сформулировать вторую Тему, актуальную для дискуссии в качестве семантической базы – общего поля, обеспечивающего возможность диалога:

## **Тема 2**

*American prosperity rests on a strong free economy, which constantly creates jobs for citizens so that each person earns decent wages and pays taxes to support American infrastructure and to maintain American exceptional standards.*

В форуме в штате Делавэр в рамках Темы 2 сформулировано 40 высказываний, в то время как в другом форуме (штат Айова) - 32.

Тема 1 является наиболее базовой темой. Такие темы можно назвать экзистенциальными или смыслообразующими. Ещё в раннем возрасте они закладываются в сознание и определяют качество взаимоотношений между социальными акторами, т.е. людьми, которые в рамках данного императива приняли на себя определенные им социальные роли (напр., immigrants, Americans, authorities). Тема 2 является дополнением и расширением Темы 1. Такие темы мы будем называть организационными или экономическими. Они затрагивают вопросы распределения ресурсов для того, чтобы Тема 1 (смыслообразующая) могла вступить в силу, и чтобы отношения, обозначенные в ней, успешно реализовывались в обществе.

Выделение тем – чрезвычайно важный шаг, так как это помогает идентифицировать семантическую базу дискуссии. Количество Тем указывает на то, что является важным в обсуждении, какой именно аспект общественных отношений выдвигается на обсуждение и кажется участниками дискуссии наиболее актуальным, так как содержит в себе ряд проблем, которые нужно решить. Семантическая база создает смысловую целостность дискуссии и расставляет приоритеты обсуждаемых проблем в видении участников форума, поэтому не только для самих модераторов, но и для исследователей это умение является полезным. Стоит отметить, что в обоих форумах в дискуссии Тема 1 занимает больше высказываний, чем Тема 2. При этом обе дискуссии завершаются в рамках Темы 2.

В рамках каждой из Тем говорящие опираются на определенную модель распределения ответственности между участниками, включенными в структуру ценностного суждения-императива. Если Темы являются непререкаемой основой для формирования мнения (the just-so judgments), то модели распределения ответственности или *Идеологические модели* представляют собой идеал, основанный на тех или иных предпочтениях в сфере общественного устройства. Они существуют как суждения-долженствования (the should-be



judgments). В их модальности зафиксирована необходимость отстаивания модели-идеала при столкновении с альтернативными суждениями. Выделение Идеологических моделей – второй этап анализа текста форума. В ходе анализа нам удалось выделить в обоих форумах по 3 Идеала, которые, как будет показано, также совпадают по своей идеологической направленности. Сначала рассмотрим Идеалы в рамках Темы 1. Напомним, что Тема 1 – смыслообразующая или экзистенциальная, она является базой для Темы 2.

Рассмотрим и сравним маркеры Идеала 1.1 в рамках Темы 1 в обоих форумах.

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 1 (Джорджтаун, Делавэр): *something that should benefit us, you know, because of-of the **different cultures**, what they can bring to you; hard work - that's what a lot of the i-i-immigrants **bring**; I enjoy trying **different** types of food, meeting with **different** people, seeing how their -- you know, **their-their cultures** are; (this is the land of opportunity and) immigrants are taking advantage of that opportunity; they can be who they want to be, and I can be who I want to be; we're able **to understand** this culture, and this culture is able **to understand** ours; we **share** some values; if two people want **to communicate** no matter what the language is; **communication**, etc.*

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 2 (Сидар-Рапидс, штат Айова): *(we are essentially shutting the door on a whole population that could potentially become) **great contributors to our society**; **building** a national identity out of **multinational** sources; **it's been a good change**; **They've added, you know, a deep richness to this city**; **and they've added to this city tremendously**; **that's what America is**; **so many people who come into this country**; **these folks are actually coming to help**; **Because this is America, this country was built on the immigration policies, on the immigrants who came here, and its future lies with those immigrants**; **the whole sense of community**, etc.*

В ходе анализа было выявлено, что маркеры в обоих форумах указывают на одну и ту же Идеологическую модель. Для наглядности приводим таблицу:

#### Таблица № 2.

Форум № 1	Форум № 2
<p>1. <i>something that should benefit us, you know, because of-of the <b>different cultures, what they can bring to you</b>; hard work - that's what a lot of the i-i-immigrants <b>bring</b>; I enjoy trying <b>different</b> types of food, meeting with <b>different</b> people, seeing how their -- you know, <b>their-their cultures</b> are; (this is the land of opportunity and) immigrants are taking advantage of that opportunity</i></p>	<p><i>(we are essentially shutting the door on a whole population that could potentially become) <b>great contributors to our society; building</b> a national identity out of <b>multinational sources; it's been a good change; They've added, you know, a deep richness to this city; and they've added to this city tremendously; that's what America is; so many people who come into this country; these folks are actually coming to help; Because this is America, this country was built on the immigration policies, on the immigrants who came here, and its future lies with those immigrants</b></i></p>
<p>2. <i>they can be who they want to be, and I can be who I want to be; we're able to understand this culture, and this culture is able to understand ours; we <b>share</b> some values; if two people want <b>to communicate</b> no matter what the language is; <b>communication</b></i></p>	<p><i>the whole sense of <b>community</b></i></p>

Строчка 1 таблицы показывает, что в обоих форумах говорится о том, что иммигранты делают общество лучше, они приносят выгоду и «строят» американское общество (something that should benefit us, what they can bring to you/ great contributors to our society; they've added to this city tremendously). Также упоминается, что иммигранты принадлежат к совершенно разным культурам (different ... cultures/multinational sources), но именно на этом и строится национальная идентичность Америки (building a national identity out of multinational sources). Поэтому (строка 2) важно общение культур (to communicate no matter what the language is), чувство единства в обществе (the

whole sense of community) и взаимное понимание (we're able to understand this culture, and this culture is able to understand ours).

В Форуме 1 Идеал 1.1 охватывает 15 высказываний. Приведем номера высказываний: 19, 21, 31, 32, 39, 40, 41, 51, 52, 63, 64, 70, 83, 125, 226. В Форуме 2 Идеал 1.1 в рамках Темы 1 охватывает 25 высказываний, в них входят следующие номера высказываний: 28, 33, 35, 43, 44, 49, 51, 70, 72, 74, 88, 90, 94, 96, 120, 121, 123, 130, 131, 132, 140, 159, 161, 168, 169.

На основании выделенных маркеров можно сформулировать **Идеал 1.1 в рамках Темы 1:**

*All immigrants should be allowed to come, settle and enjoy the opportunities that America can offer them, because it is what makes America special in the world.*

Теперь рассмотрим маркеры Идеала 1.2 в обоих форумах.

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 1: *a survival need to assimilate; support system; challenge of new immigrants; help them assimilate; you know how difficult it is; it's our responsibility to assist; help people to understand; people can go and get assistance; situations that they may have been victims; they can be victimized by crime; landlords can be abusive; complain; these people subject themselves to great risk and great abuse (of-of just basic human dignity); oppressive government; discrimination and the prejudice; nobody should be hurt or damaged; parents feel intimidated; they're abused; they're taken advantage of; they're afraid, etc.*

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 2: *she's been left now kind of on her own; they are kind of stuck with what to do; lot of these people who need the help and need the social services; person is being persecuted on the basis of race, religion or politics or belonging to a certain social group; there was no real safety net; they can't do it on their own anymore; it also makes them more victims; the stark discrepancy between the haves and the havenots; I have ... greater empathy for... for... people whose living conditions are such that it simply drives them out of their own homes; (people) don't have the same kind of luxuries... that we have here in the United States; it's going to allow them to get away from dictatorships; (the system which is right now ridden by) human smuggling; they're afraid.*

После того, как мы сравнили маркеры в обоих форумах, было установлено, что в обоих форумах маркеры указывают на одну и ту же Идеологическую модель. Таблица № 3 демонстрирует это:

Таблица № 3.

Форум № 1	Форум № 2
1. <i>a survival need to assimilate; support system; challenge of new immigrants; help them assimilate; you know how difficult it is; it's our responsibility to assist; help people to understand; people can go and get assistance</i>	<i>she's been left now kind of on her own; they are kind of stuck with what to do; lot of these people who need the help and need the social services; there was no real safety net; they can't do it on their own anymore</i>
2. <i>situations that they may have been victims; they can be victimized by crime, landlords can be abusive; complain; these people subject themselves to great risk and great abuse (of- of just basic human dignity); oppressive government; discrimination and the prejudice; nobody should be hurt or damaged; parents feel intimidated; they're abused; they're taken advantage of; they're afraid</i>	<i>it also makes them more victims, the stark discrepancy between the haves and the havenots; I have ... greater empathy for... for... people whose living conditions are such that it simply drives them out of their own homes; person is being persecuted on the basis of race, religion or politics or belonging to a certain social group; (people) don't have the same kind of luxuries... that we have here in the United States; it's going to allow them to get away from dictatorships; (the system which is right now ridden by) human smuggling; they're afraid</i>

В обоих форумах встречаются похожие или идентичные маркеры. Например, маркеры 'help' и 'they're afraid' полностью совпадают, а маркеры 'victim' и 'victimized' имеют один и тот же корень. Маркеры в первой строке таблицы указывают на то, что жители Америки обеспокоены текущим положением иммигрантов - им трудно ассимилироваться (challenge, difficult, stuck with what to do), поэтому им необходима помощь и поддержка (support system, get assistance / safety net, people who need the help and need the social services). Маркеры во второй строке таблицы раскрывают тезис о том, что

иммигранты находятся в позиции жертвы (victims, they're abused, discrimination and the prejudice / don't have the same kind of luxuries, discrepancy between the haves and the havenots).

На основании того, что маркеры указывают на одну и ту же Идеологическую модель, можно сформулировать **Идеал 1.2 в рамках Темы 1:**

*Because of theme 1, recent immigrants fleeing economic hardship and persecution should be given special support in order to assimilate quickly and easily and become productive members of American communities.*

В Форуме № 1 Идеал 1.2 охватывает 31 высказывание. Номера высказываний следующие: 12, 53, 56, 60, 62, 84, 88, 91, 93, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 117, 119, 131, 132, 133, 136, 212, 214, 220. В Форуме № 2 Идеал 1.2 во втором форуме охватывает 17 высказываний: 29, 30, 31, 32, 37, 42, 45, 47, 64, 65, 69, 115, 116, 118, 119, 129, 133.

Приведем примеры маркеров Идеала 1.3 в обоих форумах.

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 1: ***I feel there needs to be, uh, control; we cannot take on everybody's problem; a big burden; immigrants that you cannot handle; allowing them to come in any kind of way without being taught; we lose our heritage; losing our identity too much; to warn the local communities; they are untaught, etc.***

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 2: ***We can't allow everyone from every country who wants to be here to be here; we need to limit immigration; they don't have a right to come here, and we can't handle it; we have to have some constraints on how many people come here; to me, we can't just endlessly meet everyone's needs, (what we are really getting to is whether we can reconcile) conflicts between our national heritage in relation to immigration; there is too much immigration. too much difference; (admit fewer immigrants in the interest of continuing) to develop and preserve a national identity; the frustration of the majority of people; they (immigrants) are displacing people, etc.***

Маркеры ‘we can’t handle’ и ‘identity’ совпадают в обоих формах. Остальные маркеры мы разделили на смысловые группы для того, чтобы показать, что они имеют один и тот же смысл (см. Таблицу № 4).

Таблица № 4.

Форум № 1	Форум № 2
<i>I feel there needs to be, uh, control; we cannot take on everybody's problem; a big burden; immigrants that you cannot handle; allowing them to come in any kind of way without being taught</i>	<i>We can't allow everyone from every country who wants to be here to be here; we need to limit immigration; they don't have a right to come here, and we can't handle it; we have to have some constraints on how many people come here; to me, we can't just endlessly meet everyone's needs</i>
<i>we lose our heritage; losing our identity too much</i>	<i>(what we are really getting to is whether we can reconcile) conflicts between our national heritage in relation to immigration; there is too much immigration. too much difference; (admit fewer immigrants in the interest of continuing) to develop and preserve a national identity</i>
<i>to warn the local communities; they are untaught</i>	<i>the frustration of the majority of people; they (immigrants) are displacing people</i>

В обоих случаях, считается, что традиции и американское наследие находится под угрозой из-за большого потока иммигрантов (*immigrants that you cannot handle; we lose our heritage; losing our identity too much/ there is too much immigration. too much difference; conflicts between our national heritage in relation to immigration, preserve a national identity*), поэтому участники обоих форумов, придерживающихся Идеала 1.3, считают, что необходим контроль иммиграции (*I feel there needs to be, uh, control/ we need to limit immigration*).

На основании анализа маркеров можно сделать вывод, что они выражают одну и ту же Идеологическую модель, которую можно сформулировать следующим образом:

Тема 1. Идеал 1.3:

*Immigration should be controlled, as it can put great American traditions and achievements under threat, which American citizen should protect from Alien influences.*

В Форуме № 1 Идеал 1.3 охватывает 15 высказываний. Перечислим номера высказываний в рамках Идеала 1.3: 4, 5, 8, 13, 18, 66, 89, 112, 113, 116, 211, 215, 217, 228, 231. В Форуме № 2 Идеал 1.3 в рамках Темы 1 охватывает 26 высказываний. В это число входят следующие высказывания: 20, 33, 34, 41, 52, 63, 68, 73, 77, 89, 103, 107, 114, 122, 124, 128, 134, 141, 146, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 170, 175.

Теперь перейдем к рассмотрению Идеалов в рамках Темы 2. Напомним, что Тема 2 – организационная или экономическая по сравнению с Темой 1. В ходе анализа было установлено, что, как и в Теме 1, в рамках Темы 2 в обоих форумах можно выделить 3 Идеала – 2.1, 2.2, 2.3. Рассмотрим типичные маркеры Идеала 2.1 в рамках Темы 2 в обоих форумах.

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 1 (Джорджтаун, штат Делавэр): *the immigrants can actually help the United States as a nation; they bring in people to work at the jobs that supposedly others won't, won't take; it does have a benefit to us here; The most benefit for the least cost; And I think the U.S. benefits from that economically; They (immigrants) want to do the things that we Americans won't do or can't do, etc.*

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 2 (Сидар-Рапидс, штат Айова): *these folks are actually coming to help with the economic model; if you didn't have these people coming in to do some of this work, a lot of these places would be really in a world of hurt; immigrants tend to allocate to those areas where there is little competition, where actually workers are needed; you've got a symbiotic relationship here, etc.*

В обоих форумах среди маркеров Идеала 2.1 не было найдено значительных отличий. В обоих случаях, как считают участники форума,

иммиграция помогает экономике США (*'the immigrants can actually help the United States as a nation'; 'I think the U.S. benefits from that economically'/' these folks are actually coming to help with the economic model'*), и иммигранты обычно занимают такие рабочие места, на которых коренные жители Америки не стали бы работать (*'They want to do the things that we Americans won't do or can't do' / 'immigrants tend to allocate to those areas where there is little competition, where actually workers are needed'*).

Поскольку маркеры совпадают, можно сформулировать общий для форумов **Идеал 2.1 в рамках Темы 2:**

*Immigration should be encouraged because it allows low-paying jobs to be filled and the economy remain competitive and profitable.*

В Форуме № 1 Идеал 2.1 охватывает 24 высказывания. Приведем номера высказываний: 109, 139, 153, 158, 162, 163, 164, 167, 168, 175, 173, 183, 184, 186, 187, 189, 191, 193, 196, 200, 202, 206, 208, 211. В Форуме № 2 Идеал 2.1 охватывает 8 высказываний: 26, 35, 78, 79, 113, 133, 139, 173.

Перейдем к описанию Идеала 2.2 в обоих форумах.

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 1: ***substandard property** (for immigrants) can be rented and profits made off of it; Isn't that sad, though, that we want to bring in immigrants so we can **pay them less** to compete?; it just seems really sad to even suggest that we need to have more immigrants so **they'll take the lower wages**, etc.*

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 2: ***it's not a livable wage anymore**; (when workers are there, they are) **not protected**; **they really need help** to work through there; **to help prepare** them to be a part of society and **help make** their own contribution (to our greater society's growth); (there is so many situations that we see that are) so **inhumane**, etc.*

Косвенно связаны маркеры 'they'll take the lower wages' и 'it's not a livable wage anymore', поскольку в обоих случаях речь идет о низких зарплатах, которые получают иммигранты. Иммигранты представлены в позиции жертвы, и маркеры раскрывают эту идею разными словами, поэтому можно говорить об одной Идеологической модели 2.2 в обоих форумах. В первом форуме Идеал 2.2



утверждает, что иммигрантов эксплуатируют (*'substandard property can be rented and profits made off of it; Isn't that sad, though, that we want to bring in immigrants so we can pay them less to compete'*), а во втором форуме Идеал 2.2 утверждает, что иммигрантам сложно найти работу в США, поэтому они прибегают к крайним мерам, что негуманно (*'there is so many situations that we see that are so inhumane'*), поэтому иммигрантам нужно помочь найти работу (*'they are not protected'*; *'they really need help to work through there'*).

Таким образом, Идеал 2.2 в рамках Темы 2 в обоих форумах можно сформулировать так:

*Special measures should be taken to help recent immigrants find a position on the job market that would be fair and humane.*

В Форуме № 1 Идеал 2.2 охватывает 8 высказываний. Номера высказываний следующие: 138, 140, 142, 144, 146, 148, 176, 178. В Форуме № 2 Идеал 2.2 в рамках Темы 2 охватывает 7 высказываний: 62, 81, 101, 125, 148, 152, 156.

Идеал 2.3 в обоих форумах также выражен похожими маркерами, выражающими одну и ту же позицию. Чтобы доказать это, рассмотрим типичные маркеры Идеала 2.3 в обоих форумах.

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 1: *Citizen's wages can't go up, because immigrants -- they work for less; Competition from immigrants keeps wages down and even takes away from Americans; I don't know how much financially, uh, the federal government can-can withstand, uh, in continuing to have a-a totally open border; Georgetown has not the infrastructure to really accommodate the number of, uh, immigrants; this country will be bombarded and the infrastructures will never, ever, ever be able to hold up; it was harder for the black population to have a business in Georgetown; when the Hispanics came in they was given more of an easier hand; they are supposed to get a certain wage because they will ask and you will eventually have to pay them top dollars; I agree that we ought to make, uh, it a little more restrictive for people to cross our borders.*

Типичные маркеры в Форуме № 2: *I think that we're missing the boat when we're not teaching people who come here. Maybe, **we don't have enough resources right now...** to teach them; **Polish who seem to have displaced us; there was a strain on the system, because we were admitting too many immigrants;** they (immigrants) no longer have to pay any taxes; they (immigrants) are not having to be held accountable; **there's limits to what this country can absorb;** there are **financial constraints, we have constraints socially;** those areas have been overwhelmed with immigrants that they can't handle; **this country does have limits to what we can afford.** There is not, we are not unlimited, we cannot just allow anybody in the world to, to, to... come here, because they are in need... It would be nice if we could, but... that is unrealistic; **when you have extra supply, it does force wages down.** And it does hurt people who are already here; **when we bring someone else in to do the job, then we are displacing people who have been here for many many years before;** there is not enough jobs to go around; there is a lot of costs associated; sending all of their wages that they can out of our economy back into another economy, etc.*

Маркеры, выделенные жирным шрифтом, показывают, что в обоих форумах мы имеем дело с одной и той же Идеологической моделью. Во-первых, в обоих дискуссиях упоминается то, что из-за иммигрантов снижается уровень зарплаты и они буквально отнимают работу и граждан Америки (*Citizen's wages can't go up, because immigrants -- they work for less; Competition from immigrants keeps wages down and even takes away from Americans/ Polish who seem to have displaced us; when you have extra supply, it does force wages down; when we bring someone else in to do the job, then we are displacing people who have been here for many many years before*). Во-вторых, участники форума, придерживающиеся Идеала 2.3 считают, что экономическая система и инфраструктуры могут не выдержать такого большого потока иммигрантов (*I don't know how much financially, uh, the federal government can-can withstand; this country will be bombarded and the infrastructures will never, ever, ever be able to hold up/ there was a strain on the system, because we were admitting too many immigrants; there's limits to what this country can absorb*), поэтому необходимо ограничить иммиграцию.

На основании маркеров, можно сформулировать **Идеал 2.3 в рамках Темы 2**, общий для обоих форумов:

*Immigration should be controlled as immigrants pose a threat to the sustainability of American economy and infrastructure by taking the American jobs away and keeping the wages down.*

В Форуме № 1 Идеал 2.3 охватывает 10 высказываний. Перечислим номера высказываний на основе Идеала 2.3: 23, 115, 128, 130, 134, 161, 181, 194, 230, 233. А в Форуме № 2 Идеал 2.3 охватывает 22 высказывания, а именно высказывания под номерами: 23, 25, 36, 52, 54, 72, 80, 82, 84, 86, 89, 100, 110, 126, 127, 136, 138, 142, 144, 147.

Эти идеологические маркеры были выделены на основе анализа текста (транскриптов) форума. Идеологические маркеры наблюдались нами в речи участников форума. Они помогают сформулировать Идеологические модели (идеалы, frame situations), которые являются исследовательскими реконструкциями. Идеологические маркеры были взяты из текста форумов. Обратимся к двум примерам, которые покажут, как Идеологические модели реализуются в речи участников. Здесь и далее во всех примерах маркеры соответствующей Темы (1 или 2) мы выделяем полужирным шрифтом с указанием соответствующей Темы в скобках. Мы будем приводить примеры по каждому Идеалу сначала из форума в Джорджтауне (Форум № 1), а затем будем сравнивать с примером из форума в Сидар-Рэпидсе (Форум № 2).

В первом примере мы можем увидеть маркеры Идеологической модели (Идеала) 1.3 Форума № 1:

(1) 5. Ella. ***I feel there needs to be, uh, control (И 1.3),*** that there needs to be some documentation. And yes, ***we welcome all immigrants (Т1).*** And I have no problem with them, except that I think the town, like you said -- ***you cannot take everybody's problems (И 1.3).*** There's a lot of people in third-world countries that ***need help (Т1).*** ***They're persecuted (Т1).*** But ***we cannot take on everybody's problem (И 1.3).*** <...> Are you going to just run the town over with ***immigrants that you cannot handle (И 1.3),*** or are you going to devise a plan that will get these people here? If you're going to bring them here, have something to teach them,

how to live within your society. But don't, uh, get rid of the American way. I think America needs a basic plan. And we change our infrastructure, our values, to suit every immigrant that come here (И 1.3). We lose our heritage (И 1.3). So I feel that we need to stick to a basic plan. When they come, they can still have their cultures or whatever their ideals are (Т 1), but they still should be, uh, taught to assimilate within the American culture (Т 1), too.

В этом примере мы явно можем увидеть, как Тема является основой для развития Идеала. Участница дискуссии полностью принимает традиции толерантности и открытости: ‘And yes, we welcome all immigrants. And I have no problem with them’; и в то же время она отстаивает позицию, согласно которой иммигранты представляются угрозой: ‘we change our infrastructure, our values, to suit every immigrant that come here. We lose our heritage’. При этом Тема и Идеал не конфликтуют, а дополняют друг друга. Участница ничего не имеет против иммиграции, однако считает, что её необходимо контролировать (‘I feel there needs to be, uh, control’, ‘I think America needs a basic plan’).

А теперь приведем пример Идеала 1.3 из **Форума № 2**:

(2) 34. Karen. Yes, I think there are some identifications with that. Even ... as a teacher looking at the school calendar and the school year, holidays that we used to celebrate are either no longer celebrated or their name has changed, we don't have Christmas break anymore, we have winter break, um, in light of the fact that there are not just all Christians (И 1.3). This was founded as a Christian, Judeo-Christian country (Т 1), and many of the immigrants ARE of that belief, but some of them are not... So, instead of going by still by the majority, we cater to the minorities (И 1.3). I am not saying that we shouldn't be concerned about the minorities (Т 1), but there seems to be more of a catering to the minorities and more of a, of an acceptance to allow them to tell us what things, what traditions we can throw out and what traditions (Т 1) they want to see maintained (И 1.3). It hardly seems fair to have it that way. So, it's kind of like the upper cart's been upset, and some people are very disturbed by that; for example, Easter isn't called Easter break anymore, either that's spring break and... many of the other very important Christian holidays that have been observed are more or less tubed. Before immigration became a real major issue, we've had enough atheists and the agnostics in this country to to undermine some of the Christian beliefs and the Christian holidays (Т 1) anyway, but then you add to it

*other religious beliefs and it makes it even more troublesome, it becomes almost a Pandora's box (И 1.3).* How do we deal with this?

Как и в примере 1, участница в примере 3 видит в иммигрантах угрозу Американским традициям (*'holidays that we used to celebrate are either no longer celebrated or their name has changed'*; *'what traditions we can throw out and what traditions they want to see maintained'*), так как праздники иммигрантов вытесняют американские праздники, что подтверждает принадлежность данного высказывания к Идеалу 1.3. Участница строит свои рассуждения в рамках Темы 1, поскольку она говорит о традиционных праздниках в США, а также религиозных меньшинствах, мнение которых нужно учитывать (*'I am not saying that we shouldn't be concerned about the minorities'*), но не ставить его выше мнения большинства (граждан Америки).

В примере 3 из **Форума № 1** другой участник утверждает Идеал 1.1:

(3) 15. Marissa. <...> Why do they come here? Um, in my particular case, uh, my father came here about 15 years ago. <...> Uh, the economic situation didn't allow him to continue with his business, and he was looking for <...> other, uh, ways of bringing food to his family. Um, at the time <...> everybody knew that **if you need money, if you, uh, want to find a job, the place is the United States of America (T 1).** Uh, he found a way to arrive to the United States. <...> Um, 15 years later, we were able to, uh, join him here in the United States. <...> he-he lived in other states and other cities. And Georgetown in particular, uh -- he said, "<...> Um, **everybody, you know, um, welcome, uh, immigrants (T 1).** Uh, there is, uh, jobs available. Um, and I think you will **have the opportunity (T 1)** here to, um, go to school and **be part of the society (И 1.1).**" Uh, today, I am a **United States citizen (T 1).** <...> Uh, without a doubt, um, at the beginning, there were different situations where we thought, you know, this is discrimination. Uh, we are not, you know, being treated as we should as human beings. But really, now I realize what was happening was there was lack of **communication (И 1.1).** We were not **understanding (И 1.1)** each other. Once **we were able to communicate with people (И 1.1),** it has been completely different. We understand each other. **We're able to understand this culture, and this culture is able to understand ours (И 1.1).** I think, uh, the solution is not going to be, well, this is the language here, and you can only speak this language. This is the values -- uh, **these are the values and the culture (T 1)** here, and this is the only way. **I think, as everybody mentioned,**

everybody has a different background. But we all come to-to a center point (И 1.1). Uh, we share, uh, a language, which is English in this country. We share some values (И 1.1). But at the same time, we still maintain our, uh, original identity (И 1.1). Um, and people oftentimes ask me, "Why do you still say my country, Guatemala, if you now live in the United States, and you're now, uh, a United States ci-United States citizen?" And gee, I feel very lucky, because I have two countries (И 1.1) <...>..

Участница утверждает Идеал 1.1: она считает, что иммигранты имеют много общего с гражданами Америки ('*We're able to understand this culture, and this culture is able to understand ours*') и могут быть частью американского общества ('*I think you will have the opportunity here to, um, go to school and be part of the society*'), сохранив свою культурную идентичность ('*We share some values. But at the same time, we still maintain our, uh, original identity*').

Теперь обратимся к примеру высказывания, утверждающему Идеал 1.1 в **Форуме № 2:**

(4) 51. Kathy. <...> I think another point to make is, you know, the United States, you know, has a policy of all people are created equal (T 1), and is it really fair to exclude people who are either low-skilled or no-skilled workers for the advantage of having highly-skilled workers (И 1.1)... I think this goes against what this country was founded on which is to give everybody an equal opportunity to contribute to our society (T 1), and at this point by adopting the format of "we only want high-skilled, highly educated people" and that's already ingrained in the immigration system at this point anyway, but if we keep enforcing that, we are essentially shutting the door on a whole population that could potentially become great contributors to our society (T 1) (И 1.1).

В этом высказывании участница говорит о равных возможностях, которые должны быть предоставлены не только гражданам Америки, но и иммигрантам (высококвалифицированным или без квалификации): '*we are essentially shutting the door on a whole population that could potentially become great contributors to our society*'. И утверждает свой Идеал в рамках Темы 1, поскольку говорится о том, что все созданы равными, чтобы вносить вклад в американское общество ('*the United States, you know, has a policy of all people are created equal; to give everybody an equal opportunity to contribute to our society*').

Наряду с Идеалами 1.1 и 1.3 в обоих форумах можно выделить Идеал 1.2. Ярким примером Идеала 1.2 в **Форуме № 1** является следующее высказывание:

(5) 84. Mike. <...> *can we really keep our borders from being permeable? People can cross our borders virtually at will. So the stricter we are, the more -- in-in-in one sense, the more undocumented -- or some people call them illegal aliens -- **people who are seeking work, they're seeking opportunity (T 1)**, they're seeking whatever it is they're s-just to be with family, whatever it is in this-in this country. <...> And then-then people who come into the country, um, undocumented, illegal -- um, you have this whole array of justice issues that come out of that. Uh, if they're, um -- if-if -- in-in-in areas like housing, uh, the landlord can be, uh -- **can be abusive (И 1.2)**, **can not keep the property up (И 1.2)**. Uh, and **who are they to complain to (И 1.2)**? If they complain to authorities, what happens? Uh, **they can be victimized (И 1.2)** by crime. <...> Uh, they can, uh -- uh, **they-they-they don't get the medical treatment that they need (И 1.2)**. If they go into a hospital and-and they don't have the -- uh, the insurance cards, they don't have the proper identification, what happens? **They're put into some-into some jail (И 1.2)** somewhere and then **sent back (И 1.2)** to-to wherever they came from. And consequently, uh, **these people subject themselves to great risk and great abuse of-of just basic human dignity (И 1.2)**, uh, by taking the risk to come to this country, uh, undocumented. And so the tighter we make this, the harder we make it bureaucratically for people -- for these folks to come in, uh, the more people we have who face this justice dilemma. Uh –*

В понимании людей, которые придерживаются Идеала 1.2, иммигранты представлены в позиции жертвы. Например, в приведенном высказывании говорится о том, что иммигранты страдают, когда попадают в страну, потому что многие приезжают нелегально (*they can be victimized by crime; they-they-they don't get the medical treatment that they need; they're put into some-into some jail; these people subject themselves to great risk and great abuse of-of just basic human dignity*).

В **Форуме № 2** также есть высказывания, принадлежащие Идеалу 1.2. Одно из них изложено в примере 9:

(6) 29. Jerry. *Jim, my younger daughter has been living and married in Merida, Mexico, and has been there now for almost ten years. So, **we've had lots of opportunities (T 1)** to travel to Mexico and initially I was nervous being in a strange ... and felt awkward because of the*

language and have gradually overcome the awkwardness of language, but what our experience's allowed us to do is to observe first-hand the stark discrepancy between the haves and the havenots (И 1.2) in many, many... in all parts I would guess – but the parts that we've been in Mexico, and easy to see why people of sparse means would economically seek to improve themselves by moving (Т 1). So, I have ... greater empathy for... for... people whose living conditions are such that it simply drives them out of their own homes (И 1.2).

Участник утверждает Идеал 1.2, так как сочувствует тяжелому положению иммигрантов, а также у него вызывает отрицательные эмоции то, в каких условиях живут граждане других стран, которые потом становятся иммигрантами, в отличие от граждан Америки ('I have ... greater empathy for... for... people whose living conditions are such that it simply drives them out of their own homes'). Высказывание находится в рамках Темы 1, так как участник упоминает о том, что Америка – страна возможностей, и люди стремятся туда для того, чтобы сделать их жизнь лучше.

Во всех высказываниях есть маркеры Темы 1: *we welcome all immigrants; countries that need help; they're persecuted; they can still have their cultures or whatever their ideals are; American culture; this notion of a nation of tolerance; American values; if you need money, if you, uh, want to find a job, the place is the United States of America; everybody, you know, um, welcome, uh, immigrants; have the opportunity; United States citizen; these are the values and the culture; we're a-a land of opportunity, uh, and free choice; so they come here freely to do s-work; people who are seeking work, they're seeking opportunity; citizens of this community; citizens of this country.* То есть во всех высказываниях подчеркивается важность Американских ценностей и традиций, а именно говорится о том, что Америка – толерантная страна и страна возможностей и свободного выбора, которая открыта для иммигрантов. Эта презумпция и есть Тема 1. Основываясь на одной Теме, участники представляют разные Идеалы распределения ответственности, которые противоречат друг другу, но не Теме как таковой. Идеалы модально маркированы (should-be judgements), тем самым участники



представляют свои модели желаемого. Маркерами модальности являются как соответствующие глаголы (need, got to, should, cannot, to be able to, ought to).

В высказываниях, принадлежащих Теме 2 тоже представлены 3 Идеологические модели в обоих форумах. Напомним, что Тема 2 является организационной (экономической), в то время как Тема 1 – смыслообразующей. В рамках организационной темы обсуждаются экономические вопросы реализации ценностей. Рассмотрим несколько примеров каждого Идеала Темы 2 в обоих форумах.

В примере 7 показано то, как Идеал 2.1 выражается в тексте высказывания (Форум № 1):

*(7) 139. Jack. This can be so -- point three can be basically insignificant **financially (T 2)**. Uh, **this wave of export of jobs (T 2), the immigrants can actually help the United States as a nation (И 2.1)** in the future because at the rate we're sending **work (T2)** away and you know where, China, uh, around the globe, uh, we're going to have to look to **these people and hope they come here just to be able to compete with (И 2.1)** – you know, a third of the people in India are **making** less than a **buck(T 2)** a day. So, uh, **let's hope we have lots of immigrants come here that will work for less than \$25.00 an hour if we want to save this nation as we know it (И 2.1)**.*

Маркеры ‘financially’, ‘work’, ‘wave of ... jobs’ и ‘making ... buck’ представляют Тему 2, поскольку речь идет об экономической ситуации (о рабочих местах, зарплатах). Участник придерживается Идеологической модели, согласно которой иммигранты приезжают для того, чтобы работать на низкооплачиваемых работах, и это помогает американской нации: ‘*the immigrants can actually help the United States as a nation*’, ‘*let's hope we have lots of immigrants come here that will work for less than \$25.00 an hour*’.

В Форуме 2 маркеры Идеала 2.1 на основе Темы 2 можно выделить в примере 8:

*(8) 26. Matt. I feel I have a personal stake on this issue, because I am an immigrant myself, I am a new Iowan, originally from Peru, but I've been living in Iowa for about ten years now, and really love this state, I feel very much a part of that, and I am very concerned about **Iowa's long-term sustainability and social and economic health (T 2)**, and one of the most pressing*

problems that I see is that there is such a lack of younger workers (T 2), younger people who leave the state and am very concerned at the same time that given our aging workforce (T 2), we are gonna have huge, very concrete, very factual workforce needs (T 2), and I with my own work try to promote a welcoming atmosphere in communities (И 2.1), so that we are able to effectively integrate workers (И 2.1) and have the benefit maximize as well as reducing any costs (T 2) that are involved, and that's something that really drives the work that I do, and then on a more personal level, really what I find most important is that I see that really immigrants embody those Iowa values of hard work and faith and family, and so the values that I share also why it feels so like home here and that is something that we can really nurture and we can become a really welcoming state (И 2.1).

Тему 2 в этом высказывании можно выявить через словосочетания 'Iowa's long-term sustainability and social and economic health', 'younger workers', 'workforce needs' – они указывают на то, что речь идет об экономике страны ('welcoming atmosphere in communities'; 'we are able to effectively integrate workers and have the benefit maximize as well as reducing any costs'). В рамках Темы 2 Идеал 2.1 проявляется в том, что участник говорит об эффективной интеграции иммигрантов в экономику страны, о выгодах, которые это может принести. Также в его понимании иммигранты воплощают в себе такие ценности американского общества, как трудолюбие и вера, поэтому важно поддерживать иммиграцию ('I see that really immigrants embody those Iowa values of hard work and faith and family, and so the values that I share...').

Теперь обратимся к примеру 9, чтобы продемонстрировать то, как Идеал 2.3 выражается в тексте **Форума № 1**.

(9) 115. Michael. To go back to your question before, you know, I think it was, and correct me if I'm wrong, uh, it's just that is it just [porous] and just allow people in (T 2)? Do we restrict it (И 2.3)? Government has to restrict it (И 2.3). Uh, we can't -- if you, if you look at population growths over the next 50 years, uh, this country will be bombarded (И 2.3) and the infrastructures (T 2) will never, ever, ever be able to hold up (И 2.3). It's going to be up to the government to somehow limit (2.3), uh, and in a very -- you know, there's still plenty of room here (T 2). But to say that anybody that wants to come can come (T 2), in my opinion, uh, is a sign of disaster for this country (И 2.3). Uh, immigrants have, have contributed very much to

*this rich nation (T 2) in many different ways, but to simply say, "Everybody is welcome (T 2)." uh, I don't think that, that the infrastructure will be able to, you know -- we're looking at some serious, serious problems down the road (И 2.3).*

Участник не ставит под сомнение, что американская инфраструктура является надежной (*'there's still plenty of room here'*) и способна снабжать людей работой (*'immigrants have, have contributed very much to this rich nation', 'everybody is welcome'*), однако, он считает, что поток иммигрантов является угрозой для существующей сильной экономики страны (*'country will be bombarded and the infrastructures will never, ever, ever be able to hold up'*).

В тексте **Форума № 2** также мы выделили высказывания, которые утверждают Идеал 2.3, среди таких примеров следующее высказывание:

(10) 25. Karen. <...> I guess he said *there are too many Irishmen in the US (И 2.3).* We were chuckling about that... But they do already speak the English language which makes it an easier hurdle for them to overcome. He said I have no problem that I live in New York, he said, I have no problem with *the Polish who seem to have displaced us (И 2.3)* as the immigrants of choice, certainly there is more Polish coming into this country, but he said they are *excellent carpenters, have excellent carpenter skills (T 2),* he said, whereas the Irish used to carry through with carpentry *work (T 2),* building, now, he said, the Irish, a lot of them, are purchasing or have purchased buildings, for example, he himself is a bar tender and he would like some time purchase a building himself and, you know, ... *a business (T 2)* himself. And he said the Polish are now at this point where there are learning the skills of the *trade (T 2),* doing excellent, excellent *work (T 2)* and he has no problem with that himself. But THAT's where I see it, we lower some numbers of some people, raise the numbers of other people, but *are we keeping it on an equal basis, are we able to have the resources to make sure that we get these people assimilated into our system (И 2.3).*

В этом высказывании речь идет об экономике США, такие слова и словосочетания, как 'work', 'business' 'trade' 'carpenter skills' доказывают это. Идеал 2.3 маркирован следующими частями высказывания: *'the Polish who seem to have displaced us'*; *'there are too many Irishmen in the US'*; *'are we keeping it on an equal basis, are we able to have the resources to make sure that we get these*

*people assimilated into our system'* – участница форума обеспокоена тем, что принцип равенства не всегда работает при распределении рабочих мест; иммигранты доминируют в некоторых отраслях и вытесняют граждан Америки.

В рамках Темы 2 также существует ещё один Идеал. В **Форуме № 1** в примерах 11 и 12 продемонстрирован Идеал 2.2:

(11) 140. Sylvia. *Isn't that sad (И 2.2), though, that we want to bring in immigrants so **we can pay them less to compete?***

(12) 148. Sylvia. *And maybe do some restrictions on that. I don't, I don't know, but **it just seems really sad to even suggest that we need to have more immigrants so they'll take the lower wages (И 2.2).** There should be some kind of system in place so that **they don't get paid less than an average American would get paid (И 2.2).***

В этих высказываниях говорится о заработной плате иммигрантов в сравнении с гражданами Америки, поэтому это высказывание относится к Теме 2 ('wages', 'get paid'). Участница форума утверждает Идеологическую модель 2.2: по её мнению, иммигранты получают зарплату, которая по сумме меньше, чем зарплата коренных жителей Америки, и она считает это неправильным, потому что это ставит иммигрантов в невыгодное положение, то есть в позицию жертвы (*'it just seems really sad to even suggest that we need to have more immigrants so they'll take the lower wages'*).

В **Форуме № 2** мы также встречаем маркеры Идеала 2.2. Рассмотрим пример 13.

(13) 81. Christine. *There is something ... I wanna say, too, though, about those jobs as... at one time those jobs were **higher paid jobs (T 2),** and then **the wage floor (T 2)** has reduced such that it's not **... it's not a livable wage(T 2) anymore (И 2.2).** Also, I think there are fewer union protections, so **when workers are there, they are not protected (И 2.2),** and so... ah...eh... there is **an economic situation (T 2)** that's so complicated eh, to me, I, I think... eh... oh, I've lost my train of thought...*

В этом высказывании участница говорит о том, что когда иммигранты приезжают работать, то их права не защищены, они находятся в невыгодном

положении, потому что зарплаты настолько низкие, что сложно на них прожить. Участница формирует свое мнение в рамках Темы 2, так как говорит о рабочих местах; мы относим это высказывание к Идеалу 2.2, так как иммигранты нуждаются в помощи, по мнению участницы форума, а, значит, уязвимы.

Во всех высказываниях мы видим маркеры Темы 2: *wages; get paid; cheap labor; companies; pay them; to get certain wage; there's still plenty of room here; immigrants have contributed very much to this rich nation; everybody is welcome; economic cost; financially; work; wave of ... jobs; making ... buck*. Все участники рассуждают в рамках Темы 2, так как они считают прописной истиной то, что процветание Америки обусловлено стабильной свободной экономикой. При такой экономике всегда существуют рабочие места, граждане могут получать зарплаты и платить налоги, чтобы поддерживать инфраструктуру. Однако, участники имеют разное представление, как общество должно быть устроено, и каким образом должны выстраиваться отношения между иммигрантами и коренными жителями Америки. Наличие Идеологических моделей помогают выявить модальные глаголы (have to, can/can't, to be able to, need).

Таким образом, мы рассмотрели 3 Идеала в каждой из Тем в обоих форумах и продемонстрировали, как они маркируются в тексте форума.

### 2.2.2 Сценарии и их виды.

Как показывают примеры, высказывание содержит в себе не только маркеры Тематической базы или Идеологической модели. Высказывания состоят в основном из описания *Сценариев*. В сценариях показаны причины, которые, как считает говорящий, мешают реализации Идеала, который ему близок. Это третий уровень анализа смысловой структуры текста дискуссии. О наличии Сценария можно говорить тогда, когда происходит конфликт ценностей (Value conflict) – Идеал нарушен, поскольку существуют обстоятельства, которое к этому привели или социальные агенты (государство, общество, правительство), которые «виновны» в том, что Идеал не реализован. Поэтому в

структуре Сценария всегда присутствует проблема, ценностный конфликт, который побуждает к дискуссии.

Дискуссия происходит на уровне Сценариев – именно здесь ценности и Идеалы участников форума сталкиваются. Сценарии основаны на Идеологических моделях, то есть, рассказывая о какой-то ситуации и сложившейся проблеме, участник форума опирается на свои ценности, которые выражаются в тексте в виде Идеологических моделей. Предполагается, что проблема требует решения, поэтому к структуре Сценария можно добавить следствие, предполагаемый выход из ситуации (outcome). Сценарии, которые содержат и проблему, и следствие, мы будем называть *Развернутыми сценариями* (Extended scenarios). Приведем примеры Развернутых сценариев на основе разных Идеалов (Тема 1: И 1.1, И 1.2, И 1.3, Тема 2: И 2.1, И 2.2, И 3.3) в обоих форумах.

В следующем примере можно увидеть Развернутый сценарий, сформулированный на основе Идеала 1.1 в рамках Темы 1 в **Форуме № 1**:

(14) 15. Marissa. <...>there is a lot of people that oftentimes ask that question. Why do they come here? Um, in my particular case, uh, my father came here about 15 years ago. Uh, he had a business in-in our country, in Guatemala. Uh, the economic situation didn't allow him to continue with his business, and he was looking for alternatives, other-other, uh, ways of bringing food to his family. Um, at the time, you know, um, everybody knew that **if you need money, if you, uh, want to find a job, the place is the United States of America (T 1)**. Uh, he found a way to arrive to the United States. And, um, he left his family back home. He sent us money. Uh, we were able to complete, you know, um, high school. And, uh, he was able to apply for, um, his permanent residency. Um, 15 years later, we were able to, uh, join him here in the United States. Uh, one of the reasons why he wanted to bring us to Georgetown specifically -- he was -- he-he lived in other states and other cities. And Georgetown in particular, uh -- he said, "There-there is a community here. It's a small town. Um, **everybody, you know, um, welcome, uh, immigrants (T 1)**. Uh, **there is, uh, jobs available (T 1)**. Um, and I think you will **have the opportunity here (T 1)** to, um, go to school and **be part of the society (И 1.1)**." Uh, today, I am a United States citizen. And **I realize that language was the-the-the key to integrate into this society (Outcome)**. Uh, **without a doubt, um, at the beginning, there were different situations where we thought, you**

*know, this is discrimination (Problem). Uh, we are not, you know, being treated as we should as human beings (Problem). But really, now I realize what was happening was there was lack of communication (И 1.1). We were not understanding each other (Problem). Once we were able to communicate with people (И 1.1), it has been completely different. We understand each other. We're able to understand this culture, and this culture is able to understand ours (И 1.1) (Outcome) . I think, uh, the solution is not going to be, well, this is the language here, and you can only speak this language (Outcome). This is the values -- uh, these are the values and the culture here, and this is the only way. I think, as everybody mentioned, everybody has a different background. But we all come to-to a center point (И 1.1). Uh, we share, uh, a language, which is English in this country. We share some values (И 1.1). But at the same time, we still maintain our, uh, original identity (И 1.1). Um, and people oftentimes ask me, "Why do you still say my country, Guatemala, if you now live in the United States, and you're now, uh, a United States ci-United States citizen?" And gee, I feel very lucky, because I have two countries (И 1.1). I am still a Guatemalan, but I am still - I am also a United States citizen. Um, but my-my point is that language definitely opened a door for, uh, my brothers and myself to-to be part and engage in this society.*

В подчеркнутой части высказывания выделена проблема и её возможное решение. Проблема заключается в том, что общество не принимает недавно прибывших иммигрантов и им трудно ассимилироваться, потому что они не говорят по-английски ('we thought, you know, this is discrimination', 'we are not <...> being treated as we should as human beings'). Происходит ценностный конфликт, и он сформулирован в проблеме – хотя общество Америки должно быть открытым и толерантным, тем не менее, к иммигрантам относятся не как к равным, потому что они не знают язык. И участница предлагает возможное решение этой проблемы – иммигранты должны приложить усилия к изучению английского языка ('Once we were able to communicate with people, it has been completely different. We understand each other').

В Форуме № 2 Развернутый сценарий на основе Идеала 1.1 можно выделить в следующем высказывании:

(15) 51. Kathy. It's a work visa... eh, H1B is specifically designed for people that are qualified for what they call a speciality occupation, you have to have at least a Bachelor's

*degree to qualify for that type of visa, but I think another point to make is, you know, the United States, you know, has a **policy of all people are created equal (T 1)**, and is it really fair to exclude people who are either low-skilled or no-skilled workers for the advantage of having highly-skilled workers (Problem)... I think this goes against what this country was founded on which is **to give everybody an equal opportunity to contribute to our society (T 1)**, and at this point by adopting the format of “we only want high-skilled, highly educated people” and that’s already ingrained in the immigration system at this point anyway, but if we keep enforcing that, we are essentially shutting the door on a whole population that could potentially become great contributors to our society (T 1) (И 1.1) (Outcome).*

В этом высказывании участница форума говорит о том, что нечестно делать акцент на высококвалифицированных рабочих, так как это противоречит ценностям американской нации (давать всем равные возможности). То есть происходит ценностный конфликт в рамках Темы 1. Идеал 1.1 проявляется в том, что иммигранты находятся наравне с гражданами Америки (в отличие от Идеалов 1.2, где они являются жертвами, и Идеала 1.3, где они являются угрозой). В качестве решения проблемы предлагается поощрять иммиграцию, так как они вносят вклад в общество.

Приведем пример Развернутого сценария на основе Идеала 1.2 в рамках Темы 1 в **Форуме № 1**:

*(16) 53. Ed. I-I have to agree. In -- I've been on two sides of this. In 1964, I worked in my grandfather's cannery, which hired, uh, migrant **immigrants (T 1)** to bring in the crops in the summertime. So I was the only one who took it upon myself to learn Spanish so that I could communicate with those folks (problem) and **help them assimilate into the small community (И 1.2)**, that-that 300 -- we had 300, uh, people living in our small town. And so that was quite an impact. On the other side of that, when I became mayor here i-in Georgetown, um, there was some issues that basically all stemmed from **communications (T 1)**. Um, a-and if the people w-here would learn, uh -- and it doesn't have to be a lot, but just learn some Spanish or learn some way to communicate (outcome), um, because they use the nonability to communicate as an excuse to widen the differences (Problem), I think.*

Подчеркиванием выделены части высказывания, где формулируется проблема (Problem) и предлагаются возможные пути решения (Outcome).



Проблема заключается в том, что Американцы в небольших населенных пунктах отказываются взаимодействовать с иммигрантами через общение, что приводит к тому, что иммигранты оказываются в невыгодном положении, потому что это увеличивает различия между иммигрантами и коренными жителями (*'I was the only one who took it upon myself to learn Spanish so that I could communicate with those folks', 'they use the nonability to communicate as an excuse to widen the differences'*). Проблема возникает из-за ценностного конфликта – хотя американское общество, как данность, должно быть терпимым к иммигрантам, наоборот, происходит так, что иммигранты оказываются уязвимыми по сравнению с гражданами Америки – различия между культурами увеличиваются и коммуникация оказывается невозможной. Участник предлагает решение проблемы: Американцам следует учить языки, на которых говорят иммигранты, чтобы не было препятствий для коммуникации (*'if the people w-here would learn, uh -- and it doesn't have to be a lot, but just learn some Spanish or learn some way to communicate'*).

А сейчас приведем пример Развернутого сценария на основе Идеала 1.2 в рамках Темы 1 в **Форуме № 2**:

(17) 115. *Miriam. There is a lot of misinformation within the immigrant community also, about how they can immigrate, how they can become legal (Problem). Some of the things, it astounds me some of the things that people come and ask me, you know, **how can I make myself legal (T 1)**. Just recently there has been some talk about **some form of amnesty (T 1)** and there were people coming to me and saying "How can I apply for the amnesty?" Well, you cannot apply for the amnesty, unless you have a certain skill or you have some basis for it. People who were here, they came on vacation and stayed. Ok, fine, did they want to stay here, they are here illegally, they are driving illegally, now they want to become legal. These people have to have some kind of a conduit into, you know, becoming legal, but if they make themselves known, they are gonna be arrested and deported (И 1.2) (Problem). There needs to be more immigration information given into the communities so that they have the right information (Outcome).*

В рамках Темы 1 участница дискуссии говорит о законах, регулирующих легализацию иммигрантов. Она считает, что иммигранты являются жертвами

дезинформации или недостаточной информации о способах легализации ('*There is a lot of misinformation within the immigrant community also, about how they can immigrate, how they can become legal*'). Конфликт ценностей проявляется в том, что согласно Теме 1, общество должно принимать иммигрантов и давать им возможности самореализации, однако иммигранты не знают, как сделать свое обитание в Америке легальным – в этом заключается проблема. Выход из этой ситуации прост – информировать иммигрантов о правилах легализации ('*There needs to be more immigration information given into the communities so that they have the right information*').

Обратимся к примеру 18, где в тексте **Форума № 1** мы увидим Развернутый сценарий, сформулированный на основе Идеала 1.3 в рамках Темы 1:

(18) 66. *Ella. I feel that it's, uh -- it's better -- it's a better choice to have, uh, English as the main language, because just think. If -- now, when you have Hispanics, they're speaking Spanish. But suppose you have infiltration of other immigrants (T 1). When we talk about immigrants, we're talking about all the other countries (T 1). We're not -- we just happen to have an abundance of Hispanics. What if we have an abundance of Iraqis coming over here (Problem)? You know, are we going to say, "Okay, we're going to change to Iraqi language. (Problem)" We need a basis (И 1.3) (outcome). And we need to stick to it (И 1.3) (outcome), that it will be, uh, used for all immigrants, you know, not just for Hispanics. Because, uh, I know there's a lot of Haitians that are trying to get in the country, uh, that -- we're turning them back. If we say we're a free country (T 1), ho-why are we turning back the Haitians and other immigrants that are wanting to come in the country? And ju-we're just picking and choosing who we want to come in as immigrants. We're supposed to be a free country (T 1). So we have to set some, uh, standards (И 1.3) (Outcome). Either we're going to, uh, do English, or we're going to either -- eventually, maybe five years or 10 years down the road, we're going to be Iraqis, or we're going to be some other language (И 1.3) (Problem). So we're going to have to set a standard (И 1.3) (Outcome) that's going to be used for all immigration. We cannot lose our heritage (И 1.3).*

Участница форума обеспокоена тем, что иммигранты, въезжая в страну, привозят свою культуру и традиции, говорят на своем языке. Это, по её мнению, является причиной разрушения американских традиций, что, в свою очередь, представляется ей угрозой американской культуре и наследию ('*Either we're*

*going to, uh, do English, or we're going to either -- eventually, maybe five years or 10 years down the road, we're going to be Iraqis, or we're going to be some other language', 'We cannot lose our heritage'). И снова происходит конфликт ценностей: свободная страна Америка ставит под угрозу своё наследие из-за чрезмерной открытости и толерантности. Поэтому предлагается решение – разработать план и соблюдать четкие правила, иммиграцию нужно контролировать ('We need a basis. And we need to stick to it'; 'we're going to have to set a standard that's going to be used for all immigration').*

Рассмотрим пример развития Развернутого сценария в тексте **Форума № 2** в рамках на основе Идеала 1.3 в рамках Темы 1:

*(19) 165. John. I think we've all cited some positives, and there is negatives, you cited some, I've cited some, but I think ... I don't think anyone really knows the... the net. Net **net of the benefits and the costs (T 1)**, and I think it does vary by city, I think it is related to **unskilled or skilled (T 1)**, and the particular labor market at Cedar Rapids, I can... I know where some illegals are in this town and what they are doing, and I think they are displacing people here (I 1.3) (Problem), and maybe something at the federal level we could do ... employ academia to actually take us study to actually understanding impact (Outcome), I don't think we know.*

Высказывание находится в рамках Темы 1, так как говорится о квалифицированных и неквалифицированных иммигрантах и какую выгоду или убытки они приносят. Идеал 1.3 ярко выражен в маркерах '*where some illegals are in this town and what they are doing, and I think they are displacing people here*', поскольку речь идет о нелегальной иммиграции и о её негативном влиянии на общество, что является проблемой. Чтобы её решить, участник предлагает нанять исследователей для более подробного изучения вопроса нелегальной иммиграции, чтобы понять, что делать ('*employ academia to actually take us study to actually understanding impact*').

В рамках Темы 2, как известно, тоже существует 3 Идеала. Приведем примеры Развернутых сценариев, сформулированных на основе каждого из Идеалов в обоих форумах.

В Форуме № 1 в примере 20 подчеркиванием выделен Развернутый сценарий на основе Идеала 2.1:

(20) 39. Kim. <...> *But then go-go back to what you had said before, um, sh-about them coming just to get educated or coming for a particular purpose. Well, that's -- **the reason people come was for a particular purpose, whether they intended to stay or not (И 2.1)**. You know, some of them wanted to go home. They didn't go home. Some do go home. Um, you know, they- they do a career (Т 2). They go home. And they can live a better life that way (Т 2). Um, I've made a living out of going to other countries and pl-ply-plying my trade in what I had learned (И 2.1). Um, but then I came back home, too. So, I mean, just -- not too long ago, I-I was in Brazil. That's where I was making some of my living there. And I was up in New York at 9/11. And it was very tough (Problem). And -- you know, t-being around, j-jus-just seeing the things. Uh, so it does have an impact. But I think the-uh, the impact -- I'm just kind of rambling here -- is -- a lot of the impact is in the-the **financial burden (Т 2)** th-that is falling on the government now, because they do want to put in the extra precautions (Problem) that -- I don't know if those precautions would-would have prevented the 9/11 anyway (Outcome).*

Участница видит проблему в том, что правительство тратит больше денег, чтобы ограничить иммиграцию и начать контролировать её ('*the impact is in the-the financial burden th-that is falling on the government now, because they do want to put in the extra precautions*'). Однако, именно иммиграция, по мнению людей, придерживающихся Идеала 2.1, делает экономику США конкурентоспособной и стабильной. Некоторые иммигранты остаются в стране после того, как сделают карьеру, а некоторые уезжают домой, но миссия США именно в том, чтобы люди реализовывали себя, используя возможности, которые Америка предоставляет ('*they do a career. They go home. And they can live a better life that way*'). В высказывании упоминается теракт 11 сентября, который обрушился на США в 2001 году ('*And I was up in New York at 9/11*'). Несмотря на трагичность произошедшего ('*And it was very tough. And -- you know, t-being around, j-jus-just seeing the things*'), участница считает, что меры предосторожности всё равно бы не смогли предотвратить это. А поэтому в качестве решения проблемы (излишних затрат государства в политике иммиграции) она предлагает

прекратить тратить такие большие деньги на контроль иммиграции (*'I don't know if those precautions would-would have prevented the 9/11 anyway'*).

Пример Развернутого сценария на основе Идеала 2.1 в **Форуме № 2** представлен в следующем высказывании:

(21) 99. Matt. ...and once a debate takes place actually we realize that immigrants... the contributions outweigh the costs (**T 2**), the costs are very real (Problem), but the contributions (И 2.1) or the potential contributions , if we actually integrate immigrants successfully (И 2.1), over the long term would greatly outweigh the costs (Outcome) and most importantly there is that shared ... that is what I believe the most important to the issue of immigration is that we have common ground of those shared values, in a lot of ways it's who we are as a nation (И 2.1). And over a long term it is really... a benefit to everyone (И 2.1).

Идеал 2.1 создает основу для формирования сценария в этом высказывании. Участник развивает уже поставленную ранее проблему (высказывание 39. John: 'unskilled their first generation, maybe, the second generation of the unskilled, probably have a net cost to society just economically'): существуют определенные затраты на иммиграцию и интеграцию иммигрантов в общество, в том числе в экономическую систему (*'the costs are very real'*). Поскольку участник считает, что иммигранты вносят большой вклад в экономику страны (*'potential contributions'*), он предлагает делать акцент на успешную интеграцию в общество, а это приведет к тому, что выгода перекроет и даже превысит затраты (*'if we actually integrate immigrants successfully, over the long term would greatly outweigh the costs'*).

Следующий пример иллюстрирует Развернутый сценарий, основанный на Идеале 2.2 в **Форуме № 1**:

(22) 148. Sylvia. And maybe do some restrictions on that. I don't, I don't know, but it just seems really sad (И 2.2) to even suggest that we need to have more immigrants so they'll take the lower wages (T 2) (И 2.2) (Problem). There should be some kind of system in place so that they don't get paid (T 2) less (И 2.2) than an average American would get paid (outcome).

Идеологическая модель 2.2 проявляется в том, что участница хочет помочь иммигрантам, поскольку считает, что они получают меньше, чем американцы –

проблема в этом и состоит: по её мнению, иммигрантам приходится работать на низкооплачиваемых должностях (*'it just seems really sad to even suggest that we need to have more immigrants so they'll take the lower wages'*). И она предлагает придумать систему, по которой им не будут платить меньше, чем среднестатистическому американцу (*'There should be some kind of system in place so that they don't get paid less than an average American would get paid'*).

В Форуме № 2 Развернутые сценарии на основе Идеала 2.2 отсутствуют.

Пример 23 демонстрирует, как на основе Идеала 2.3 в Форуме № 1 формулируется Развернутый сценарий:

(23) 115. Michael. To go back to your question before, you know, I think it was, and correct me if I'm wrong, uh, it's just that is it just [porous] and just allow people in (T 2) (Problem)? Do we restrict it (И 2.3) (Outcome)? Government has to restrict it (И 2.3) (Outcome). Uh, we can't -- if you, if you look at population growths over the next 50 years, uh, this country will be bombarded (И 2.3) and the infrastructures (T 2) will never, ever, ever be able to hold up (И 2.3) (Problem). It's going to be up to the government to somehow limit (И 2.3) (Outcome), uh, and in a very -- you know, there's still plenty of room here (T 2). But to say that anybody that wants to come can come (T 2), in my opinion, uh, is a sign of disaster for this country (И 2.3) (Problem). Uh, immigrants have, have contributed very much to this rich nation (T 2) in many different ways, but to simply say, "Everybody is welcome (T 2)," uh, I don't think that, that the infrastructure will be able to (И 2.3), you know -- we're looking at some serious, serious problems down the road (Problem).

Проблема в этом Развернутом сценарии такова: иммигранты создают дополнительную нагрузку на инфраструктуры, поскольку каждому иммигранту нужно удовлетворять свои потребности, а для этого необходимо дополнительное финансирование (*'we can't -- if you, if you look at population growths over the next 50 years, uh, this country will be bombarded and the infrastructures will never, ever, ever be able to hold up'*). Участник предлагает типичный выход для человека, придерживающегося Идеала 2.3 – усилить меры по контролю иммиграции и ограничить въезд в страну (*'Do we restrict it? Government has to restrict it'*).

В примере из **Форума № 2**, подчеркиванием выделен Развернутый сценарий, сформулированный на основе Идеала 2.3:

(24) 142. *Christine. But I think that the reason why **companies** (T 2) continue to do it is that they want **cheap labor** (T 2). I mean, that's the bottom line, and there is not an interest in NOT HAVING cheap labor (Problem). So, I don't... And to me, when you have cheap labor, that opens up rights for so many different abuses. You've got **workplace** (T 2) abuse, you've got many different situations... I cited one example, where... if you make too little, then you don't **have enough to live off** (T 2), then you have too many people living in one house or one apartment, and that's not a humanitarian situation. So, again, you know, like you, I would like to see companies be more responsible and think about the net impact on a community (Outcome). Ok, if you have eight people living in an apartment, you know, then, you know, what are the social implications of that? Likely, **they are going to have a lot of stress, and when you got a lot of stress, then you got police issues** (И 2.3), you know we have to THINK, you know, practically about things too.*

Участница дискуссии считает, что в США появляется все больше и больше иммигрантов, потому что компаниям выгодно иметь дешевую рабочую силу, чтобы продавать товары дешевле (*'But I think that the reason why companies continue to do it is that they want cheap labor'*). Идеал 2.3 проявляется в отношении к иммигрантам, которые являются этой рабочей силой, как к угрозе мирному сосуществованию людей в обществе, так как когда иммигранты недовольны условиями, они могут совершать разбои и мелкие преступления (*'they are going to have a lot of stress, and when you got a lot of stress, then you got police issues'*). Чтобы избежать этого, участница предлагает компаниям стать более ответственными и думать об общественном благе тоже, а не только о выгоде (*'I would like to see companies be more responsible and think about the net impact on a community'*).

Однако, в ходе анализа форума выявлены и такие Сценарии, в которых есть проблема, но нет следствия или пути решения проблемы. Такие Сценарии мы будем называть *Усеченными*. Как правило, участники форума, в высказывании которых были выделены Усеченные сценарии, высказывали лишь свое недовольство и растерянность, чтобы привлечь внимание к проблеме, но не

предлагали никаких решений в силу своей пассивной позиции по вопросу. Приведем примеры Усеченных сценариев в рамках Темы 1 и Темы 2 на основе разных Идеалов (Идеалы 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3) в обоих форумах.

Пример 25 из **Форума № 1** показывает развитие Усеченного сценария на основе Идеала 1.1 в рамках Темы 1:

(25) 6. Kim. Well, I'll talk next. Um, I think, um, if you th-really think about it, **America's a melting pot (T 1)**. I remember is -- in elementary school and junior-high school, **studying about all the immigrants that came to America (И 1.1)**. My grandfather immigrated from Germany in 1914. So I'm a second generation. Um, and I'm one of the few people that's not a fifth- or sixth- or seventh-generation Georgetown-Georgetown native, it seems like. **But this is just another wave (И 1.1) (Problem)**. It just happens that it's mostly Hispanic instead of, um, Irish or German or English (Problem). And we have -- I guess it's part of growing older. It just seems newer to us (Problem), so –

Здесь участница говорит о следующей проблеме: людям сложно принять новые волны иммиграции и изменять свой обычный стиль жизни или отношение к вещам ('*But this is just another wave. It just happens that it's mostly Hispanic instead of, um, Irish or German or English <...> It just seems newer to us*'). При этом, эта проблема кажется нерешаемой, участница форума лишь выражает свою обеспокоенность существующим положением вещей, которое вряд ли что-то может изменить, поэтому этот сценарий – Усеченный.

Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеала 1.1 в **Форуме № 2** подчеркиванием выделен в примере 26:

(26) 94. Miriam. Completely different. **You've got immigration 'cause people want to come here for a better life (T 1)**, you've got affirmative action to balance out the workforces of people that are already here. I think a lot of people take immigration issues... if it is someone from Europe – fine! – if they are white, with light skin, blond hair, hey, let them in! But they are not, they are dark-skinned people from Latin America, people from the South America and Central America, and the Arab countries (Problem)...

В этом высказывании говорится о том, что граждане Америки, несмотря на то, что иммигранты приезжают в страну ради лучшей жизни, чтобы



воспользоваться возможностями ('*You've got immigration 'cause people want to come here for a better life*'), не всегда готовы принять их, если их цвет кожи отличается, и они принадлежат к национальным меньшинствам ('*if it is someone from Europe – fine! – if they are white, with light skin, blond hair, hey, let them in! But they are not, they are dark-skinned people from Latin America, people from the South America and Central America, and the Arab countries*'), что, в свою очередь, вызывает конфликты на расовой почве. Участница не предлагает никаких решений. По пунктуации (восклицательные предложения) понятно, что эта проблема очень беспокоит её, но никакого выхода из этой ситуации участница не видит.

В примере из **Форума № 1** сформулирован Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеала 1.2 Темы 1:

(27) 12. Linda. ***Our open-door policy (T 1). And we're a country of immigration (T 1). I mean, none of us, I think, here are Native Americans. So whether it's one, two, or three generations, we've come from somewhere else. And I think it's easier -- it was easier back then to-to learn the language (Problem). Today we have radio, television, movies, where the pockets of different cultures, as they arrive, can -- th-there isn't that strong of a survival need to assimilate (И 1.2) (Problem), because they can rely on maintaining their own language to survive and-and to succeed, because they have a support system (И 1.2) of radio and film and friends and a social group that all speak the same language (Problem). So I think that's sort of a challenge for-for new immigrants to come here. There isn't that urgent need to learn the language. Although I think they do l-ultimately learn it.***

Это высказывание относится к Идеологической модели 1.2, потому что в нем говорится о выживании иммигрантов в новой стране и о системе поддержки недавно прибывших иммигрантов ('*survival need to assimilate*', '*they have 'a support system*'). Проблема, о которой говорит участница, касается ассимиляции иммигрантов. Сформулировать проблему можно следующим образом: в настоящее время, если сравнивать с ситуацией в прошлом, иммигранты не чувствуют острой необходимости в ассимиляции, и они не чувствуют, что для выживания им нужно учить язык ('*And I think it's easier -- it was easier back then*

*to-to learn the language', 'h-there isn't that strong of a survival need to assimilate').*

Однако, несмотря на наличие проблемы, она не нуждается в поисках путей решения, потому что, как бы сложно иммигрантам ни было, в итоге, они все равно учат язык (*'There isn't that urgent need to learn the language. Although I think they do l-ultimately learn it'*).

В **Форуме № 2** в примере 28 на основе Идеала 1.2 сформулирован Усеченный сценарий:

*(28) 31. Judy I have a story, I am working with a woman through the promised jobs program and welfare reform program, who is a **battered alien (T 1)**. She came to the United States because of a relationship that she had developed over Internet with a man who lives here in this area. And she married the man and came here in the United States and now that he has **abused her (И 1.2)**, and so she has left, **she's been left now kind of on her own (И 1.2)** and I understand that she does have rights as far as being able to stay here, because of that connotation, I guess, ... it's being a battered alien, but I've read somewhat recently, I guess in Newsweek, that that is a thing that's happening quite often in the United States, that women are coming here to seek a better life and to find some stability (T 1) and then things happen and that's not working out, and so then they are kind of stuck with what to do (И 1.2) now, so... (Problem)*

В этом высказывании поднимается проблема женщин, которые приезжают в США после того, как выходят замуж за американца, а потом из-за того, что они подвергаются унижениям в браке, они не знают, куда идти и что делать (*'abused her', 'she's been left now kind of on her own', 'they are kind of stuck with what to do'*). Участница говорит, что это происходит довольно часто, и это сложно контролировать, поэтому решения не предлагает, но она выражает свою обеспокоенность этой ситуацией, так как миссия Америки – предоставлять возможности к улучшению жизни (*'to seek a better life and to find some stability'*). В этом случае эта ценность не реализуется, поэтому возникает проблема.

В следующем примере из **Форума № 1** представлен Усеченный сценарий, сформулированный на основе Идеала 1.3 в рамках Темы 1:

(29) 211. Ed. <...> **They want to do the things that we Americans won't do or can't do (И 1.3)** (Problem). Uh, when we look at our **education (T 1)**, I'd like to ask Tammy because I'm really concerned about what you said. Because in my experience, most, uh, **children of immigrants (T 1) that are in school have the desire to learn. That's something that a lot of our own children don't have** (Problem). And is that becoming -- does that create a problem to you?

Участник форума призывает подумать над следующей проблемой: большинство детей иммигрантов в процессе обучения имеют более сильную мотивацию, чем американские дети ('most ... children of immigrants that are in school have the desire to learn', 'That's something that a lot of our own children don't have'). А это, в свою очередь, может стать угрозой для американской нации, так как в дети иммигрантов могут стать более конкурентоспособными, чем дети американцев ('They want to do the things that we Americans won't do or can't do', 'does that create a problem to you? '). Однако, участник не предлагает свои варианты по решению этой проблемы, и решить эту проблему сложно, поскольку это уже происходит в образовательных учреждениях. Поэтому участник форума призывает других к взаимодействию на уровне проблемы, а не на уровне поисков решения.

В Форуме 2 Усеченный сценарий, сформулированный на основе Идеала 1.3, выделен подчеркиванием в примере 30:

(30) 89. Karen <...> she saw as a secretary there three young men that were coming in to interview for a job, they were all high school age and **the one who got hired, no, you know, no more credentials than any others, in fact he was lacking in some, was a black person (И 1.3)** (Problem). And my mom said that was fine with her, because she had done a lot of work with a lot of black women when she did waitress work (T 1) and when she went to the...Pepsico company in Chicago, and she found them to be excellent workers, but she said that she was sorely disappointed that this young man didn't show up for work (Problem), the boss who had hired him made a point that he should quote "a feather in his cap" for hiring this person (Problem). So, that was an affirmative action decision, **it was not one based on equality (T 1)** (Problem). We could go back to our constitution, we talk about being created equal (T 1), and then we throw that out of the window just like the young women who were not able to enter **Michigan University because they were white (И 1.3)** (Problem), their grades were actually

*higher than those who were of another race, a minority race, and yet those young women weren't allowed into the school, they were not until President Bush and some of the people in this administration entered into that and discussed that situation, and asked for these merits to be weighed out... So, I think we wanna be really careful, it's a fine line to walk, **we definitely wanna be accepting, I grew up accepting people of all colors (T 1)**, because my mom always had that viewpoint, because she'd worked with people of other colors and other cultures, we had ... my father was a serviceman, so we were over in Tehran, Iran, when I was only a year old. We've had foreign-language visitors, foreign visitors who speak other language to our farm, ... to **two hundred visitors... enjoyed them thoroughly, we've had some of them to our dinner table, we had... have hosted for an exchange student to go to high school (T 1)**. I've thoroughly enjoyed that experience <...>*

Участница форума считает, что национальные меньшинства иногда дискриминируют «белых» людей, и это является проблемой при приеме на работу и поступлении в университет (*'the one who got hired... was a black person', 'who were not able to enter Michigan University because they were white'*). При этом, она не против того, чтобы принимать всех иммигрантов и относиться к ним дружелюбно (*we definitely wanna be accepting, I grew up accepting people of all colors*), но игнорировать проблему нельзя. Происходит острый конфликт ценностей: с одной стороны, нужно принимать иммигрантов, с другой стороны, они вытесняют «белых». Участница не предлагает выхода из ситуации, а заканчивает свою часть высказывания на том, что в ней воспитали толерантность и как ей нравилось принимать иммигрантов у себя (*'We've had foreign-language visitors, foreign visitors who speak other language to our farm, ... to two hundred visitors... enjoyed them thoroughly, we've had some of them to our dinner table, we had... have hosted for an exchange student to go to high school'*). Возможно, она делает это для того, чтобы смягчить свои высказывания по поводу проблемы (*'I think we wanna be really careful, it's a fine line to walk'*).

В рамках Темы 2 на основе Идеалов (2.1, 2.2, 2.3) в обоих форумах также были найдены Усеченные сценарии.

Рассмотрим пример 31 (**Форум № 1**):

(31) 139. Jack. *This can be so -- point three can be basically insignificant **financially** (T 2). Uh, **this wave of export of jobs (T 2), the immigrants can actually help the United States as a nation** (И 2.1) in the future because at the rate we're sending work away and you know where, China, uh, around the globe, uh, we're going to have to look to these people and hope they come here just to be able to compete with (Problem) -- you know, a third of the people in India are making less than a buck a day. So, uh, let's hope we have lots of immigrants come here that will work for less than \$25.00 an hour if we want to save this nation as we know it (Problem).*

В этом высказывании участник говорит о проблеме конкурентоспособности США по сравнению с другими странами ('*at the rate we're sending work away and you know where, China, uh, around the globe, uh, we're going to have to look to these people and hope they come here just to be able to compete with*'). И он считает, что иммигранты помогают экономике страны и помогут ей в будущем как нации, поэтому это высказывание можно отнести к Идеологической модели 2.1 ('*this wave of export of jobs, the immigrants can actually help the United States as a nation*'). Сценарий можно считать усеченным, потому что не представлено решение проблемы, поскольку оно не требуется: по мнению участника, остается только надеяться, что иммигранты сохранят лучшее в американской нации.

В **Форуме № 2** отсутствуют Усеченные сценарии в высказываниях, утверждающих Идеал 2.1. Это можно объяснить тем, что люди, придерживающиеся Идеала 2.1, считают, что иммигранты приносят выгоду экономике, а поэтому участники оптимистично настроены и нацелены на решение проблемы, что приводит к отсутствию «повисших», то есть Усеченных сценариев.

В примере 32 из текста **Форума № 1** представлен Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеологической модели 2.2 в рамках Темы 2:

(32) 138. Mike. <...> *Uh, now in the construction industry. If you go around to all this housing development in the area, most of these construction crews, uh, if you're a homebuyer and you want to go talk to them about how they're building your house, then you need to take an interpreter with you. Uh, I think they've been, uh, an economic benefit to, uh, uh, in the real estate market where a, uh, property can be rented to folks* (Problem). *Uh, substandard property can be rented and profits made off of it* (И 2.2) *that, uh, that wouldn't necessarily be, be rented to, uh, to other people* (Problem). *So I think in, in those regards and probably other regards, uh, they've been a -- at least they're coming here and people are*

*hiring them. So whoever is hiring them and whoever is making money off of them through rental and other means (И 2.2), are economically benefiting (Т 2). Whether or not the average citizen is economically benefiting is, is another question.*

Участник форума говорит о том, что иммигранты находятся в уязвимом положении потому, что им предлагается снимать жилье, не соответствующее нормам, которое граждане Америки не стали бы снимать, а строительные компании делают на этом выгоду (*'Uh, substandard property can be rented and profits made off of it (И 2.2) that, uh, that wouldn't necessarily be, be rented to, uh, to other people'*). Высказывание основано на Идеологической модели 2.2, потому что иммигранты являются жертвами в этой ситуации.

В Форуме № 2 в высказываниях участников, утверждающих Идеал 2.2 были найдены только Усеченные сценарии. Вот один из них:

(33) 125. Christine. There's... For me there is some confusion too about the responsibility of *business and corporate society (Т 2)* too in terms of *hiring (Т 2)*, and we see, especially in Iowa with agricultural need for hiring... of more workers, *migrant labor (Т 2)*, but also hiring of illegal immigrants – so, is the corporation company responsible for being sure that they are approaching things legally (Problem)? And then to me they have some responsibility at hand too, but I don't really see how they become penalized (Problem), so it becomes so complicated, they obviously know that they are hiring illegal workers, I think it must be pretty plain, and yet when we do... there is so many situations that we see that are so inhumane, you know, we see people who try to come up here in box cars, and you know they've died (И 2.2) (Problem), you know, from... heat... and there is just so many contradictory policies and contradictory approaches that bothers me (Problem), and the effect on people is really what bothers me, you know. For everyone.

Участница продолжает свою мысль, которую она высказала в высказывании 81 (см. пример 13, параграф 2.2.2) – права иммигрантов на рабочих местах не соблюдаются, и их никто не защищает: им платят меньше, чем американцам и с ними плохо обращаются. Компании безответственно относятся к этой проблеме, и их никто не наказывает за это (*'I don't really see how they become penalized', 'they obviously know that they are hiring illegal workers, I think it must be pretty plain, and yet when we do... there is so many*

*situations that we see that are so inhumane, you know, we see people who try to come up here in box cars, and you know they've died'). При этом вопрос остается нерешенным, и очевидного решения ему нет.*

В следующем примере из **Форума № 1** продемонстрировано, как сформулирован Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеала 2.3 в рамках Темы 2:

*(34) 130. Tony. And it's important and a lot of them feel that when the Hispanics came in they was given more of a easier hand (Problem) because of everything that was going on. I mean, you look at TV sometime, it's -- and I realize they [come] in real fast and all that, but it makes me feel and even some of the people in the community that, uh, we've been here a long time and we didn't never have similar opportunities (T 2) (Problem). And it is, uh -- you know, a lot of them have went for **business (T 2)**. A lot of them have tried to get different homes in some of the same areas and tried to buy homes in the same areas the Hispanic population [bought] and, and it wasn't happening (Problem). But then all of the sudden it's happening. I mean, I don't -- I can go around the community and I can remember the people in this town that was in these communities when I grew up, you know. But there's nobody, there's nobody left no more.*

Участник форума обеспокоен тем, что из-за нового потока иммигрантов, афроамериканцы находятся в невыгодном положении, когда речь идет о бизнесе и покупке домов ('*you know, a lot of them have went for business. A lot of them have tried to get different homes in some of the same areas and tried to buy homes in the same areas the Hispanic population [bought] and, and it wasn't happening*'). Он считает несправедливым, что государство и администрация предоставляют льготы иммигрантам, которые недавно прибыли, а про интересы сообщества афроамериканцев забывают. Таким образом, несмотря на то, что Америка – страна возможностей, не все могут воспользоваться ими в равной степени ('*we didn't never have similar opportunities*'). Данное высказывание можно отнести к Идеологической модели 2.3, потому что иммигранты представляются угрозой для коренных жителей – они отнимают у них возможности, которыми они сами могли бы воспользоваться ('*when the Hispanics came in they was given more of a easier hand*').

Приведем пример Усеченного сценария на основе Идеала 2.3 из **Форума № 2:**

(35) 82. John. I think that's an excellent point, though, that puts tremendous, it's, it's, I studied *economics (T 2)* and, and, you know, when you have extra supply, it does force wages (T 2) down. And it does hurt people who are already here (И 2.3). eh blue collar that live here unskilled (Problem) ... I don't think there's any question that across the country... you know, there's isolated places where this won't be true, you know, maybe in Iowa, 'cause we're labor short, yes... but around the country it's forcing wages (T 2) down, and it's putting a lot of pressure on the blue collar that are, that are here already (Problem).

В почеркнутой части высказывания выделена проблема: некоторые иммигранты, прибывшие недавно, забирают рабочие места у тех, кто уже обосновался в США ('when you have extra supply, it does force wages down. And it does hurt people who are already here'). Идеал 2.3 проявляется в том, что иммигранты здесь выступают в качестве агентов, наносящих вред экономической системе страны. Участник вводит проблему, но оставляет её нерешенной.

В тексте форума нами был выделен ещё один вид сценариев – *Декларативный сценарий*. Он появляется тогда, когда участник форума хочет возразить другому участнику форума. Когда происходит такое взаимодействие, два участника придерживаются разных Идеологических моделей. Декларативный сценарий содержит в себе какой-то неоспоримый аргумент. Обычно он представлен в форме возражения или заявления, а не проблемы. В следующем параграфе мы подробнее рассмотрим, какую роль декларативный сценарий играет в динамике дискуссии.

Этот вид сценария из-за своей особенной структуры и функции встречается не во всех Идеологических моделях. Например, в **Форуме № 1** он отсутствует в Идеологических моделях 1.2, 2.2 и 1.3, 2.3. Это объясняется тем, что Идеалы 1.1 и 2.1 наиболее «позитивно-настроенные» по отношению к иммиграции, поэтому люди, которые придерживаются этих Идеалов и строят рассуждения на их основе, склонны к тому, чтобы просто отрицать наличие проблем и надевать



«розовые очки». В **Форуме № 2** Декларативный вид сценариев присутствует во всех Идеалах, кроме Идеалов 2.2 и 2.3.

Рассмотрим пример 36 из текста **Форума № 1**:

(36) 109. Phil. I think this whole idea that the immigrants are coming and taking the jobs (T 2), and we're-we're-we're going to all be poorer (Problem), is something that's -- it's a-it's a global force right now anyway (И 2.1) (declaration). You can lose your job (T 2) to somebody who never crosses the border into the U.S (declaration). And, uh, if somebody comes here and wants to work in the chicken factory (T 2), I mean, whose job are they taking (И 2.1)? Is there a line of, uh, Americans standing in line to work in the chicken factory (И 2.1)? I don't think so.

Высказывание относится к Теме 2, поскольку в нем встречаются такие слова и словосочетания, как 'taking the jobs', 'to work in the chicken factory'. Возражение выделено подчеркиванием в тексте высказывания. Говорится о глобальной силе, из-за которой каждый может потерять работу в любой момент, и его место может занять любой, не обязательно иммигрант ('it's a-it's a global force right now anyway. You can lose your job to somebody who never crosses the border into the U.S'). То есть участник изменяет формулировку проблемы так, что иммигранты перестают быть угрозой обществу, а наличие проблемы списывается на «глобальные силы», которые в любом случае не остановить. Этот Сценарий сформулирован на основе Идеала 2.1, поскольку говорящий считает, что когда иммигранты занимают низкооплачиваемые должности, например, на птицефабрике, то они не забирают работу у американцев, а, наоборот, приносят прибыль, так как никто из американцев не хочет работать в этой отрасли ('Is there a line of, uh, Americans standing in line to work in the chicken factory? I don't think so').

В **Форуме № 2** Декларативный сценарий, сформулированный на основе Идеала 2.1, развивается в следующем примере:

(37) 137. Miriam. Well, that's not the case with most immigrants, most immigrants want to come here and make a life here for themselves and their families (Problem- вызов модератору), but there are some immigrants who want to come and work and they pay taxes (T 2), while they

*live here **they invest in the community (И 2.1) (declaration)**, they make a life here for a while, and then, you know, they go back home. They are not... they need to live here, so they need to spend money here (declaration).*

Этим Декларативным сценарием участница форума бросает вызов модератору, который вводит проблему того, что иммигранты, зарабатывая деньги в США и отправляя их своим семьям в другие страны, вредят экономике, так как иммигранты зарабатывают деньги в Америке, а их семьи тратят их в другой стране, и прибыль уходит из США (*136. Moderator. 'perhaps even working here illegally and **sending all of their wages that they can out of our economy back into another economy** ... that's hardly an argument for that being a good thing....'*). В её высказывании проблема «побеждена» контраргументом: иммигранты не только отправляют заработанные деньги своим семьям, но и тратят деньги в США на проживание и еду (*'they need to live here, so they need to spend money here'*); более того, иммигранты этим самым вносят вклад в экономику Америки (*'they pay taxes', 'while they live here they invest in the community'*).

В Форуме № 1 в рамках Темы 1 Декларативный сценарий сформулирован в следующем примере:

(38) 54. Jared. You know, I-I, uh -- in the last few years, uh, I did some farm work for my family. And we hire immigrant Mexicans (T 1). And, uh, **they speak very little English (T 1)**, and I speak no Spanish (Problem). And we had no problem at all, you know -- a-and understanding, communicating (И 1.1) with each other and-and-and actually holding a conversation (И 1.1) (declaration). I spoke in English and they in Spanish. But, uh, you know, you-you don't talk about building rockets or anything like that. But, you know, the job that you're about, you get done.

В этом высказывании участник форума отрицает то, что существуют проблемы в коммуникации с иммигрантами, которые почти не знают английский язык (*'they speak very little English, and I speak no Spanish'*). Участник утверждает, что несмотря на то, что он говорил по-английски, а иммигранты, которых он нанял, говорили по-испански, они понимали друг друга и общались друг с другом (*'And we had no problem at all, you know -- a-and understanding,*

*communicating with each other and-and-and actually holding a conversation*’). Тем самым, он провозглашает отсутствие проблемы.

В Форуме № 2 развитие Декларативного сценария на основе Идеала 1.1 продемонстрировано в примере 39:

(39) 90. *Miriam. I think you are mixing your groups here. You are talking about affirmative action, we are talking about immigration. Two different issues completely (declaration).*

Эта реплика была сказана в ответ на высказывание Карэн под номером 89 (см. пример 35: *‘the one who got hired, no, you know, no more credentials than any others, in fact he was lacking in some, was a black person’*). Участница отрицает наличие проблемы, говоря о том, что эта сфера не относится к предмету обсуждения дискуссии.

Также в Форуме № 2 в отличие от Форума № 1 в рамках Темы 1 присутствуют Декларативные сценарии на основе Идеалов 1.2 и 1.3.

Приведем пример Декларативного сценария на основе Идеала 1.2:

(40) 42. *Mariam. Well, the definition of a refugee is set by the international law, by treaties that the US has signed. A refugee is **someone who is fleeing persecution from his home country (T 1)**, because **that person is being, because that person is being persecuted on the basis of race, religion or politics or belonging to a certain social group (И 1.2)**. I, my experience as an attorney representing refugee<s> has been very rewarding, I have represented **people who were slaves in Sudan (И 1.2)**, in the Sudan, I have represented women who were fleeing their countries because **their daughters were going to be... to, to... to be endangered (И 1.2)**, because of the female genital mutilation. I think that we should not change our policy on refugees (declaration). The history of this country and the position of the United States in front of the world as **the open country (T 1)**...an open country for **people who are fleeing persecution (T 1)** should not change (declaration).*

В этом высказывании подвергается сомнению сама возможность изменения политики по отношению к беженцам (*‘I think that we should not change our policy on refugees’*), поскольку это именно то, что является ценностью США как нации – предоставлять убежище тем, кто подвергается расовым, религиозным или политическим гонениям (*‘the position of the United States in front of the world as*

*the open country ... an open country for people who are fleeing persecution should not change’).*

А теперь приведем пример Декларативного сценария на основе Идеала 1.3:

*(41) 107. As a national law-making body Congress does make laws in this area. There are certain discretions ... to the executive branch. But I would like to stress something beyond law. **We are the country, but we are a culture, a culture is bigger than government (И 1.3).** And when it comes to immigration, for example, you have individual issues, you have family issues, you have community issues. And America is in one sense one great large community with many subsets of communities, and when it comes to immigration, it’s community that’s more important than law (declaration), over law, undergirds everything. And so how we approach things is based upon rules; these rules can be followed or not followed, but they also get subjected to how communities react. And **it’s the cultural American community (Т 1) that’s bigger than your government or your subset of local governments.** America is after all just a great big family (declaration).*

Участник считает, что вопрос о том, стоит ли иммигрантам ассимилироваться или сохранять свою культурную идентичность становится нерелевантным, если считать Америку одной большой семьей, представляющей одну и ту же культуру, одни и те же традиции (*‘America is after all just a great big family’*). Поэтому иммигранты должны ассимилироваться и принимать культуру сообщества, где они поселяются, так как культура сообщества важнее законов (*‘America is in one sense one great large community with many subsets of communities, and when it comes to immigration, it’s community that’s more important than law’*). Мы относим это высказывание к Идеалу 1.3, поскольку участник дискуссии враждебно относится к влиянию других культур на американскую культуру.

Таким образом, семантическая структура текста форума состоит из двух Тем, трех Идеалов в каждом из форумов и трех видов сценариев – Развернутых, Усеченных и Декларативных. В следующем параграфе будет проведен анализ взаимодействия высказываний на разных уровнях.

## 2.3. Анализ взаимодействия в двух форумах.

### 2.3.1 Динамические элементы дискуссии

На основании выделенных структурных единиц можно перейти к характеристике форума как целостного текста. Для нас важно то, что организующей целью данного диалога является установление участниками степени согласия и несогласия в группе по поводу наиболее важных для них проблем. В ходе анализа мы выделили пять динамических элементов дискуссии – Тематический сдвиг (Thematic shift), Вызов (Challenge), Разработка (Elaboration), Потеря фокуса (Drift), Поддержка другого участника (Acknowledgement). Динамические элементы показывают, как участники взаимодействуют друг с другом на уровне сценариев.

*Тематический сдвиг* – динамический элемент, о котором можно говорить тогда, когда внутри одного высказывания участник начинает развивать Сценарий в рамках одной Темы, а заканчивает свое высказывание в рамках другой Темы. Приведем примеры Тематического сдвига из обоих форумов.

#### Форум № 1.

(41) 9. Ed. *One of the things that struck me is, uh, whether you're talking about in economics (T 2), uh, whether it's, uh, somebody that's taken a job (T 2) from you (Problem), uh, whether it's in education, I think you have to look back at the desire of the immigrants. Uh, **they're coming here because they desire employment (И 2.1). They want to do the things that we Americans won't do or can't do (И 2.1).** Uh, when we look at our education (T 1), I'd like to ask Tammy because I'm really concerned about what you said. Because in my experience, most, uh, children of immigrants that are in school have the desire to learn. That's something that a lot of our own children don't have (И 1.1) (Problem). And is that becoming -- **does that create a problem (И 1.1) to you?***

Сначала участник говорит о следующей проблеме – иммигранты занимают рабочие места, на которых американцы не стали бы работать ('*They want to do the things that we Americans won't do or can't do*'). Этот Усеченный сценарий сформулирован на основе Идеала 2.1 в рамках Темы 2. После этого участник начинает говорить о проблемах образования, что переносит нас в Тему 1: у

детей иммигрантов присутствует желание учиться, в отличие от американских детей. Такое видение проблемы говорит о том, что участник дискуссии, сравнивая американских детей и детей иммигрантов, считает последних более трудолюбивыми, что указывает на то, что участник склоняется к Идеалу 1.1. Решение участник не предлагает, поэтому сценарий Усеченный.

## Форум № 2.

(42) 52. Karen. But then sometimes this poses a problem with so many people in our country (Problem) (И 1.3). This country has quite few yet open spaces and places for people (T 1), but eventually, if we continue growing up at a geometric rate, at which we are growing right now, I think we are gonna have major problems down the road (Problem). We can't allow everyone from every country who wants to be here to be here (Outcome) (И 1.3), it's almost like what we are doing with Iraq right now, we've helped them to become democrat... democratic country (T 1), where they have actually had an election where they could go and vote, <...> but helping those people to establish a democracy (T 1) in their own country, helping them to get the rights and the freedoms (T 1) that we have here in their homeland. a lot of them really don't want to leave their homeland, but they want to leave it because of extreme political, religious, all the other persecutions that they are suffering, they don't want to leave their family behind and some of them have to leave family behind... <...> and I think that we need to realize that it's more important for us to take democracy, the idea of a republic to the world (T 1), as it is important for us to accept so many immigrants (Outcome).

One thing that I will point out that I have learnt from our Irish son-in-law is that up until July of 2004 the green card immigrants were **working (T 2) and paying taxes (T 2)**, and paying taxes means that it goes for roads, sewers, and all the **infrastructures of cities and towns (T 2)**; since that time, since July, they no longer have to pay any taxes (И 2.3) (Problem)...

В начале своего высказывания участница разрабатывает Развернутый сценарий на основе Идеала 1.3 в рамках Темы 1: она говорит о том, что в США слишком много иммигрантов ('*this poses a problem with so many people in our country*') и предлагает решить эту проблему усилением контроля ('*We can't allow everyone from every country who wants to be here to be here*'). Затем она начинает

говорить о налогах и рабочих местах - происходит Тематический сдвиг, так как эти слова маркируют Тему 2. Участница развивает Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеала 2.3: иммигранты не платят налоги, и из-за этого город лишается средств на поддержание инфраструктур в хорошем состоянии.

В Форуме № 1 было найдено 5 Тематических сдвигов, в то время как в ходе анализа транскрипта Форума № 2 было найдено 3 Тематических сдвига.

Следующий динамический элемент, который нам удалось выделить в дискуссии – *Вызов*. Об этом элементе можно говорить тогда, когда в высказывании одного участника присутствует критика или аргументация против высказывания участника, который высказался ранее. Чаще всего высказывание участника, прибегнувшего к Вызову, имеет другую идеологическую маркированность. Рассмотрим примеры Вызовов в обоих форумах.

### Форум № 1.

(43) 66. *Ella. I feel that it's, uh -- it's better -- it's a better choice to have, uh, **English (T 1)** as the main language (T 1) (Outcome), because just think. If -- now, when you have Hispanics, they're speaking Spanish. But suppose you have **infiltration of other immigrants (И 1.3)**. When we talk about immigrants, we're talking about all the other countries. We're not -- we just happen to have an abundance of Hispanics. What if we have an abundance of Iraqis coming over here? You know, are we going to say, "**Okay, we're going to change to Iraqi language (И 1.3)**." We need a basis. And we need to stick to it, that it will be, uh, used for all immigrants (И 1.3) (Outcome), you know, not just for Hispanics. Because, uh, I know there's a lot of Haitians **that are trying to get in the country (И 1.3)**, uh, that -- we're turning them back. If we say **we're a free country (T 1)**, ho-why are we turning back the Haitians and other immigrants that are wanting to come in the country? And ju-we're just picking and choosing who we want to come in as immigrants. We're supposed **to be a free country (T 1)**. So we have to set some, uh, standards (Outcome). Either we're going to, uh, do English, or we're going to either -- eventually, maybe five years or 10 years down the road, we're going to be Iraqis, or we're going to be some other language (Problem). So we're going to have to set a standard that's going to be used for all immigration (Outcome). **We cannot lose our heritage (И 1.3)** (Problem).*

68. *Melanie. I think you run the risk of the individual, uh, cultures losing their identities when you, uh, demand that they all **speak English (T 1)** (Challenge). Because as you said, I'm a second generation. I'm a daughter of an immigrant and, uh, Spanish-speaking parents. And my Spanish is not fluent. And my son's Spanish is going to be even less. So you -- I think like we run the risk of losing our-our heritage from where we came from (Problem) and, you know, kind of becoming a homogenized society, everyone speaking the same **language (T 1)** and –*

В высказывании 66 участница разрабатывает Развернутый сценарий на основе Идеала 1.3: она считает, что иммигранты, когда приезжают в Америку, вносят изменения в американскую культуру, так как они не учат английский язык, что ставит американское наследие под угрозу (*'We cannot lose our heritage', 'maybe five years or 10 years down the road, we're going to be Iraqis, or we're going to be some other language'*). Для того, чтобы выйти из положения, она предлагает разработать план, которому бы следовали все граждане Америки и все иммигранты (*'We need a basis. And we need to stick to it, that it will be, uh, used for all immigrants'*).

После этого участница в высказывании 68 бросает Вызов: она считает, что меры, предложенные предыдущей участницей, приведут к тому, что иммигранты потеряют свое культурное наследие, если они начнут все говорить по-английски. Судя по позиции в вопросе, участница строит свои рассуждения на основе Идеала 1.1, поскольку одинаково ценит культурное наследие американцев и иммигрантов, и разрабатывает Усеченный сценарий (*'I think you run the risk of the individual, uh, cultures losing their identities when you, uh, demand that they all speak English'*).

В 44 примере из **Форума № 2** представлены сразу 2 динамических элемента – Вызов и *Разработка*: динамический элемент, о котором можно говорить тогда, когда участник развивает Сценарий (проблему или следствие), возникший в предыдущих высказываниях. Часто участники форума «разрабатывают» Сценарии не сразу, а спустя несколько высказываний. То есть участник слышит развитие Сценария, запоминает, что ему важно и близко, согласно его Идеологической модели, и, спустя некоторое время, начинает развивать тот самый Сценарий. Развитие Сценария может происходить как на уровне проблемы (участник раскрывает в своем высказывании определённые аспекты проблемы или добавляет что-либо к ранее сказанному), так и на уровне следствия (участник предлагает другие варианты решения проблемы или продолжает развивать уже предложенные версии).

Рассмотрим пример № 44:



(44) 100. John. *One of the issues, though, it is... short term... you know, what ARE the economics (T 2) of that? And I don't know if we have good numbers, I can tell you, I've read... And I've stated that sort of earlier... I think that first generation, it's possible that they actually cost us, but by the second and third generation, they are hard working people, they get educated (elaboration), most of these folks ... The guy that worked (T 2) for me is... from... eh, Ir-Iran... his kids went to college, now he is hoping for better; that's what parents want... better... and then by the second-third generation, usually <it> is much better... this has been our history (Elaboration). The problem is, the **first generation, low skilled, there is a lot of costs associated (И 2.3)** and so when you roll through the **economics (T 2)**... it gets very complicated (Problem), are there a net winner or a net loser, and... I would say that we really don't know.*

101. Dave. *I think you ... point... short-term/ long-term. I mean where would this country be today without the massive immigration that took place in the early 1900s?(Challenge) Would we be as wealthy a society (T 2) as we have? (Challenge) And there were certainly ... economic costs (T 2) back then, and at that time my sense is society was a little less welcoming and supporting them, opening arms to help (И 2.2) (Elaboration of the problem Matt 99). But I do think the short-term and long-term cost (T 2) is a good measure (Elaboration of outcome Matt 99). I think also that issue of concentrations. You can overwhelm ... probably makes sense. And I think that one of the public services that deals... pays the toughest cost (T 2), the most cost is schools (Problem). Because we really do have, in particular in this state – and other states too, – a commitment to all kids. And we want them all to do well. Heard the superintendent of the Des Moines schools talk the other day: in Des Moines they have kids speaking native languages, forty seven native languages,... who are attending school. And so some of them are English-full others of them are not, and **they really need help to work through there (И 2.2)** (Outcome). And that is a very direct expense and cost (T 2) (Problem). What's interesting, you know, is usually we see those kids a few years later and they have assimilated in terms of language very effectively and very well, but it is a cost upfront (Problem). **To help prepare them to be a part of society and help (И 2.2) make their own contribution to our greater society's growth (T 2)** (Outcome).*

В высказывании 100 участник форума развивает тот же Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеала 2.3, что и в примере 42: Америке приходится тратить дополнительные деньги на иммигрантов и это вредит инфраструктурам. Поскольку сценарий один и тот же, можно говорить о Разработке: участник добавляет к проблеме то, что, хотя ассимиляция первого поколения иммигрантов требует больших затрат, второе и третье поколение уже таких затрат не требуют, потому что они получают образование и усердно работают (*'I think that first generation, it's possible that they actually cost us, but by the second and third generation, they are hard working people, they get educated'*).

Однако, участник в высказывании 101 против того, чтобы считать, что затраты на иммигрантов нужно считать проблемой, поскольку именно они и

сделали Америку процветающей страной с сильной экономикой, и этой позицией он бросает Вызов предыдущему участнику (*I mean where would this country be today without the massive immigration that took place in the early 1900s? Would we be as wealthy a society as we have?*). При этом, чтобы поддержать свою точку зрения, он ссылается на мнение другого участника и разрабатывает Развернутый сценарий на уровне следствия в высказывании № 99 (Matt). Рассмотрим это высказывание:

(45) 99. Matt. ...and once a debate takes place actually we realize that immigrants... the contributions outweigh the costs (Outcome), the costs (T 2) are very real (Problem), but the contributions or the potential contributions (Outcome), if we actually **integrate immigrants (И 2.1) successfully, over the long term would greatly outweigh the costs (T 2)**(Outcome) and most importantly there is that shared ... that is what I believe the most important to the issue of immigration is **that we have common ground of those shared values, in a lot of ways it's who we are as a nation (T1)**. And over a long term it is really... a **benefit to everyone (T 2)**.

В этом высказывании участник строит Развернутый сценарий на основе Идеала 2.1: он говорит о том, что затраты действительно существуют (*'the costs are very real'*), но потенциальный вклад иммигрантов в экономику страны покрывает все затраты, если смотреть в долгосрочной перспективе (*'but the contributions or the potential contributions ... over the long term would greatly outweigh the costs'*). Так и участник в высказывании 101 (пример 44) говорит об этой проблеме, но с позиции Идеала 2.2 – действительно существуют затраты, и иммигранты страдают от недостатка материальной помощи со стороны общества (*'And there were certainly ... economic costs back then, and at that time my sense is society was a little less welcoming and supporting them, opening arms to help'*). Здесь можно говорить о Разработке на уровне проблемы. Также в примере 44 участник упоминает следствие, предложенное в примере 45: нужно рассматривать затраты в краткосрочной и долгосрочной перспективе (*'But I do think the short-term and long-term cost is a good measure'*). Таким образом, можно говорить о Разработке и на уровне следствия.

Приведем пример Разработки из Форума № 1:

(46) 29. Kim. It's become much str-much more difficult to come into th-and stay here (Problem). You can't just come in with a student visa, and if it l-lapses, you just stay put. Uh, they-they have tightened up their controls (Problem) and their tracking of people. They just send them back.

31. Phil. I think it's made a-made a big difference. Uh, it's much harder to get into the country now, whether as an immigrant or a visitor, particularly if you are, uh, an Arab (Elaboration of problem). Um, I know -- uh, I attend professional meetings, and, uh, some of the Arab scientists I used to work with don't even bother to come anymore, because they-they can't get a visa (elaboration of problem). It's just too much hassle, uh, although they may have been educated here and gone back to their country. Uh, it-it-it's just so much-so much more difficult now that **a lot of goodwill overseas is being lost (II 1.1).**

В высказывании 29 участница развивает Усеченный сценарий в рамках Темы 1 (речь идет о контроле иммиграции на границах) на основе Идеала 1.1 (она рассматривает приезжих студентов как полноценную часть общества): из-за того, что государство усиливает контроль на границах, студентам становится все сложнее попасть в страну ('*It's become much str-much more difficult to come into th-and stay here*', '*they-they have tightened up their controls*'). В высказывании 31 мы можем обнаружить Разработку этого Сценария: участник добавляет, что и ученым-иммигрантам сложнее попасть в страну, особенно если они не европейской внешности, хотя они потенциально могли бы внести большой вклад в общество ('*I attend professional meetings, and, uh, some of the Arab scientists I used to work with don't even bother to come anymore, because they-they can't get a visa*').

В ходе анализа мы выделили 23 высказывания, содержащих Вызов в Форуме № 1 (9, 21, 25, 27, 51, 55, 68, 91, 109, 116, 125, 126, 132, 133, 149, 153, 158, 162, 163, 178, 179, 183, 196) и 20 таких высказываний в Форуме № 2 (26, 32, 42, 47, 58, 72, 75, 78, 97, 99, 101, 120, 131, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 139, 146).

Также в Форуме № 1 было найдено 60 высказываний с Разработкой, а именно высказывания под номерами: 19, 50, 51, 52, 60, 62, 93, 94-99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 108, 117, 119, 121, 130, 131, 133, 134, 136, 140, 142-148, 153, 163, 164, 166 - 168, 173, 175, 184, 186, 187, 195, 196, 200, 202, 205, 206, 211, 217, 220, 221, 224, 230, 235. Форум № 2 содержит 49 таких высказываний, приводим

их номера: 30, 31, 37, 44, 45, 47, 52, 64, 65, 72, 73, 79, 80, 82, 86, 94, 96, 97, 100, 101, 103, 107, 113, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 125, 129-135, 137, 141, 144, 147, 148, 152, 156, 159, 161, 163, 167, 169.

Количество Вызовов и Разработок показывает, что оба форума обладают высокой смысловой связностью, поскольку происходит сценарное взаимодействие и дискуссия.

Во время дискуссии иногда участники выходят за рамки сценарного взаимодействия, такой динамический элемент мы будем называть *Потерей фокуса*. Высказывание с Потерей фокуса не вписывается в ход дискуссии, зачастую тормозит её. Потеря фокуса сигнализирует о понижении внимания участников в связи с избыточностью обсуждения Сценария или отсутствием новых идей. Этот динамический элемент, как и другие, встречается в обоих дискуссиях. Рассмотрим пример из **Форума № 1**:

(47) 78. *Fred. You know, so I ca-I can-I can see-I can see the impact on that, uh, you know, on how it is on them. So I -- you know, it affects -- **it-it-it's-it's -- affects everybody (И 1.1)**. But how it affects people really depends on the size of the community and wh-what the community does when they're there (Problem), if they're **open and an accepting community (Т 1)**. You know, are you interested in going and, you know, purchasing food at, uh -- right here at Joe's Market, uh, in town? I like to go to Joe's Market. Um, but again, food. [Laughter](drift)*

79. *Unidentified Male. We're talking food (drift).*

80. *Unidentified Male. There is a common theme here (drift).*

81. *Fred. Yeah.*

82. *Unidentified Male. All right. Any o-I'm sorry (drift).*

Участник в высказывании 78 развивает Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеала 1.1, который можно сформулировать следующим образом: в маленьких городах в отличие от больших городов, иммигрантам сложнее ассимилироваться и сохранять свою культурную идентичность, так как общественность не принимает их – в маленьких городах люди менее склонны принимать новшества и изменения (*how it affects people really depends on the size of the community and*

*wh-what the community does when they're there*). Впервые этот Сценарий был сформулирован в высказывании 68 (см. пример 43) (*'I think you run the risk of the individual, uh, cultures losing their identities'*). После этого участники дискуссии теряют фокус, и участник начинает шутить про еду (*'I like to go to Joe's Market. Um, but again, food'*), другой участник подхватывает его, пытаясь развить эту мысль (*'We're talking food'*), но приходит в тупик (*'All right. Any o-I'm sorry'*), так как логически это невозможно. Интересно отметить, что после этого Сценарий далее не развивается в дискуссии, даже спустя несколько реплик.

А теперь обратимся к примеру Потери фокуса из **Форума № 2**:

(48) 102. Brad. *One question that keeps coming back to me, and I doubt if I have nearly the knowledge of immigration law (T 1) and how it's created and so on and so forth as most people do here, but I am really questioning how is our immigration law formed(Problem)? I don't know. When you think about most important things that are really important and have a lot of impact on our society, what do we hold for beliefs? What do we believe about immigrants, about immigration, about **people's rights (T 1)**? Whatever it may be, I am wondering **are those written down somewhere (Problem statement)**? Like you said, I think you have to have discussion like this to create those... but what are these decisions being based on is what I'd like to know. Obviously a lot of them are short-term, economic, foreign policy, whatever, but ... I am just wondering how those laws are created. **Do we have a set of beliefs and who decided on those beliefs (И 1.3)**, and this is just a question that keeps coming up to me.*

103. Ruth. *Well, along that line we keep talking about 9-11 and the changes made after that, was that Congress, was that President, who decided that things would be different after 9-11 (Elaboration of the Problem in utterance № 102)?*

104. Unidentified female. *Congress.*

105. Unidentified female. *I think Congressman Leech could... (drift)*

106. Jim (Leech). *As a national law-making body Congress does make laws (T 1) in this area. There are certain discretions ... to the executive branch (Elaboration). But I would like to stress something beyond law. We are the country, but we are a culture, a culture is bigger than government. And when it comes to immigration, for example, you have individual issues, you have family issues, you have community issues. And America is in one sense one great large*

*community with many subsets of communities, and when it comes to immigration, it's community that's more important than law (declaration), over law, undergirds everything. And so **how we approach things is based upon rules** (скрытый И 1.3 – закон превыше всего); these rules can be followed or not followed, but they also get subjected to how communities react. And it's the cultural American community that's bigger than your government or your subset of local governments. **America is after all just a great big family (T 1).***

В высказывании 103 участница разрабатывает Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеала 1.3 в рамках Темы 1, который берет своё начало в высказывании 102: некоторые граждане Америки не знают, как формируются законы (*'I doubt if I have nearly the knowledge of immigration law and how it's created ... as most people do here'* / *'was that Congress, was that President, who decided that things would be different after 9-11'*). После этого другая участница шутит (*'I think Congressman Leech could...'*), и её реплика никак не относится к разработке этого Сценария, что мы и называем Потерей фокуса. Интересно то, что объект шутки (участник форума Джим Лич) после этого активизируется и комментирует мнение участницы по поводу того, что конгресс должен решать законодательные вопросы (в высказывании 106), но в русле другого Декларативного сценария на основе Идеала 1.3: сохранение культуры и устоев Америки важнее любых законов, касающихся иммиграции. Таким образом, и в этом примере Потеря фокуса привела к смене Сценария.

В Форуме № 1 мы выделили 14 высказываний с Потерей фокуса (16, 17, 79-82, 152, 154-157, 165, 171, 222), в то время как в Форуме № 2 нами было обнаружено 7 высказываний (105, 106, 108, 111, 154, 155, 179).

*Поддержка другого участника* (или общее выражение поддержки чего-либо) также является динамическим элементом дискуссии. Высказывания, в которых есть Поддержка как правило не содержат разработки какого-либо Сценария, так же, как и высказывания с Потерей фокуса. Зачастую трудно определить на основе какой Идеологической модели построено высказывание. Рассмотрим примеры из обоих форумов.

### **Форум № 1.**

*(49) 208. Jack. And I respect and I'm in awe with people who have been there. He's worked in every chicken plant in Sussex County (acknowledgement). So when you hear people who have been there, done that, I can't see how you could not respect and be swayed by their experience and decisions (acknowledgement). Good program.*

В примере 49 участник выражает признательность и уважение участнику по имени Тони, который работал на тяжелом производстве (птицефабрика). Важно отметить, что, если смотреть в целом (во всем форуме) Джек придерживается Идеологической модели 1.1, в то время как Тони – Идеологической модели 1.3. Таким образом, можно предположить, что участник таким способом хочет показать, что, несмотря на разные точки зрения, он уважает участника и его мнение. Также интересно то, что Тони высказывался намного ранее (высказывание 166), и уже несколько участников успели высказаться и развить Сценарии, прежде чем Джек решил высказаться в поддержку Тони.

## **Форум № 2.**

*(50) 21. John. I guess my... my interest is in terms of just general public policy and this is one of those issues that it tends to be kind of a third rail, a hard one that quickly can...d... I guess... people throwing fire bombs at each other about issues, instead of talking about it... so I thought it would be interesting to come to a forum like this and hopefully get some nice balanced dialogue (acknowledgement), 'cause I do think this is a complex issue.*

В примере 50 мы можем увидеть пример выражения Поддержки идеи организации форума: участник считает, что в других ситуациях люди не способны к сбалансированному диалогу, поэтому он выражает признательность организаторам форума по вопросам иммиграции (*'I thought it would be interesting to come to a forum like this and hopefully get some nice balanced dialogue'*).

В обоих форумах мы обнаружили по 5 высказываний с Поддержкой. Приводим номера высказываний: 209, 223, 226, 228, 233 в Форуме № 1 и 21, 97, 172, 173, 181 в Форуме № 2.

Если подвести итог параграфа, мы выделили пять динамических элементов и объяснили, чем они отличаются, и как их можно выделить в форумах. На

следующем этапе нами будет показано то, как сценарное и динамическое взаимодействие помогают определить смысл форумов.

### 2.3.2 Анализ взаимодействия в форуме в Джорджтауне.

Ключевым параметром качества дискуссии будет являться диалогическое взаимодействие по поводу Сценариев. Однако очень важным показателем будет и отсутствие сценарного взаимодействия в тех случаях, когда участники используют Усеченные сценарии.

В ходе форума можно выделить 7 длительных эпизодов сценарного взаимодействия и 4 случая конфликтного противостояния. Мы говорим о длительных эпизодах сценарной дискуссии, когда они охватывают от 3-х высказываний и в них задействовано от 3-х участников. В этих случаях можно говорить о наличии собственно групповой дискуссии. Также были выделены случаи малого конфликтного взаимодействия (5) и малого сценарного взаимодействия (9), где было задействовано только два участника. Как показал предыдущий параграф для того, чтобы развить Сценарий, участник не обязательно сразу выскажется по поводу проблемы или добавит новый путь решения. Поэтому высказывания, развивающие один и тот же Сценарий, не всегда могут идти одно за другим.

Рассмотрим пример, демонстрирующий эпизод дискуссии, основанный на конфликтном взаимодействии:

(43)172. Moderator. Right. And so again, flip that around to this approach where it says, "We need to focus on our immigration on only those with **skilled labor (T 2)**."

173. Sylvia. I think it's the American way (elaboration + challenge). Excuse me, that's it.

174. Facilitator. What do you mean by that?

175. Sylvia. Uh, that is what's important. Like he was saying, it's all about the dollar. How we can get the **cheapest labor (T 2)** or the most for the least amount, for the least cost (T 2). **The most benefit for the least cost (И 2.2)** (elaboration + challenge).

176. Linda. But approach, approach three is saying only bring **the elite (T 2: high-skilled workers)** of the immigrants (elaboration of outcome in Moderator 172).



177. *Female Voice. The doctors.*

178. *Linda. And I don't think that's, that would be right (И 2.2) (challenge to Moderator 172).*

179. *Ed. But isn't that dollar what you're coming here for? What, what these workers (Т 2) are coming here for (challenges both Linda and Sylvia)?*

180. *Tony. That's right. [unintelligible].*

181. *Ed. I mean, you're, you're saying that it's an evil, but that's, that's what they're coming here for (challenge to Linda). *I mean, we have to realize that we're operating, whether we like it or not, in a **global economy (Т 2)**. And when we make decisions here locally, we need to do them with an eye towards that **global economy (Т 2)**. Uh, it's like Fred said, I agree that we ought to make, uh, it a little more restrictive (И 1.3) for people to cross our borders (elaboration of outcome). And when you do that, uh, you have to consider the **cost (Т 2)**. It's a daunting task to if you make it more restrictive (И 1.3), then you're going to have more illegals. Uh, so it's a. it's a just a gigantic task to be done (problem).**

182. *Jack. And some of, some of you will remember when they put, they put up the Berlin wall (Т 1: about the border control) and how was it ever going to come down? (challenge to Ed) But it was torn down by their own people (И 1.1). We could put a wall (Т 1) all along the southeast, southwest portion of this country, but, you know, they'll find a way in (elaboration of problem). *Somebody said that.**

В примере 42 эпизод конфликтного взаимодействия сначала развивается в рамках Темы 2, но заканчивается в рамках Темы 1. Здесь представлены Идеалы 2.2, 2.3 и Идеал 1.1, конфликтующие между собой. Начинается дискуссия с Модератора, который представляет «подход 3» из брошюры, который имеет маркированность Идеала 2.3, поскольку он гласит, что нужно контролировать поток иммигрантов и приветствовать только хорошо обученных специалистов, которые приносили бы пользу экономике США. Сразу же Сильвия возражает против этого подхода, развивая свою точку зрения в высказывании 167 (Декларативный сценарий, основанный на Идеале 2.2: *'Which brings to light an American value that wasn't mentioned in the beginning, discount prices, money. That's a big one and no one even said it.'*). Она продолжает мысль о том, что

экономика Америки основана на стремлении везде найти выгоду. И в высказывании Сильвии это представлено как нечто негативное, поскольку эта несправедливая экономическая система, построенная на дешевой рабочей силе, ставит иммигрантов в уязвимое положение (Идеал 2.2) (*'How we can get the cheapest labor or the most for the least amount, for the least cost. The most benefit for the least cost'*).

В следующих высказываниях (176-176) Линда с позиции Идеала 2.2 также выражает протест по поводу подхода 3 в высказывании 172 Модератора (Идеал 2.3). Однако, Эд, основывающий свои рассуждения на Идеологической модели 2.3 (*'we ought to make, uh, it a little more restrictive for people to cross our borders'*), вступает в полемику и с Линдой, и с Сильвией, бросая им Вызов: хотя Линда считает этот подход неправильным, а Сильвия негативно отзывается об американских экономических реалиях, иммигранты ничего не теряют, а, наоборот, выигрывают в этой ситуации – они приезжают, чтобы заработать деньги, и ничего в этом плохого нет. Далее Эд развивает другой сценарий, упомянутый в дискуссии ранее, согласно которому необходимо ограничить поток иммиграции (*'I agree that we ought to make, uh, it a little more restrictive for people to cross our borders'*), где происходит Тематический сдвиг (Тема 1), поскольку он говорит об усилении контроля на границах. Что, в свою очередь, вызывает конфликтное взаимодействие. Джэк считает, что невозможно воздвигнуть стену, поскольку люди все равно снесут её, и этими словами он бросает Вызов Эду.

В этом эпизоде конфликтное взаимодействие обусловлено идеологическими отличиями, а также несогласием на сценарном уровне, которое проявляется в виде Вызовов. Важно отметить, что ссылки на других участников или Разработка, также встречаются в эпизодах конфликтного взаимодействия как основа для аргументации.

Другие эпизоды длительного конфликтного взаимодействия: 1-6, 54-60, 211-220.

Мы также выделили малые эпизоды конфликтного взаимодействия (2 высказывания), в которых везде присутствует Вызов как динамический элемент. Приведем номера высказываний: 89-91, 130-131, 139-140, 161-162, 172 и 183.

Приведем случай длительного сценарного взаимодействия, которое происходит сразу после конфликтного взаимодействия в предыдущих высказываниях. Для этого обратимся к примеру 43.

(44) 183. Marissa. *And also you need to have a balance because if you, uh, bring immigrants, only professional immigrants, you're going to have **immigrant professionals (T 2)** teaching in universities. You're going to have **professionals (T 2)** in the medical field. You're going to have professionals in economics and science. And then what is going to happen with the American people? Are those the ones who are going to work in the poultry plant (T 2)? (Challenge) And then there is going to have -- there is going to be another problem. **You need people at all different levels (M 2.1)**. Uh, you need the, you know, the [first] line workers (T 2), you need professionals, you need doctors (problem statement). I mean, we have a great shortage in the, in the medical field and what is happening? We're bringing doctors, but you're -- you know, you don't see as many white American doctors anymore because there are a lot of doctors from other, from other places (Problem). And people even doesn't -- don't like that. Where is my typical American doctor? I see Chinese doctors. I see, you know Iraqi doctors or from other places. So if you only bring the skilled, you know, uh, immigrants, that's going to cause another problem (Problem).*

184. Phil. And you're also draining those countries of their **skilled people (T 2)** (Elaboration of the problem).

185. Jack. Good point.

186. Phil. I mean, all the Philippine nurses here are -- there is no, no Philippine **nurses (T 2)** left, you know, in the Philippines (Elaboration of the problem).

187. Ed. Along that same line, I, I had a gentleman who worked here in the **chicken industry (T 2)** in Georgetown. Uh, he rented an apartment from me and, uh, I got to know him pretty well. And I asked him where he came from. I believe he came from -- my memory is that he came from Guatemala, I believe. And I asked him what he did before he came here. He was an **attorney (T 2)** (Elaboration of the problem).

188. *Male Voice. Is that right?*

189. *Ed. He was an attorney in his own land, but he's coming here and working in the, in the chicken industry (T 2) (Elaboration of the problem). So, I mean, it's, it's not always the dregs that are coming here to work in our industries.*

Групповая дискуссия проходит в рамках Темы 2, поскольку речь идет о рабочих местах и разных профессиях, а также уровне навыков иммигрантов. Все высказывания принадлежат к Идеалу 2.1, так как участники считают, что как иммигрантам, так и гражданам Америки должны предоставляться равные возможности в трудоустройстве (*'You need people at all different levels'*). В этом эпизоде можно выделить два сценария, продолжающих и дополняющих друг друга.

Первый сценарий представлен в высказывании 183: участница считает неправильным то, что государство способствует процессу иммиграции только в тех случаях, когда иммигранты хорошо обучены, имеют хорошие навыки и могут занять престижные рабочие места. Когда это происходит, то часто они занимают места граждан Америки (этой частью сценария она ссылается на Идеал 2.3). Интересно отметить, что групповая дискуссия начинается с Вызова модератору (высказывание 172: *Moderator. Right. And so again, flip that around to this approach where it says, "We need to focus on our immigration on only those with skilled labor."*). Она предлагает решение – государству нужны иммигранты на разных рабочих местах с разными уровнями зарплат, тогда у всех будут равные возможности (Развернутый сценарий).

В высказывании 184 участник предлагает другой Сценарий в поддержку предыдущего: привлекая в страну только высокообразованных и хорошо обученных иммигрантов, Америка тем самым способствует «утечке мозгов» из других стран (*'And you're also draining those countries of their skilled people'*). Все последующие высказывания развивают проблемную часть сценария, не предлагая решения, и формулируют Усеченный сценарий. 185 высказывание поддерживает 184, а в высказывании 186 участник развивает проблему в высказывании 184 (*'there is no, no Philippine nurses left, you know, in the*

*Philippines*’). В высказывании 187 участник делится историей из жизни, основанной на Усеченном сценарии, а затем добавляет другой аспект проблемы: не всегда те, кто покинул другую страну, работают по своей профессии, несмотря на уровень навыков и опыт работы на хорошей должности (*‘He was an attorney in his own land, but he's coming here and working in the, in the chicken industry’*).

Другие эпизоды длительного сценарного взаимодействия: 40-53; 68-78; 84, 88, 91; 94-108; 117-119; 140-148.

Малое сценарное взаимодействие основано на Разработке сценариев, подробнее об этом динамическом элементе мы уже говорили в предыдущем параграфе. Примеры малого сценарного взаимодействия: 6-7; 9-10; 31-32; 57-60; 125-126; 167-169; 194-195; 220-222; 235-237.

Всего в форуме участниками было разработано 11 Развернутых сценариев, 16 Усеченных сценариев и 8 Декларативных (см. таблицу № 5):

Таблица № 5.

Виды сценариев/Тема	Тема 1	Тема 2
Развернутые	И 1.1 – 1 И 1.2 – 3 И 1.3 – 4	И 2.1 – 1 И 2.2 – 1 И 2.3 – 1
Всего: 11	Общее число: 8	Общее число: 3
Усеченные	И 1.1 – 7 И 1.2 – 2 И 1.3 – 2	И 2.1 – 2 И 2.2 – 1 И 2.3 – 2
Всего: 16	Общее число: 11	Общее число: 5
Декларативные	И 1.1 – 4 И 1.2 – 1 И 1.3 – 0	И 2.1 – 3 И 2.2 – 0 И 2.3 – 0
Всего: 8	Общее число: 5	Общее число: 3

Можно сделать вывод о том, что форум, который прошел в Джорждтауне, обладает высокой степенью связности, поскольку присутствуют случаи групповой дискуссии, а также в ходе обсуждения разработано множество сценариев.

### 2.3.3 Анализ взаимодействия в Сидар-Рапидсе.

В форуме, который прошел в Сидар-Рапидсе, нами было выделено 3 эпизода длительного сценарного взаимодействия и 3 эпизода малого сценарного взаимодействия (Разработка Сценариев), а также 4 эпизода длительного конфликтного взаимодействия и 5 эпизодов малого конфликтного взаимодействия (Вызов другому участнику).

Рассмотрим пример конфликтного взаимодействия:

(45) 133. Matt. <...> Now in terms of border security (T 1) and enforcement, I think immigration reform (T 1) should definitely have very strong enforcement (elaboration of outcome – Miriam 132), because that’s national security, it’s a great concern, not just to native-born Americans, but to immigrant Americans. I am VERY concerned about the safety of my community and terrorism (problem). The thing is that right now, by having such huge illegal activity, such limited legal channels (T 1), you have so much underground activity of human smuggling (И 1.2) (Problem), and that is actually a national security concern. So, by instituting legal channels we would would drain that swamp of illegal activity and actually improve security at the border (T 1) (Outcome). And there has to be also significant enforcement increase, once you institute those legal channels in order to deal with, with that issue.(Outcome).

134. Dail. It. it helps me, because yesterday the headlines in the paper were “Al-Qaeda finds that the best way to get into the country now is the Mexican border (T 1).” (Problem) And we talked a little bit earlier about removing the border guards to some extent, that simply is not gonna fly (И 1.3) in this country (Problem) in this ... age, but your point about illegal trafficking, that’s how they are gonna come in (challenge to Matt 133). And so...

135. Matt. And do you want the border patrol (T 1) to be focused on intelligence to prevent terrorism or to be concerned with stopping children and families at the border? (challenge to Dail) ... It’s just not the rational allocation of resources for national security (T 1) at some point (problem elaboration).

136. Moderator. *Let's come back to an earlier point for just a minute too though. If I'm a someone who is wanting to look at this as an economic issue (T 2) and take a hard-line economic position (T 2) on it (Thematic shift) and you are telling me that's not being sufficiently humane (challenge) to... accommodating of someone who is working here... perhaps even working here illegally (T 2) and sending all of their wages that they can out of our economy back into another economy (И 2.3) (problem)... that's hardly an argument for that being a good thing... (challenge)*

137. Mariam. *Well, that's not the case with most immigrants, most immigrants want to come here and make a life here for themselves and their families, but there are some immigrants who want to come and work (T 2) and they pay taxes (T 2), while they live here they invest in the community (И 2.1) (declaration), they make a life here for a while, and then, you know, they go back home. They are not... they need to live here, so they need to spend money here (declaration).*

138. Karen. *They are buying for themselves, whereas their family back home that they are sending the money to (T 2) is buying things (T 2) in their home country, and not, not in the United States (И 2.3). Is that what you're saying? (challenge)*

139. Miriam. *... you are saying... by doing... by sending money (T 2) back to their home country, they are shoring up their own economy (T 2), so that they don't have to come here and work (challenge, declaration). You know, you've got a symbiotic relationship here (И 2.1). When this happens. And... I wanna say one this about this terrorism thing, people are forgetting that one of the largest terrorists in this country are illegal drugs (problem, thematic shift). You know, you've got a lot of that coming into this country, you don't have... by any generous measure, if there is ten thousand Al-Qaeda, you've got nothing compared to the illegal trafficking (T 1) of drugs that's coming into this country (challenge to Dail 134). And I think people are forgetting that.*

В примере 45 дискуссия разворачивается сначала в рамках Темы 1, затем Модератор переводит обсуждение в русло Темы 2, в конце этого эпизода дискуссия снова возвращается в рамки Темы 1. Данный длительный эпизод конфликтного взаимодействия начинается с высказывания 133, в котором участник разрабатывает вариант решения проблемы сложности устройства законов, касающихся иммиграции (132 Mariam: 'we need a change in immigration

laws’). Он добавляет, что в связи с сложившейся ситуацией, иммиграционную реформу необходимо сделать приоритетным направлением. Далее на основе Идеала 1.2 он продолжает высказываться по поводу предложения по изменению иммиграционной политики: по его мнению, необходимо создать законный способ въезда иммигрантов в страну (*‘by instituting legal channels we would drain that swamp of illegal activity and actually improve security at the border’*).

Однако, в высказывании 134 Дейл возражает против таких мер, поскольку откроется ещё один канал для террористов (*‘Al-Qaeda finds that the best way to get into the country now is the Mexican border’*). Ранее в дискуссии говорилось об уменьшении охраны на границах и перенаправлении этих средств на нужды государства (127 Ruth: *‘I think that we are spending too much money on the borders and not in heartland’*). Участник дискуссии с этим не согласен, так как считает, что это тоже способствует нелегальному проникновению террористов в страну. В высказывании 135 Мэтт бросает Вызов Дейлу, продолжая утверждать, что усиление контроля на границах – неправильная трата ресурсов (*‘do you want the border patrol to be focused on intelligence to prevent terrorism or to be concerned with stopping children and families at the border?’*).

В высказывании 136 происходит Тематический сдвиг. Модератор с позиции Идеала 2.3 бросает вызов представителям Идеала 2.2: люди, которых все считают жертвами несправедливой экономики США, проникают нелегально и отправляют деньги, заработанные в Америке в свою родную страну - тем самым они вредят американской экономике. В следующем высказывании участница бросает Вызов модератору и разрабатывает Декларативный сценарий на основе Идеала 2.1: иммигранты не только отправляют деньги из страны, но и тратят их внутри страны, платят налоги. На что Карен на основе Идеала 2.3 возражает (Вызов), что семьи, которым они высылают «американские» деньги, тратят их у себя в стране, а не в США. Другая участница отвечает на этот Вызов с позиции Идеала 2.1, разрабатывая Декларативный сценарий: существует взаимная выгода при таком обмене, так как, посылая деньги в родную страну, иммигранты



способствуют укреплению её экономики, создавая почву для того, чтобы меньше иммигрантов стремилось покинуть её в будущем. Далее происходит второй Тематический сдвиг, и участница бросает Вызов Дейлу. Она считает, что нелегальное распространение наркотиков гораздо серьезнее проблемы терроризма ('if there is ten thousand Al-Qaeda, you've got nothing compared to the illegal trafficking of drugs that's coming into this country').

Другие эпизоды длительного конфликтного взаимодействия: 51-62; 88-99; 166-170. Малые эпизоды конфликтного взаимодействия содержат в себе Вызов и задействуют только двух человек: 22-26, 41-42, 64-67, 100-101, 130-131.

Обратимся к примеру длительного сценарного взаимодействия:

(46) 28. *Dave. Well, in my own family, the roots of how the folks got here goes back so far I have no idea. So, immigration in that sense is so distant. However, in my wife's family, her grandparents, aunts, uncles immigrated here from Sweden. And so she has personal stories of when they moved into Chicago area of the men basically **working as carpenters (T 2)** and the women **working as maids (T 2)**, and as **cooks (T 2)** for wealthy Chicago families. And that the struggles that they had in terms of **language (T 1)** and **getting adjusted (T 1)** opened up a whole new sort of sense to me from what I had experienced; so, it's been an issue that I have interest in between looking back a couple of generations and then looking to the day what's similar what's different... and it's sometimes I think I can tell the difference, and sometimes I can't (declaration).*

29. *Jerry. Jim, my younger daughter has been living and married in Merida, Mexico, and has been there now for almost ten years. So, **we've had lots of opportunities (T 1)** to travel to Mexico and initially I was nervous being in a strange ... and felt awkward because of the **language (T 1)** and have gradually overcome the awkwardness of **language (T 1)** (elaboration of language problem), but what our experience's allowed us to do is to observe first-hand the stark discrepancy between the haves and the havenots in many, many... in all parts I would guess (problem) – but the parts that we've been in Mexico, and easy to see why people of sparse means would **economically seek to improve themselves by moving (T 1)**. So, I have ... **greater empathy for... for... people (H 1.2) whose living conditions are such that it simply drives them out of their own homes** (problem).*

30. Colin. I guess I would agree with that a lot; my role in the company that I have requires me to travel, let's say, approximately 40 to 70 percent of the time to all areas of the world and I spend a lot of time working and teaching people who don't **speak English (T 1)** and **don't have the same kind of luxuries in terms of the educational systems (T 1) (H 1.2)** that we have here in the United States (elaboration of problem – Jerry 29), and so... seeing their perspective from that way and the way that I had then to design my materials that I'm training them and so forth with... hearing their stories of **how much they would like to come to the United States (T 1 – seeking opportunity)** and so forth. Makes it personal in a way that I wouldn't have known, I thought it would have been.

31. Judy. I have a story, I am working with a woman through the promised jobs program and welfare reform program, who is a battered alien (elaboration of problem Colin 30). She came to the United States because of a relationship that she had developed over Internet with a man who lives here in this area. And she married the man and came here in the United States and now that he has **abused her (H 1.2)**, and so she has left, **she's been left now kind of on her own (H 1.2)** and I understand that she does have rights as far as being able to stay here, because of that connotation (elaboration of problem), I guess, ... it's being a battered alien, but I've read somewhat recently, I guess in Newsweek, that that is a thing that's happening quite often in the United States, that women are coming here to seek a better life and to find some stability (T 1) and then things happen and that's not working out, and so then **they are kind of stuck with what to do (H 1.2) now, so...** (problem)

32. Miriam. From my standpoint, **I have a foot in each culture (T 1)**. Half of my family has been here a long time, but they were immigrants, and part of my family is... recent immigrants. My husband is a new American, I have one foot, you know, where "we've been here for a long time," one foot where it's new. And growing up with both of these issues, I see <it> from both perspectives, you know, some people say "well, you shouldn't be coming, because you should stay home or "go back to your country." people take a look at me and my scarf and they say to me "Get out of my country!" (Challenging H 1.3) You know, and they just see that, that's all they see. But as far as the women coming here - there is a double sided issue there – you have women that come who come to marry and they want to stay here, and there is a battered spouse law (elaboration of problem Judy 31), where they can stay, if they are battered, then there is the ones who **come seeking a better life (T 1)**, but you've got men and women, I've traveled extensively and the people come to me and say: "How can I emigrate, well, how can I get into

*the US?" The only thing you can tell them is to go through the channels (problem). But overseas the United States to some of these immigrants is a shining star (T 1), it's going to allow them to get away from dictatorships, to have a better life (T 1), and when they get here there is a completely different reality (I 1.2).*

Сценарное взаимодействие начинается в высказывании 28. Участник разрабатывает Декларативный сценарий на основе Идеала 1.1 в рамках Темы 1. Все последующие высказывания будут находиться в рамках Темы 1. Высказывание принадлежит Теме 1, так как приоритетным вопросом в высказывании является преодоление языкового барьера и приспособление к жизни в новой стране (*'the struggles that they had in terms of language and getting adjusted'*). Дейв считает, что иммигранты самостоятельно способны ассимилироваться – так было в прошлом, и то же самое происходит сейчас, что показывает, что его высказывание построено на основе Идеала 1.1 (*'what's similar what's different... and it's sometimes I think I can tell the difference, and sometimes I can't'*).

В следующем высказывании участник говорит о языковом барьере (*'and felt awkward because of the language and have gradually overcome the awkwardness of language and felt awkward because of the language and have gradually overcome the awkwardness of language'*), но затем разрабатывает другой Усеченный сценарий на основе Идеала 1.2. Он считает, что в других странах разница между бедными и богатыми настолько огромна, что некоторые люди вынуждены покинуть свои дома для того, чтобы искать лучшей жизни в США. Он испытывает сострадание к иммигрантам, поэтому высказывание основано на Идеале 1.2 (*'I have ... greater empathy for... for... people'*).

Далее все участники разрабатывают этот Сценарий. Колин говорит о том, что проблема социального неравенства в других странах затрагивает и сферу образования (*'people who don't speak English and don't have the same kind of luxuries in terms of the educational systems that we have here in the United States'*), поэтому люди приезжают в США. Джуди рассказывает историю о женщинах, которые выходят замуж за американцев, так как стремятся к лучшей жизни, но

затем они оказываются в затруднительном положении – их мужья унижают и оскорбляют их, и им приходится уходить от них. В высказывании 32 участница комментирует Декларативный сценарий (Дейв 28): она говорит о том, что иммигранты продолжают приезжать и ассимилироваться (она сама является ярким примером), несмотря на то, что многие люди против этого. Она возмущена тем, что люди не принимают иммигрантов, поэтому она бросает Вызов представителям Идеала 1.3 (*“well, you shouldn’t be coming, because you should stay home or “go back to your country,” people take a look at me and my scarf and they say to me “Get out of my country!”*). А затем она разрабатывает проблему оскорбленных женщин – в стране есть установленные законы, которые защищают их права, в отличие от тех людей (неважно, женщин или мужчин), которые приезжают в США за лучшей жизнью. После этого она разрабатывает новый Сценарий, состоящий из следующей проблемы: не существует легальных способов иммиграции (*“How can I emigrate, well, how can I get into the US?” The only thing you can tell them is to go through the channels’*) для людей, которые жаждут лучшей жизни, ищут укрытия от тирании.

Таким образом, в этом эпизоде разные участники создают единый текст дискуссии, дополняя друг друга, несмотря на то, что иногда разрабатывают другие Сценарии. Приведем номера высказываний других длительных эпизодов сценарного взаимодействия: 102-111, 118-121; а также малого сценарного взаимодействия: 43-44, 115-116, 132-133.

Всего в форуме, который прошел в штате Айова в Сидар-Рapidсе, было развито 14 Развернутых, 15 Усеченных и 8 Декларативных сценариев (см. Таблица № 6).

Таблица № 6

Виды сценариев/Тема	Тема 1	Тема 2
---------------------	--------	--------

Развернутые	И 1.1 – 4 И 1.2 – 1 И 1.3 – 3	И 2.1 – 3 И 2.2 – 0 И 2.3 – 3
Всего: 14	Общее число: 8	Общее число: 6
Усеченные	И 1.1 – 3 И 1.2 – 1 И 1.3 – 4	И 2.1 – 0 И 2.2 – 2 И 2.3 – 5
Всего: 15	Общее число: 8	Общее число: 7
Декларативные	И 1.1 – 3 И 1.2 – 1 И 1.3 – 1	И 2.1 – 3 И 2.2 – 0 И 2.3 – 0
Всего: 8	Общее число: 5	Общее число: 3

Форум № 2, как и Форум № 1 обладает высокой степенью связности, если обратить внимание на количество разработанных сценариев и наличие эпизодов групповой дискуссии.

## Выводы по ГЛАВЕ 2

1. Иммиграция в США – сложный и противоречивый вопрос. Граждане США считают, что проблемы, связанные с иммиграцией, достойны внимания и в обсуждения, а также требуют принятия мер.
2. В этой главе представлена семантическая структура двух форумов, состоящая из трех уровней – Тем, Идеалов и Сценариев. В каждом из форумов было выделено две темы, три идеала и несколько сценариев.
3. В нашем исследовании мы показываем, каким образом можно выделить Темы, Идеалы и Сценарии на основании определенных маркеров в транскриптах форумов. Также мы приводим списки типичных маркеров для каждого из уровней анализа (Тема, Идеал, Сценарий). Сравнивая Темы и Идеалы в обоих форумах, мы приходим к выводу, что в обоих форумах одна и та же ценностная база (Тема 1 и Тема 2) и идеология (по три Идеала в рамках каждой из Тем).
4. Раздел 2.2 показывает виды сценариев (Развитый, Усеченный, Декларативный). Участники были активны при развитии сценариев разных видов на основании всех Идеалов.
5. Раздел 2.3 показывает динамические элементы, встречающиеся в дискуссии, обеспечивающие её развитие (Тематический сдвиг, Вызов, Разработка, Потеря фокуса, Поддержка). Также производится анализ взаимодействия в обоих форумах по-отдельности, который выявляет высокую степень связности в обоих форумах.

## ЗАКЛЮЧЕНИЕ

Проведенный анализ позволяет оценить общественную дискуссию как целостный текст. Жанровая специфика текста форума заключается в том, что текст состоит из высказываний нескольких участников, при этом один из них – модератор, который ведет дискуссию и дает идеологические ориентиры для того, чтобы представители разных идеологий могли высказать свое мнение. Отдельные высказывания участников не имеют смысла вне контекста всего текста форума, что говорит о его связности и цельности. Таким образом, смысл текста форума можно определить, как опыт, который человек обретает, воспринимая текст как одно целое.

В нашей работе определение Тем и Идеалов позволяет уточнить положения, связанные с теорией текста. Термин «Тема» сочетает в себе многие понятия: конвенциональное знание, фрейм, стереотипические ситуации, базовое знание и ценности. Темы являются обязательным условием взаимопонимания и возможности диалога. Термин Идеал (основанный на понимании «фреймов» Ч. Филлмора, уточняющий понятия «когнитивные модели» и «ментальные пространства») обозначает идеальное положение вещей, где ответственность за указанные действия распределена между агентами. Он помогает структурировать ценностные суждения говорящих и разделить их на несколько Идеологий (в нашем случае их 3). Напомним, что Темы являются непререкаемой основой для формирования мнения (*the just-so judgments*), а Идеалы существуют как суждения-долженствования (*the should-be judgments*). Разделение этих двух уровней смысла текста дискуссии позволяет описать механизм сосуществования разнообразных позиций в рамках одной языковой культуры. Тематический императив маркирован единообразно в высказываниях участников, которые по-разному выражают свое отношение к тому, как данный императив должен реализовываться в обсуждаемой ситуативной модели.

В нашем исследовании аналитический метод помогает объяснить, как смысл формируется в ходе дискуссии. Все высказывания участников объединяют Тема 1 или 2, определенные группы участников объединяют

Идеалы (принадлежность высказывания к тому или иному Идеалу мы определяем через маркеры) в рамках Тем, а на уровне Сценариев (проблемных ситуаций) мы видим, как Идеалы разных участников сталкиваются, как участники форума продолжают разрабатывать Сценарии, упомянутые ранее, формулируют новые проблемы и пути решения. Таким образом, когда мы проводим анализ взаимодействия между участниками, становится ясно, каким образом высказывания между собой связаны, какие конкретные маркеры повторяются в разных высказываниях, и как Сценарий развивается в ходе дискуссии разными участниками – всё это формирует смысл дискуссии.

Приведенный анализ показывает, что динамика общественной дискуссии связана с наличием конфликта между ценностными моделями различных уровней. Участники дискуссии вовлечены в обсуждение имеющихся противоречий. При этом они могут приходить к условному согласию на уровне Сценариев.

Хотя мы рассмотрели только один из многих видов общественной дискуссии, на примере двух форумов можно видеть, что выявление маркеров Идеалов (или Идеологических моделей) и реконструкция ценностных суждений служит надежным инструментом для анализа взаимодействий между участниками дискуссии. Этот инструмент позволяет давать характеристику диалога как целостного текста, который в большей или меньшей степени удовлетворяет имеющуюся у участников потребность в создании коллективного видения проблемной ситуации.

Также выявление маркеров на трех уровнях (Темы, Идеалы, Сценарии) может помочь модераторам эффективнее управлять дискуссией. Если проанализировать то, как модераторы справлялись со своей ролью в обоих форумах, можно сказать, что в Форуме № 2 модератору удавалось более эффективно направлять дискуссию. В Форуме № 1 у модератора не всегда получалось сменить Идеологическую модель, на основании которой велась дискуссия, что привело к преобладанию Идеала 1.1 в самом начале дискуссии. Также он не всегда мог четко представить ту или иную позицию из брошюры. В



отличие от него, модератор в Форуме № 2 постоянно помогал участникам переключиться на другой Идеал, таким образом помогая дискуссии развиваться.

На данный момент, работ, которые рассматривают форумы как единый текст, состоящий из высказываний разных участников, не так много. Поэтому проведенное исследование открывает новые перспективы исследования.

## БИБЛИОГРАФИЯ

1. Гуревич П. С. Это человек: Антология. – М.: Высшая школа, 1995. – 320 с.
2. Карасик В.И. «Культурные доминанты в языке» // Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. [Электронный ресурс] – В., 2002. - С.166-205 Режим доступа: <http://philologos.narod.ru/ling/karasik.htm> (дата обращения: 15.06.2016).
3. Ван Дейк, Т. А., Кинч, В. Стратегии понимания связного текста // Новое в зарубежной лингвистике. [Электронный ресурс] – М., 1988. Режим доступа: <http://philologos.narod.ru/ling/dijk.htm> (дата обращения: 25.04.2017).
4. Amsler T. (2007) *Planning Public Forums: Questions to guide local officials*. Sacramento, CA: Institute for Local Government.
5. Bakhtin, M.M. (1986) *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans.by McGee V. W. Austin, Tx: University of Texas Press.
6. Barker et al. (2012) *Democratizing Deliberation: A Political Theory Anthology*. The Kettering Foundation Press.
7. Bartlett, F. C. *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1932.
8. Batalova, J. *Immigrants in the U.S. Armed Forces*, 2008. Available at: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/immigrants-us-armed-forces/>
9. Center for Immigration Studies, *Immigrant Population at Record 40 Million in 2010*, 2011. Available at: <http://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/immigrant-population-at-record-40-million-in-2010-131205954.html>
10. Clarke I. et al. (2012) *A Context-sensitive Approach to Analysing Talk in Strategy Meetings*. British Journal of Management, [Vol. 23, Iss. 4](#), 455–473.
11. Chandler, D. *The Act of writing*. Aberystwyth: UWA,1995.
12. Charteris-Black, J. *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
13. Elliott D, Mayadas N. S., Segal U. A. *Immigration Worldwide: Policies, Practices, and Trends* – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Available at: <http://www.thedivineconspiracy.org/Z5254F.pdf>
14. Fairclough N. (2004) *Analysing Discourse*. MPG Books Ltd.

15. Fairclough, I., Fairclough, N Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students. London, New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis Group, 2012.
16. Fauconnier G. 1985. Mental Spaces. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
17. Fillmore C. (1976) *Frame semantics and the nature of language*. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences: Conference on the Origin and Development of Language and Speech. Vol. 280: 20-32.
18. Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, New York: Pantheon.
19. Gudowsky N., Bechtold U. (2013) *The Role of Information in Public Participation*. *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 9: Iss. 1, Article 3.
20. Harris, Z. S. (1954). *Distributional structure*. *Word*, 10, 140–162.
21. Henton D., Melville J. (2005) *Collaborative governance: A Guide for Grantmakers*. William and Flora Hewlett Foundation
22. Jorgensen M., Phillips L. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. SAGE Publications
23. Karerat, R. L-1B visas to become easier to get: Barack Obama, 2015. Available at: <https://www.americanbazaaronline.com/2015/03/24/l-1b-visas-to-become-easier-to-get-barack-obama/>
24. KhosraviNik M. (2010) *Actor descriptions, action attributions, and argumentation : towards a systematization of CDA analytical categories in the representation of social groups*. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7 (1). pp. 55-72.
25. Lakoff G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
26. Langacker R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar*. Theoretical prerequisites, Vol. 1. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
27. Lee, J., Rytina, N. Naturalizations in the United States: 2008, 2009. Available at: [https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/natz\\_fr\\_2008.pdf](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/natz_fr_2008.pdf)
28. Levine, Peter; Fung, Archon; and Gastil, John (2005) "Future Directions for Public Deliberation," *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 3.
29. McKay, R. Family Reunification, 2003. Available at: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/family-reunification/>
30. McShea, R. J., McShea, D. W. *Biology and the Foundation of Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

31. Minsky M. 1975. *A framework for representing knowledge*. The Psychology of Computer Vision, ed. by Patrick Henry Winston, 211-277. New York: McGraw-Hill.
32. Musolff A. (2006) *Metaphor Scenarios in Public Discourse*. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 21:1, 23-38
33. Niemeyer, S. (2004) *Deliberation in the Wilderness: Displacing Symbolic Politics*. *Environmental Politics*, 13(2), 347-372.
34. O'Doherty K., Kieran C. (2013) *Synthesising the outputs of deliberation: Extracting meaningful results from a public forum*. *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 9: Iss. 1, Article 8.
35. Papademetriou, D., Terrazas A. *Immigrants in the United States and the Current Economic Crisis*, 2009. Available at: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/immigrants-united-states-and-current-economic-crisis/>
36. Putnam H. (1975). *Mind, language and reality*. Philosophical papers, Vol. II. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
37. Smith C. (2003) *Modes of Discourse: The Local Structure of texts*. Cambridge University Press
38. Spada P., Vreeland J. (2013) *Who Moderates the Moderators? The Effect of Non-neutral Moderators in Deliberative Decision Making*. *Journal of Public Deliberation*: Vol. 9: Iss. 2, Article 3.
39. US Bureau of Consular Affairs. *Nonimmigrant Visa Statistics*, 2010. Available at: <https://travel.state.gov/content/visas/en/law-and-policy/statistics/non-immigrant-visas.html>
40. US population hits 300 million, 2017. Available at: [http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-10/17/content\\_5215770.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-10/17/content_5215770.htm)
41. van Dijk, T. A. *Semantic Macro-Structures and Knowledge Frames in Discourse Comprehension* // Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1977.
42. <https://www.kettering.org> – The Kettering Foundation Official Website
43. <http://www.publicdeliberation.net/jpd> - The Journal of Public Deliberation

## **ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ I**

**Транскрипт форума по вопросам иммиграции в Джорджтауне.**

1	Moderator:	<p>-- so they can plan. That sound familiar to anybody? Okay. Subsidize local governments who aids large numbers of immigrants. Make immigrants, adults and children, learn to speak English. So what are some of the tradeoffs or the flipsides or the drawbacks of this? One, we may lose our tradition of tolerance. We English speaking -- onl-only -- English-only initiatives can create prejudice against immigrants. Immigrants always cling to their home country, but their children continue to adopt America's culture. And immigrants keep this nation vibrant and adaptable. That's the approach one, this notion of we're losing our identity. Approach two is along the lines of this is what made this country great. We are a nation of immigrants. This is-this is-this is a piece -- this is the most important piece of our heritage. Immigration built America. Short-term costs -- whatever the long run, this notion that, as we continue to infuse this country with immigrants, we learn, we grow, and we expand. We cannot abandon refugees, who, like our forefathers, seek freedom. We need every-we must welcome everybody. What do we need to do? Admit more refugees. Give refugees a better chance to prove persecution. Expand family-sponsored immigration. Allow more skilled workers into this country. And negotiate a new immigration policy with Mexico. Dangers, drawbacks. Without limits, the life by which the America -- could capsize, drowning us all. We can't take them all. Can't take them all, folks. Caring for and educating all of th-these newcomers costs American taxpayers. We're seeing it right now. Americans in low wages suffer. Citizen's wages can't go up, because immigrants -- they work for less. And Americans even lose jobs to immigrant competitors. And the last approach is one of -- you know, all of this is great, but we need to look inward first. We need to take care of our own. So we need to limit the new -- the-the number of newcomers. Their arrival impacts those who are already here. Immigration costs the American citizens. Competition from immigrants keeps wages down and even takes away from Americans. What do we need to do? Admit fewer immigrants. Keep out immigrants who would take jobs from Americans. Focus immigration on the skilled workers, the skills that we need. Help out taxpayers and communities where immigrants settle. Stop illegal immigration. Dangers and the flipsides. Immigrants get blamed for problems they don't cause. People will have no safe haven from tyranny. There will be no workers to do the unskilled jobs Americans refuse to accept. And immigrants are a criti-critical part of this economy. We're going to work through all of them as we go through the -- as we go through the night. And so are we ready to go? All right. To get the evening started -- I mean, I want you to kind of -- I mean, on th-on the personal side, has anybody here experienced, uh, some of the complexities or some of the issues around immigration personally? What got you here today, besides a call at five o'clock last night that said, "Hey, what are you doing tonight, you know?"[Cross talk]</p>
2	Male Voice:	Why are you here? How has immigration i-you know, impacted you?

3	Jack:	Well, I see -- I want to speak to that. I go to the post office every day to pick up the Wall Street Journal. And, uh, there are a number of immigrants that pass through the door. And when I go through the door, I say, "Good morning," and they say, "Good morning." And I find that they're responsive to me. And, uh, I feel that, uh, you know, I welcome them. And they can be who they want to be, and I can be who I want to be.
4	Mike:	I'm here because I think that, uh, the issue of immigration is particularly, um, s-salient in this community that has, uh, a growing, uh, population of Hispanic and now Haitian immigrants, uh, some documented and some undocumented. And as a community, Georgetown is -- has been, for-for several years now, struggling with what do we do. How do we -- uh, how do we treat these people? Do we welcome them in? Do we keep them out? Uh, they're-they're an important part of the economy. Where do they live? How do we take care of them? Uh, and there are lots of justice issues involved with the immigrant population and their relationship to the mainline society. Uh, important issue. That's why I'm here.
5	Ella:	I feel there needs to be, uh, control, that there needs to be some documentation. And yes, we welcome all immigrants. And I have no problem with them, except that I think the town, like you said -- you cannot take everybody's problems. There's a lot of people in third-world countries that need help. They're persecuted. But we cannot take on everybody's problem. We need to devise a plan so that we can assimilate these people into our societies and so it will not be a big burden on the taxpayers. We need to get them to be American citizens so that they can help take s-uh, charge of some of their -- you know, what -- the programs that you establish for them, that they can also be paying taxpayers, and they can cover some of these fees. Like Georgetown -- Georgetown has not the infrastructure to really accommodate the number of, uh, immigrants that they have in Georgetown, like the housing problem. They have the sewerage and the water problems. And, you know, the taxpayers are the ones that are bearing the brunt of all of these problems. So I think the town needs to sit down and devise a plan. Are you going to just run the town over with immigrants that you cannot handle, or are you going to devise a plan that will get these people here? If you're going to bring them here, have something to teach them, how to live within your society. But don't, uh, get rid of the American way. I think America needs a basic plan. And we change our infrastructure, our values, to suit every immigrant that come here. We lose our heritage. So I feel that we need to stick to a basic plan. When they come, they can still have their cultures or whatever their ideals are, but they still should be, uh, taught to assimilate within the American culture, too.

6	Kim:	Well, I'll talk next. Um, I think, um, if you th-really think about it, America's a melting pot. I remember is -- in elementary school and junior-high school, studying about all the immigrants that came to America. My grandfather immigrated from Germany in 1914. So I'm a second generation. Um, and I'm one of the few people that's not a fifth- or sixth- or seventh-generation Georgetown-Georgetown native, it seems like. But this is just another wave. It just happens that it's mostly Hispanic instead of, um, Irish or German or English. And we have -- I guess it's part of growing older. It just seems newer to us, so --
7	Fred:	One of-one of the questions that you had asked when you brought it up was have-have we been impacted by it. And I-I don't know if I w-can say I certainly b-I've been impacted by it one way or the other. But everything I have found -- and I-I've always gotten -- to me, uh, I find it interesting and fun, because I -- as we spoke earlier at-at dinner, I used to travel. That's what I used to do for a living. So I spent a lot of time in New York City. And you talk about the enclaves. Well, to me, that was always something good, because I -- every day, I found something else interesting to eat. Uh, so I-I look at it as, you know, it's so-it's -- as something that should benefit us, you know, because of-of the different cultures, what they can bring to you. And I used to travel overseas, too, in my business. So, you know, I've been an outsider there. And, uh, like my wife had just said, I'm only a second generation. My grandfather came over from England, and both my mother's parents were French Canadian. So, you know, I'm a hodgepodge myself.
8	Moderator:	All right. Thanks. First approach. Remember, this is the one about we're losing our identity too much. You know, the folks that, uh -- you know, if-if they don't speak English, then-then we lose our-our heritage. We lose our language. You know, they stay in their own enclaves. They don't assimilate. So we need to start thinking about our identity, this notion of we need to admit fewer. We need to warn the local communities. I mean, did Georgetown ever get a heads up that life would change in -- by like 40 percent demographics in 10 years? The notion that when this is going to happen, that-that these communities become subsidized -- all right -- that-that you help this community out. And then this notion of folks, you got to learn English. You know, you need to learn English. That's the language we use. You got to learn that. The drawbacks are this notion of tolerance. By doing this, are we-are we-are we-are we walking away from this notion of a nation of tolerance? Um, do we really want to demand that everybody has to speak English? And, uh, lastly, this idea that, uh, it's going to happen anyhow, because the first generation clings to their values, but the second generation becomes Americanized, so it's going to happen anyhow. So to start his conversation off, I mean, can anybody here tell me, you know, what-what are American values. You know, what-what is-what is this country about?



9	Fred:	Hard work, I think. You know, uh, and I think that's what a lot of the i-i-immigrants bring. They bring hard work. They're striving to get ahead. And I think that's what, uh, you know, our forefathers have done. Um, so I think, you know, to some -- in that respect, they bring to us a-a benefit, you know, no-nes-not a detriment.
10	Jared:	Yeah. I think we're a-a land of opportunity, uh, and free choice. So they come here freely to do s-work. Uh, I-I think back. Even my short lifespan -- uh, we are a hodgepodge(see 7) of all kinds of different cultures. What we have today is -- we call American culture is not American culture as it was a hundred years ago or 50 years ago. It's been constantly changing since 1600s. And it will change. Every generation, you w-you will have a slight change. Something is changing, because there's more inputs. And, to me, change is good, 'cause you're growing. Otherwise, you'd die, if you don't change.
11	Moderator:	Hard work. The notion of independence and free choice. What are others -- what are some of the other values there -- that-that we consider inherently American? What are they?
12	Linda:	Our open-door policy. And we're a country of immigration. I mean, none of us, I think, here are Native Americans. So whether it's one, two, or three generations, we've come from somewhere else. And I think it's easier -- it was easier back then to-to learn the language. Today we have radio, television, movies, where the pockets of different cultures, as they arrive, can -- th-there isn't that strong of a survival need to assimilate, because they can rely on maintaining their own language to survive and-and to succeed, because they have a support system of radio and film and friends and a social group that all speak the same language. So I think that's sort of a challenge for-for new immigrants to come here. There isn't that urgent need to learn the language. Although I think they do l-ultimately learn it.

13	Tony:	<p>[unintelligible]. Uh, we all-we all came over on different ships, but we're on the same boat now. Uh, even though it's equal opportunity and all of these different things, uh, we speak -- as American, but is it fair -- is it right to bring somebody and put them in a place where they're un-untaught -- even though t-they won't be part of a land, uh, of-of-of the free and everything. But is it fair to them to just put them in a position that, uh, they don't know nothing, they don't understand things? Um, part of me -- I-I grew up in Georgetown, been in Georgetown my whole life. And I just seen dramatic changes, you know, um, some for the good and some for, you know, th-the bad. But, uh, my thing is even -- I can't speak on, uh, the rest of the countries. I can speak on what I see in this area. You know, just part of me just feel that, um, they're here now. So what are we going to do? We need to help these p-we need to help them and do the right thing. But I-I --part of me feel they're not getting the right help. S-some are, to me -- some are just saying something and doing something -- doing another -- doing something else. And, uh, tenu-not speaking bad about things. I have actually addressed some issues in Georgetown, because I hated to see people do some of the things they do. And really, I got no response. You know, a-and I just felt it was wrong, because I felt like this. If I go to another country, if I'm hungry, I'm going to eat. And I feel these people are hungry. If somebody put some food on my plate, and I'm hungry, I'm going to eat it. And I feel that's what we're -- they are doing. But it's just, to me -- part of me is saying some are just dr-allowing them to come in any kind of way without being taught, without teaching them different things or -- I-I-I don't -- it's just not good. Now, the next generation coming up, the ones in school and everything -- I think they have a better chance than the people that's just coming over illegally or whatever. Uh, I-I go out to the school, and I think the ones that's going to school with the kids now -- you're going to the schools and see how well they've been getting along and how they've been taught. And I think they have a better chance. But the ones that's here now, just came over with like just -- you know, I don't -- it's-it's kind of hard for them. So I think it sh-it should-should have really addressed, uh, you know, the help.</p>
14	Moderator:	<p>Because I know some of you -- I don't want to put you on the spot, but I will call on you occasionally. And Marissa, I'll ask you. I mean -- uh, you know, whatever. I mean, eight years ago, I mean, why-why did you-why did you-why did you want to come to-to America?</p>

15	Marissa:	<p>Um, and that is exactly the-the reason I-I was motivated to attend this forum, because, um, there is a lot of people that oftentimes ask that question. Why do they come here? Um, in my particular case, uh, my father came here about 15 years ago. Uh, he had a business in-in our country, in Guatemala. Uh, the economic situation didn't allow him to continue with his business, and he was looking for alternatives, other-other, uh, ways of bringing food to his family. Um, at the time, you know, um, everybody knew that if you need money, if you, uh, want to find a job, the place is the United States of America. Uh, he found a way to arrive to the United States. And, um, he left his family back home. He sent us money. Uh, we were able to complete, you know, um, high school. And, uh, he was able to apply for, um, his permanent residency. Um, 15 years later, we were able to, uh, join him here in the United States. Uh, one of the reasons why he wanted to bring us to Georgetown specifically -- he was -- he-he lived in other states and other cities. And Georgetown in particular, uh -- he said, "There-there is a community here. It's a small town. Um, everybody, you know, um, welcome, uh, immigrants. Uh, there is, uh, jobs available. Um, and I think you will have the opportunity here to, um, go to school and be part of the society." Uh, today, I am a United States citizen. And I realize that language was the-the-the key to integrate into this society. Uh, without a doubt, um, at the beginning, there were different situations where we thought, you know, this is discrimination. Uh, we are not, you know, being treated as we should as human beings. But really, now I realize what was happening was there was lack of communication. We were not understanding each other. Once we were able to communicate with people, it has been completely different. We understand each other. We're able to understand this culture, and this culture is able to understand ours. I think, uh, the solution is not going to be, well, this is the language here, and you can only speak this language. This is the values -- uh, these are the values and the culture here, and this is the only way. I think, as everybody mentioned, everybody has a different background. But we all come to-to a center point. Uh, we share, uh, a language, which is English in this country. We share some values. But at the same time, we still maintain our, uh, original identity. Um, and people oftentimes ask me, "Why do you still say my country, Guatemala, if you now live in the United States, and you're now, uh, a United States ci-United States citizen?" And gee, I feel very lucky, because I have two countries. I am still a Guatemalan, but I am still - I am also a United States citizen. Um, but my-my point is that language definitely opened a door for, uh, my brothers and myself to-to be part and engage in this society.</p>
16	Male Voice:	<p>I was actually beginning to pick up a little bit of a Sussex County accent there. [unintelligible]. You got -- you have that twang in there, you know?</p>

17	Unidentified Male:	I learned English at Delaware Tech, and --
18	Moderator:	All right. One of-one of the ways, you know, that you can -- when you start to take this approach a-part is, you know, to admit fewer immigrants. All right? I mean, we're-we're -- what do you -- how do you feel about that, this notion of admitting fewer immigrants? Is there too much diversity? I mean, if-if-if-if an immigrant was coming to a community near you, would you like to pick -- you know, do you have any parameters around the immigrant community that's going to settle next to you or settle close to you? Don't let me peel the onion here. You know what I mean? But this is about -- you know, hey, is -- I mean, do -- or do we like -- would we like different communities here, or is-is it just an open-door policy? Bring them on.
19	Nicole:	I think-I think the difficult thing about immigration is understanding how complex it is and all the millions of different reasons why people come. I mean, we th-we think that the majority of people come for economic reasons. But, um, people come for business reasons. People come for political persecution. People come to join family members. Uh, people come as fiancés. People come as tourists. There's-there's hundreds of reasons why people come, skilled workers, unskilled workers. And I think that's, um -- we assume immigration is kind of one way, and everyone's coming for one reason. And-and also thinking that everyone's coming to stay. And that's the other side of immigration, that not everyone is coming to stay. Some immigrants are coming just for a couple years or just for a specific purpose and with hopes of going home. And I think that's hard for us. We assume -- I teach, um, at a community college. And all of the students are there to learn English. But people assume they're all coming to stay and live here. And a lot of them want to go back home. And people say, "Well, why would you go back home," thinking that this is the greatest land in the world, and everybody naturally wants to come and live here. Not all immigrants want to come and live here forever. They want to come for a couple years. They have a specific purpose. A lot of them hope and dream to go home someday. Um, but, um, a lot of them don't go home. They end up staying here and getting used to it here and-and planting roots, um, and establishing themselves here, and they don't go home. But it's-it's really a complex issue.
20	Moderator:	How do the others of you -- how do you feel about that? I mean, is that right, that folks can roll into Dodge and go to school for a couple years and-and-and-and make some bucks, and then go home?

21	Phil:	I-I think that's a very-a very valid point. I think a lot of, uh, at least first-generation immigrants come here with the idea of working for a while, maybe saving a bit of money, and then going back to-to where they came from with a better lifestyle. And I don't think, really, there's anything wrong with that. Um, I don't think we have to homogenize them and bring them to be just like us. Uh, the country I lived in before the U.S., uh, uh, United Arab Emirates -- it's probably the most diverse, uh, country in the world. There's people from every single corner of the world living there. And except for the 15 percent of the locals, everybody else is coming, spending a while, and then going back home. And that works just fine.
22	Male Voice:	Ed, you were going to say something.
23	Ed:	I th-I think that, uh, it's-it's a two-edge sword, uh, when you talk about immigration, no matter what the specific issue that you have. Um, a-as far as shutting down the borders, I d-I don't think that's even a possibility. Um, it's-it's a federal -- federally mandated, uh, uh, thing that we have to deal with, if they -- whatever their policy seems to be, that we here locally have to deal with that situation. And, uh, I have to agree with Marissa. I mean, th-the people that-that come here -- I've had the, uh -- the good fortune to-to deal with a lot of her family, uh, when-when they came here and, uh, have seen them be successes in our community. Um, and-and I th-I think that it's something that -- uh, we all, i-in our hearts would-would enjoy seeing people come and be successes here in our community. Uh, on the other hand, I don't know how much financially, uh, the federal government can-can withstand, uh, in continuing to have a-a totally open border, uh, on all sides. So, you know, it's a double-edge sword.
24	Moderator:	Where does the notion of 9/11 fit into this conversation?
25	Jared:	I don't even see where it's related, but --
26	Unidentified Female:	Oh, I do.
27	Jared:	-- but that's not the way the news thinks about it. It's a completely different, separate issue. I-uh, people coming to this country other than immigrants to work and -- they came here for one purpose, to inf-infiltrate and do harm. So I think it's a different-a different scenario completely.
28	Moderator:	Others on that? I mean, it's a different scenario, but yet, what has that done? What has been the impact on immigration law and immigration in this country?

29	Kim:	It's become much str-much more difficult to come into th-and stay here. You can't just come in with a student visa, and if it l-lapses, you just stay put. Uh, they-they have tightened up their controls and their tracking of people. They just send them back.
30	Jack:	I remember when, uh, the week after 9/11, I was taking a trip to Wilmington. I stopped at a gas station to get gas. And, uh, it was an Exxon station, and nobody came out to put gas or greet me. So I went up to one of the bays, and here were two, uh, Middle Eastern folk, to me looked like husband and wife. And they were afraid to come out, because they looked different. I might hold them accountable for 9/11. I never forgot that.
31	Phil:	I think it's made a-made a big difference. Uh, it's much harder to get into the country now, whether as an immigrant or a visitor, particularly if you are, uh, an Arab. Um, I know -- uh, I attend professional meetings, and, uh, some of the Arab scientists I used to work with don't even bother to come anymore, because they-they can't get a visa. It's just too much hassle, uh, although they may have been educated here and gone back to their country. Uh, it-it-it's just so much-so much more difficult now that a lot of goodwill overseas is being lost.
32	Melanie:	I think it's also opened up a lot of prejudices now that we might not have had, or different kinds of prejudice, I should say, now, you know, with the 9/11. And, you know, now we'll ac-like with immigration, now we'll accept a-an educated British man, but we won't accept a-an Arab or even an unskilled Mexican. You know, it's like where do you draw the line with that, um -- that topic as far as -- y-you just have to deal with the, uh -- the whole thing of prejudice with -- if you were to limit immigration.
33	Moderator:	Should we demand that everyone speak English?
34	Unidentified Female:	No.
35	Kim:	Well, I think --
36	Moderator:	This will be like an auction. This is a pop quiz.
37	Kim:	I-I think --
38	Moderator:	Everybody raise your hand here. All in favor.

39	Kim:	<p>D-should we demand it before they can come in? No, I don't-I don't think that that-that has, you know, sh-can't demand it now. I think they will learn, because they-they'll need to learn to pursue a career, to pursue trying to make a living. You know, they -- I think they'll need to learn it. And as we -- o-o-others have said, you know, the next generation will have it, 'cause they-they are attending schools. But then go-go back to what you had said before, um, sh-about them coming just to get educated or coming for a particular purpose. Well, that's -- the reason people come was for a particular purpose, whether they intended to stay or not. You know, some of them wanted to go home. They didn't go home. Some do go home. Um, you know, they-they do a career. They go home. And they can live a better life that way. Um, I've made a living out of going to other countries and pl-ply-plying my trade in what I had learned. Um, but then I came back home, too. So, I mean, just -- not too long ago, I-I was in Brazil. That's where I was making some of my living there. And I was up in New York at 9/11. And it was very tough. And -- you know, t-being around, j-jus-just seeing the things. Uh, so it does have an impact. But I think the-uh, the impact -- I'm just kind of rambling here -- is -- a lot of the impact is in the-the financial burden th-that is falling on the government now, because they do want to put in the extra precautions that -- I don't know if those precautions would-would have prevented the 9/11 anyway.</p>
40	Michael:	<p>The-the question th-it's -- of making people speak English, I-I-I think, is very prejudicial. Um, in my line of work, I deal with a lot of Hispanic families. Uh, it's very unique. The children act as translators. Uh, and they've only been here for a couple of years, and they speak English. The kids -- we-we allow them -- we were allowing them to have translators in there, because they were bilingual, thinking they'd be more, uh, comfortable in their native language. And that's not the case at all. Kids that have been here from five and up -- if they've been speaking English in schools for two or three years, they're more comfortable speaking English. To say that a parent that comes here has to lear-has to speak English -- obviously, it would be to their benefit, um, as-as you said before. I mean, it w-i-it's just-it's just going to help so much. Um, but these people are here, at least in this community, the-the Hispanic community -- you work -- some of them w-work 16 hours a day. And there's ju-there simply isn't the time. Um, it is a problem. But, you know, the next generation's getting it very quickly. And-and, uh, uh, it will work itself out.</p>
41	Phil:	<p>Uh, okay, it would be nice for immigrants to-to learn English, but perhaps those of us who are already here -- it would be nice if we learned another language to speak to them in their own language. And that's something that's not-not very, uh, much emphasized, uh, i-in America. Um, in many other countries, people routinely speak two, three, four languages.</p>

42	Melanie:	But on the flip side of that, if -- I don't know if anyone's ever been to France. Um, y-you won't make it unless you speak French. I mean, you-you just -- they'll look at you cross-eyed, even if they --
43	Unidentified Male:	Dummies.
44	Melanie:	-- do, you know, understand you. So I don't think it's too unreasonable to expect people to come to this country and learn English when, you know, if you -- if I was to go to, say, Germany -- and to really integrate into their, uh, country, I would have to learn German. So I don't think it's too unreasonable or too prejudicial to expect that of immigrants.
45	Phil:	No, I think they should. But perhaps we could also, from our side --
46	Unidentified Male:	Mm-hmm.
47	Phil:	-- learn --
48	Unidentified male:	Exchange.
49	Phil:	-- another language.
50	Melanie:	Oh, definitely. A-a-and, too, like you said, you go to Germany, and you can get by speaking English as a tourist, because so many people do speak it. And that's unr-I-I-I mean, that's unreal here. Like a German couldn't come here and speak German. You know, no o-they wouldn't get by that way, so --
51	Michael:	But to enact laws that say that you must -- or English only -- uh, I-I just think that's wrong. You know, I-I-I think that sends a wrong message. I think it's very negative. And that kind of contempt breeds more contempt.
52	Sylvia:	Not so much English only, but English also. You know, you can speak Spanish, but learn the language too, so you communicate. Um, and I agree that the public schools should be offering or teaching our students a foreign language, 'cause that's the time they need to learn it. And they would make, you know, much better citizens if they did learn that when they were younger.



53	Ed:	I-I have to agree. In -- I've been on two sides of this. In 1964, I worked in my grandfather's cannery, which hired, uh, migrant immigrants to bring in the crops in the summertime. So I was the only one who took it upon myself to learn Spanish so that I could communicate with those folks and help them assimilate into the small community, that-that 300 -- we had 300, uh, people living in our small town. And so that was quite an impact. On the other side of that, when I became mayor here i-in Georgetown, um, there was some issues that basically all stemmed from communications. Um, a-and if the people w-here would learn, uh -- and it doesn't have to be a lot, but just learn some Spanish or learn some way to communicate, um, because they use the nonability to communicate as an excuse to widen the differences, I think.
54	Jared:	You know, I-I, uh -- in the last few years, uh, I did some farm work for my family. And we hire immigrant Mexicans. And, uh, they speak very little English, and I speak no Spanish. And we had no problem at all, you know -- a-and understanding, communicating with each other and-and-and actually holding a conversation. I spoke in English and they in Spanish. But, uh, you know, you-you don't talk about building rockets or anything like that. But, you know, the job that you're about, you get done.
55	Male Voice:	And I-I'm just -- I -- well, about what you said. Some folks -- what do they do with th-with the language barrier? They use it or they use the --
56	Ed:	Use that as a tool to widen the differences between -- it's a we/them type of thing. Uh, you know, it's-i-i-i-is that cl-not clear?
57	Nicole:	Well, I-I think something that, um, I have noticed is, um, here in Georgetown -- I've kind of been noticing the Hispanic communities in the other towns, as opposed to Georgetown. And in Georgetown, my observation is that, because we have lots of bilingual people and lots of bilingual services, that a large percentage of the town is more dependent and is less likely to learn English. Whereas in Lewes or Rehoboth or Selbyville or Seaford, they have to learn English, because there isn't the support system there. I'm not saying that's good or bad. But I've just noticed people outside of Georgetown speak more English, the immigrants, recent immigrants. People in Georgetown spend -- tend to speak less, because they have more access to bilingual services or a more close-knit community between church and work and stores and things like that. They can kind of operate in their own language, and they're not forced to speak it as much.
58	Moderator:	[Ally], were you going to say something?
59	Ally:	No.

60	Linda:	Well, I just want to say I agree with you, because I think if-if the Spanish-speaking network, as it grows -- and it's growing compared to a hundred years ago when immigrants came over -- the reason -- the necessity to speak English is lessened. But I think people who want to come here want to speak -- it's a hard language to learn --
61	Unidentified Female:	Yes.
62	Linda:	-- for people. And y-y-you teach it, so you know how difficult it is. But I want to recount a story. Um, in Georgetown, there was an event called caroling on the square. And I did not attend that event, but I heard from some people who did attend it. And it's Christmas carols. The first hour or so was all Spanish songs. And the people who attended it came back. And you were speaking of c-feelings of contempt. It was like, "We had to wait an hour before we could sing along with our Christmas carols." And there was resentment from, you know, the native Georgetowns, the American-speaking people, about that. And I hear that a lot from pockets of people. They go, "Well, you know, they got to come over here, and they have to learn how to speak English. This is-this is the country they came to." And I don't agree with that. I think it's proven that, within a generation, the children of immigrants are speaking English. But those kinds of -- when those kinds of events happen, there is resentment from people towards the immigrants.
63	Tammy:	Well, there's been a lot of conversation around the group tonight about the children speak English, and if we just wait for the second generation, we're okay. Speaking from an education point of view, the federal government doesn't say that the educational system can wait for the next generation. We're held accountable right now for, um, their development. And, you know, the federal government is passing laws, No Child -- the No Child Left Behind Act says these kids have to perform as well as every other child in the school. And so from my perspective as an educator, it's very, very difficult, um, to conference with and work with immigrant parents to ensure that these children do acquire the knowledge and the skills that they need to-to perform well. And quite frankly, I'm affected, because it's my job that's on the line if they don't, right now, with the climate in this state and with the climate in this country. And so i-it's a very awkward and uncomfortable place for me to be as a teacher.

64	David:	<p>This country is so huge and spread out, and there are so many facets to our society that both systems are at work. Now, Fred and others said earlier on that the way to get ahead would be to learn the language. And I'm sure that that's true if you're going into business or industry. And yet, at the same time, there are many communities -- well, I'll speak of New Hampshire, where my wife and I used to live -- many communities where only French is spoken. And they get along very well. And they go to a-a French hospital. Uh, if there's going to be a town meeting -- and on occasion, I had to go to such town meetings and give speeches. And they said, "By the way, you won't be accepted unless you speak French." So that was done. So this system is existing, and they seem to do very well. Um, I don't know that we can exclude one system at the expense of the other.</p>
65	Moderator:	<p>Okay. If you had to put your finger on-on -- we-we've, you know, kind of worked this approach fairly well. I mean, and so what are the -- what are some of the tensions embedded in this choice? And b-I guess by what I'm looking at -- if we demand English speaking -- you know, that-that they all have to learn English, what's the flip side of that? What happens because we do that? And look at some of the other things we talked about.</p>
66	Ella:	<p>I feel that it's, uh -- it's better -- it's a better choice to have, uh, English as the main language, because just think. If -- now, when you have Hispanics, they're speaking Spanish. But suppose you have infiltration of other immigrants. When we talk about immigrants, we're talking about all the other countries. We're not -- we just happen to have an abundance of Hispanics. What if we have an abundance of Iraqis coming over here? You know, are we going to say, "Okay, we're going to change to Iraqi language." We need a basis. And we need to stick to it, that it will be, uh, used for all immigrants, you know, not just for Hispanics. Because, uh, I know there's a lot of Haitians that are trying to get in the country, uh, that -- we're turning them back. If we say we're a free country, ho-why are we turning back the Haitians and other immigrants that are wanting to come in the country? And ju-we're just picking and choosing who we want to come in as immigrants. We're supposed to be a free country. So we have to set some, uh, standards. Either we're going to, uh, do English, or we're going to either -- eventually, maybe five years or 10 years down the road, we're going to be Iraqis, or we're going to be some other language. So we're going to have to set a standard that's going to be used for all immigration. We cannot lose our heritage.</p>
67	Moderator:	<p>Okay. That's one flip side. If you don't do it, where do you stop? Okay. Others? Others on some of the things that we've talked about?</p>

68	Melanie:	I think you run the risk of the individual, uh, cultures losing their identities when you, uh, demand that they all speak English. Because as you said, I'm a second generation. I'm a daughter of an immigrant and, uh, Spanish-speaking parents. And my Spanish is not fluent. And my son's Spanish is going to be even less. So you -- I think like we run the risk of losing our-our heritage from where we came from and, you know, kind of becoming a homogenized society, everyone speaking the same language and --
69	Unidentified Male:	And just -- I mean, can you have it both ways?
70	Fred:	Why not? I mean, I-I don't -- I th-a part of it is, I guess, the size of the community on-on how-how they assimilate or how they-they grew. B-because, you know, as I said earlier, y-g-go up to New York City, and you can go from Italian to German to-to --
71	Unidentified Female:	Korean.
72	Fred:	-- Korean to every language. And you go into, uh, uh, New Jersey, you know, Fort Lee, New Jersey. I mean, that's all Korean, all the shops. There's hardly an English sign on it. But they do f-they do fine. And for me, it was, y-you know, a-a learning -- I enjoyed it. But that's because I enjoy trying different types of food, meeting with different people, seeing how their -- you know, their-their cultures are.[Cross talk]
73	Unidentified Male:	Yeah. And th-and that's kind of what I was getting at --
74	Fred:	Right.
75	Unidentified Male:	-- when you were in that community.
76	Fred:	But it's a larger -- y-you're-you're-you're talking about a larger area. Uh, and New York has more customs, because that's where, you know, the most immigrants came. Of course, my grandfather came to Massachusetts and ran away to New York, but a-aside from that. Um, you know, so -- and-and Georgetown -- you know, it's a smaller community. You're-you're talking of, you know -- uh, uh, it's-it's probably harder on the local economy or harder on the people. And because a lot of people in Georgetown had n-not left the state of Delaware -- there are some that have never left Delaware. Um, you know, so --
77	Unidentified Male:	There's rumors that they've never crossed the [unintelligible].

78	Fred:	You know, so I ca-I can-I can see-I can see the impact on that, uh, you know, on how it is on them. So I -- you know, it affects -- it-it-it's-it's -- affects everybody. But how it affects people really depends on the size of the community and wh-what the community does when they're there, if they're open and an accepting community. You know, are you interested in going and, you know, purchasing food at, uh -- right here at Joe's Market, uh, in town? I like to go to Joe's Market. Um, but again, food. [Laughter]
79	Unidentified Male:	We're talking food.
80	Unidentified Male:	There is a common theme here.
81	Fred:	Yeah.
82	Unidentified Male:	All right. Anyo-I'm sorry.
83	Marissa:	I-I-I think the other situation about language -- I-I'm -- to tell you the truth -- I came to this country, a-as I said, eight years ago. And I am surprised that the-the debate is whether the language should be English or what other language. Because I think, you know, if, in my house, I speak one language, and-and I invite somebody to come to my house, I expect them to accommodate to my house if they are coming to my house. But th-that's what I'm -- I am surprised of this. I knew from the beginning that if I was coming to a different country, there was going to be differences in language, differences in culture, and dif-and I was ready to make, you know -- uh, take the necessary steps to change. Um, a lot of the language, I think, also has to do with the, uh, opportunity that people have to legalize themselves. For example, when I came to this country, I came as a permanent resident, um, with the idea that I was going to stay -- come here to stay. Uh, we went through a lot of change academically, you know, uh, our family. So the idea was we're here to stay. We have to learn the language so we can, you know, um, become part of this society. But when people don't have the opportunity to do that, and they come here anyway illegally, well, a lot of people come here hoping that they're able to work. You know, and whenever they get caught and sent back, you know, well, their chance ended there. So there is no point in -- you know, I'm going to learn the language because I'm-I'm going to stay there, if there is an opportunity that they can legalize themselves and-and stay in the country. So I think a lot of language has to do also with the opportunity to-to be in the United States legally versus illegally, and just, you know, stay here for as long as they're able to and then go back.

84	Mike:	<p>I think she-I think she, uh, raises an important point here, because y-we started this conversation talking about whether or not we should restrict immigration. And the more restrictive we are -- we can be procedurally, bureaucratically more restrictive, but can we really keep our borders from being permeable? People can cross our borders virtually at will. So the stricter we are, the more -- in-in-in one sense, the more undocumented -- or some people call them illegal aliens -- people who are seeking work, they're seeking opportunity, they're seeking whatever it is they're s-just to be with family, whatever it is in this-in this country. Um, and-and that's sort of the dark side or the underside of this, uh -- of this issue about tightening things up. And then-then people who come into the country, um, undocumented, illegal -- um, you have this whole array of justice issues that come out of that. Uh, if they're, um -- if-if -- in-in-in areas like housing, uh, the landlord can be, uh -- can be abusive, can not keep the property up. Uh, and who are they to complain to? If they complain to authorities, what happens? Uh, they can be victimized by crime. If they call the police, uh, and the-and the police start asking for identification, what happens? Uh, they can, uh -- uh, they-they-they don't get the medical treatment that they need. If they go into a hospital and-and they don't have the -- uh, the insurance cards, they don't have the proper identification, what happens? They're put into some-into some jail somewhere and then sent back to-to wherever they came from. And consequently, uh, these people subject themselves to great risk and great abuse of-of just basic human dignity, uh, by taking the risk to come to this country, uh, undocumented. And so the tighter we make this, the harder we make it bureaucratically for people -- for these folks to come in, uh, the more people we have who face this justice dilemma. Uh --</p>
85	Moderator:	<p>Good. Good. That's good. Right on target. I'll take it. We're going to move into approach two. That's kind of where we're going.</p>
86	Unidentified Male:	<p>Okay.</p>

87	Moderator:	<p>You know, and again, brief review on approach two. A nation of immigrants remembering America's heritage. This is who we are. You're not Native American. You came from someplace else, you know? All right. Uh, so this notion is about welcoming newcomers. What should be done? What's the flip side? We need-we need to admit more. And, you know, our immigration policy is based on three things. One, the idea of refugees, those that see persecution. Two, this notion of expand family-sponsored immigration. And lastly, we-we allow more skilled laborers into this country. That's-that's -- that is what our immigration policy is based on. And then on top of that, we need to negotiate a new immigration policy with-with Mexico. All right? Drawbacks, dangers. Without limits, the lifeboat which is America could capsize, drowning us all. Caring for and educating all of these newcomers -- as Ed said earlier, there's a cost to that. There are no free rides. This notion that Americans in low wages suffer. They will -- they lose their jobs. The idea that citizens' wages don't go up because immigrants work for less. All right? And lastly, that even -- we even lose job to immigrant competitors. Americans lose jobs to immigrant competitors. All right? So approach two.</p>
88	Ed:	<p>[unintelligible] expound on what Mike just had to-to say. Um, it's been my experience in working with the few Hispanics that-that, uh, I've dealt with here in our community that they bring with them, uh, whatever restrictions or con-or-or problems that they have from, uh, maybe a-an oppressive government that they-they existed under in their own-own land. Uh, and when they get here, that creates problems for them here, because if they have a problem with their living conditions, they don't want to say anything to their landlord, because they're afraid of the way they would be dealt with, the way they may have been back home. Uh, they don't go to the police and report, um, situations that they may have been victims, because they were afraid of maybe problems that they might have seen in, uh, policing i-from their native land. So I-I think, again, it's communications. If they understand what needs to be done here, i-it's going to be better for everyone.</p>

89	Ella:	<p>I believe they need to be trained, too, uh, far as the -- our standards here. I don't believe any person is beyond the law. I mean, um, they, uh -- any immigrant, American citizen, anybody, needs to abide by the law. And, uh, like he said, yeah, they've been oppressed. And it's a lot of people that have come over from other countries that have been oppressed, too. And, uh -- but they need to know the law, and we need to educate them on the law. Because, uh, I've had a problem. Some of them don't -- uh, they don't respect, uh, certain things. Uh, they don't respect -- if they live near you, they don't respect your property. I've had that problem. And they throw trash on your property. And, uh, you know, I feel that they need to assimilate in the -- I can't go live next to you and do you the same way, because there's going to be a repercussion. I think they also need to be responsible, be responsible for their actions, even though -- we can't always -- uh, they're over here in America. They were oppressed wherever they came from. But now that they're in America, they need to be responsible, too. This is all -- I mean, no person should be beyond the law, no matter where you came from. You should not be beyond the law. And we should not let them go, or whoever, immigrants or whatever -- go and then, you know, let the citizens go. We need to draw a line that everybody stays within the law.</p>
90	Moderator:	<p>Okay.</p>
91	Tammy:	<p>And I think it's our responsibility, as citizens of this community and as citizens of this country, to assist in that education, that we need to be, um, welcome hosts initially and help people to understand what is acceptable in this country and what is not and to -- you know, we need to do it as individuals. I think that the-the poultry industries in this area and the other large corporations and businesses need to do the same thing. They need to help individuals instead of just saying, you know, "These people are bad. They don't follow our rules. They don't know them. They ought to learn them." Well, it's our job as -- i-I feel that i-it's-it's my job as a Christian person to-to say, "Okay, this is how it's done here. Let me help you. Let me show you. Let's do this together first." Y-there's-that's-that's our responsibility as-as citizens.</p>
92	Unidentified Female:	<p>And als- --</p>
93	Nicole:	<p>And ha-having an undocumented population is-is-is dangerous. Um, it's -- it poses public-safety risks, uh, 'cause we can't find people. Um, child support is a huge issue. We can't find fathers of children, um, because they don't exist. They don't show up on any computer screen. They don't show up on any place. So h-the undocumented population costs us a lot of money. And it's-and it's a-it's a public-safety risk in terms of driving without licenses, living places that we can't find, committing crimes and we can't find people. That's a real concern, I think, in the community and in the country.</p>



94	Linda:	I was going to say, in speaking of-of abiding by the law, we have to do it, too. There are unscrupulous landlords out there who are-who are taking of it. They fully know the law. And they-they can get away with it, because --
95	Unidentified Female:	Employers, too.
96	Linda:	-- they've got somebody that isn't going to complain about them, who might not be able to read the lease fully.
97	Unidentified Female:	Yes.
98	Linda:	Um, we are their potential employers. How many employers are giving them their full due as-as new-as new employees? So I think the law abiding --
99	Jack:	A couple of years ago, I was walking over to Smith's Restaurant. It was a Wednesday morning after church. And here was a -- someone from South America. He had this summons in his hand. And he said to me, "Do you know where the JP court is?" And I read the summon, and he'd been stopped twice for D-DUI. And I said, "Well, let me take you there." The point being when we got to the court, the lady took the piece of paper. He was then sat down, and somebody came to him and told him what was going to happen. But he had no idea. And he was running around with a piece of paper.
100	Linda:	Oh, they're-they're collecting double, triple security deposits on some people.
	Unidentified male:	Is that right?
101	Linda:	They're not putting, uh, the-the money into an escrow account. And-and they don't know the law. They don't know the law, so they're being taken advantage of.
102	Michael:	One of the really good schemes is, uh -- you know, you got to give some of these -- you know, if there's a buck to be made -- is in car insurance. And they'll buy a car, and they're given, uh, an insurance card, uh, and they pay whatever. And they think they have car insurance, and it's not-and it's not. You know, and it-i-i-i-it's sad. It's sad to s-to see those kind -- and they're still going on. I mean, this was going on years ago. It's still going on today. But, uh, with the identity theft that we have in our own country, a-a-you know, you look at all the different scams -- you know, th-those things are goi-not going to go away. They're an easy target.
103	Linda:	I'm curious. Is there any liaison between the d-like a Legal Aid, or is there a place where-where even an undocumented worker could go and check certain things out before they enter into things like car insurance or --

104	Unidentified Male:	Well, yeah.
105	Linda:	You know, like is this-is this legit, you know?
106	Ed:	We have two really good -- or three really good avenues here in town for, uh, immigrants, uh, to get help. We have La Esperanza. And, um, the other name, uh --
107	Unidentified Female:	La --
108	Ed:	-- La Gaceta, uh, which is I believe is funded and supported by the Catholic Church. Um, but then you also have Legal Aid, which these people can go to and get assistance with any, uh, legal issue which they might have.
109	Phil:	I think this whole idea that the immigrants are coming and taking the jobs, and we're-we're-we're going to all be poorer, is something that's -- it's a-it's a global force right now anyway. You can lose your job to somebody who never crosses the border into the U.S. And, uh, if somebody comes here and wants to work in the chicken factory, I mean, whose job are they taking? Is there a line of, uh, Americans standing in line to work in the chicken factory? I don't think so.
110	Moderator:	Yeah. But this one is about reexamining our immigration policy. And what it's doing is-is -- it's along the lines of, you know, give refugees a better chance to prove persecution. And, as you know, in this community, it w-you know, the-the majority of the initial immigrants were Guatemalan.
111	Facilitator:	And this is the idea of, you know, if folks are coming, uh, you know, you can kind of pick and choose by earmarking the skill set, all right? So, I mean, where, where do we stand. Where, where should we stand as Americans in looking at other countries that are oppressed? I mean, can we draw the line for folks that are trying to get out of that country? How do you feel about that?
112	Ella:	As I see it, uh, there are many people that are oppressed, as you say. And if we're going to allow just certain ones, then we should open the borders to everybody. I believe all people; I don't care where you're from. If you're seeking freedom and you said, "Well, this is a freedom country," then it should be opened up to everybody. This is the way I feel.

113	Tony:	<p>Accountability is very important. Accountability is -- I mean, I worked in a, a supervisor at a chicken plant for over 10 years and I supervised, uh, mostly Hispanics. Uh, it was -- I can't -- I grew up in this community and some of the things they are dealing with and some of the things they're are going through, really they are some of the same issues I faced my whole life around here, but it seemed like people couldn't see that. So really part of me says, "Well, I must have been an illegal immigrant my whole life," you know? But, in, in our community I think a lot of prejudices came about when a lot of different issues started. People started coming for a job and everything and things weren't addressed. You know, like people -- there were language barriers and different things like that. But, uh, as working in a chicken plant, coming up it was the most, one of the most important jobs there was for our community, especially the black community. Now, as years went by, Hispanics came in and, and part of me felt that some of the black community were pushed out of the poultry business because of that; to make room for them. I worked there for 10 years and I know and I was supervising. It was just like some of them just being pushed out. But for what reasons -- some of the reasons was because they just had to make room for people. I don't think there was -- a part of me doesn't think that was fair. You know, a part of me feels if you come here it's the same rules for everybody. I have no problem with Hispanics. I love them all. Uh, I have good, real good friends. Uh, I couldn't speak no Spanish at all, but I got along with everybody and I've got quite a few Hispanic friends right here in Georgetown now. Uh, but, uh, a big part of it is, is the way some things or the way they do things in the small community. Some in this small community and there are some issues not addressed. I think that's, that's the big thing right now. I live, I live right down the street, I live right down the street from [unintelligible] Street and I'm surrounded by Hispanics. And just even behind my house is a big ditch. And I actually can look out my window and watch people come by, drink water out of the ditch or [unintelligible] in the ditch; a number of things. That hurt me. Do you understand what I'm saying? That hurt me. And I have reported it. I have talked to people about this because it can make them sick or whatever. And things have -- then things got a little worse, uh, behind the, the drinking issue. So I have addressed that. I have little kids. And just teaching people certain things are very important. We have to be accountable for everything we do. I understand it's a lot of justice issue and I, I help prisoners. I don't want to put nobody in jail, you know? But I have come to the point that I had to -- I had my kids in the swimming pool. I actually have them stand right on the road with my kids in the swimming pool and urinate. So I have to call the police. I called them and I said, "I don't want them to go to jail. I just want you to move them along." But, you know, even as they move them along, I still feel that things should have been addressed. They should have [brought someone in] to speak their language to help them and tell them this is wrong. I can't tell them it's wrong. Do you understand? If I could, they would continue doing it, you know? And to</p>
-----	-------	--

114	Facilitator:	Okay. We've talked about, you know, some of the things along the lines of once they're here there's this whole notion of accountability for those of us here that were here first. You know, help them get the schooling, make sure they're responsible and things like that. I mean, but what I'm hearing is, is that we're not ready yet to really open the doors all the way.
115	Michael:	To go back to your question before, you know, I think it was, and correct me if I'm wrong, uh, it's just that is it just [porous] and just allow people in? Do we restrict it? Government has to restrict it. Uh, we can't -- if you, if you look at population growths over the next 50 years, uh, this country will be bombarded and the infrastructures will never, ever, ever be able to hold up. It's going to be up to the government to somehow limit, uh, and in a very -- you know, there's still plenty of room here. But to say that anybody that wants to come can come, in my opinion, uh, is a sign of disaster for this country. Uh, immigrants have, have contributed very much to this rich nation in many different ways, but to simply say, "Everybody is welcome," uh, I don't think that, that the infrastructure will be able to, you know -- we're looking at some serious, serious problems down the road.
116	Nicole:	Even with as strict as it is, we have lots of people coming. I mean, since 9/11 it has gotten stricter, uh, but it hasn't slowed things down in, in this town. People continue to come, continue to move here. Uh, I volunteer at a community center and we can barely keep up with people walking in the door and they're new to the area, or calling on their phone and they don't know where this is and they don't know how to do this. And they're just looking for some guidance or some direction or some orientation. And, uh, and this curve continues. We're not even -- we're not to a peak yet. I feel like the community is continuing to grow and there are immigrants continuing to move to the county. The county is booming and jobs are here The county is booming and jobs are here and that's what really is kind of driving this. (T 2?) Uh, people are coming because there are jobs. And people come tomorrow, there are jobs and they come the next day, there are jobs. Uh, and, and it's -- that's the projection for this community or for this county. It's going to continue to grow and we're going to continue to have more and more immigrants move to our area.

117	Kim:	Also, nine to 10 years ago when this started with a trickle of Hispanics, I worked with Ed and I remember this Ed. We, uh, didn't have La Esperanza then. And there were a lot of Hispanics, especially from Guatemala, who had never seen a refrigerator. Uh, didn't know what an electric stove was or a toilet; had no clue. So someone -- and I'm not sure it wasn't us at Lester Realty -- but somebody came up with the idea of handing out these flyers that said, "With an electric stove you do not take a bucket of water and pour it on it to shut it off." [Laughter] Uh, and we had people doing that and almost electrocuting themselves. Uh, but there was one problem with that; they couldn't read, even in Spanish of any kind. And couldn't figure out what the pictures meant. Uh, but La Esperanza came and I know that, uh, Sister Maria, I believe it was, starting running classes that were always filled on Saturdays, because it was about the only time the women were not working, showing them how to use an electric stove.
118	Elaine:	How to bathe the baby.
119	Kim:	Well, that was a little farther down the road. [Laughter] That was Sister Rosa. But, I mean, just the basics. What was a refrigerator for? And that when you thaw food, you don't just put it in the sink and turn the water on all day. That was done a lot. I mean, they couldn't believe when they started getting \$2,000 water bills because they would turn on the water and just let it run all day to thaw out meat to cook. And it wasn't that they were unintelligent or anything. They just didn't have that experience.
120	Facilitator:	Let's do it this way: if you, if you look at Georgetown now, okay? Georgetown is the result of approach two; legally or illegally you opened the faucets and they came. All right? Okay? I mean, that's it. Here it is; you are approach two. How has that impacted this community?

121	Ben:	<p>I think I listen to these folks talking and look at right back to the beginning and you talk about a land of opportunity and you think about incentive. A lot of people have a lot of different motivations for coming here, uh, for moving here. For where I'm at where I live, I have a motivation for being there. And different motivations are going to make me go to school or learn a language or do better for my child or my grandchild. And I'm sure that's common no matter what heritage somebody comes from. So take Georgetown and you think I'm sure this same discussion was taking place years back in New York or any one of these, uh, about the same type of issue with another color or another, uh, language of a group of people coming in. But I think it comes back to that motivation. And I've been in like emergency services and let's say when you deal with somebody that's in a bad situation like a medical or an injury type of thing, if two people want to communicate no matter what the language is, it could be on a farm, then you will communicate. There is certainly a trust issue and if somebody feels like they've maybe been oppressed and they see somebody maybe in a uniform or something that simulates a uniform, they might not have that trust yet because of what they've experienced in, in their -- uh, wherever they came from. But I think that develops. If their motivation is to succeed here, to do like other people that live here now or other people in their own culture that have come here and succeeded, they're going to follow along a, a pathway and it's going to be corrected as they go and probably corrected by the folks that brought them here or the folks that convinced them to come here. And you talk about time with La Esperanza or any of these other, uh, community centers, 10 years ago they were talking about not putting water on the oven and then they're talking about cooking on the oven and then they're talking about bathing babies. And now they're talking about putting babies in car seats. So it's a progression that's actually gone a long way in 10 years. So though it may really seem slow, people are motivated to fit in and to do well. And they're going to come about to where they're going to blend in. And I think we're just in a time where it's, uh -- we're still at odds. There is trust issues. There is, uh, not used to it type of issues, but I think give it another 10 years and this conversation is going to be happening in another community somewhere else because Hispanics, Haitians, whatever, slowly they'll start to blend in and still keep their culture, but blend into our own.</p>
122	Facilitator:	<p>What happened to Georgetown? 1994 a trickle. 2005 it's still here. If I remember the data, the Hispanic Latino population of Georgetown was like point nine percent. Now I think you're banging around 35 percent, close. I think I'm close. Am I close?</p>
123	Male Voice:	<p>You're pretty close.</p>
124	Facilitator:	<p>Implications? What's happened? How do you feel? What are the changes to the town? Is Georgetown capsizing? This is approach two. What's going on?</p>

125	Fred:	Have we sunk? I don't think we've sunk.
126	Ed:	I would have to agree with this gentleman. We've come a long way in assimilating our differences. Uh, when we first started on this road, uh, there were a lot of things that we butted heads about and, and, uh, there has been a lot of communications that's, uh, gotten the two sides closer together. Uh, now I find, uh, the Hispanic community is, is coming, uh, to the point where they have worked long enough in this neighborhood, uh, that, uh, they are establishing their own churches, their own businesses, their own, uh, places to, to, uh -- restaurants, their own, their own things that they, they can feel like it's their own community. And, uh, now they're all becoming, uh, profitable, uh, in doing that. And buying new homes, uh, establishing, uh, their own buildings, if you will, to where, uh, they're becoming a viable part of the community.
127	Facilitator:	All right, but it's not all roses. What has happened to Georgetown? What's the flipside? Is anybody bothered by this? I mean, help me out here. Is everybody a happy camper? Are there folks in this town that are not happy campers and if so, why?
128	Tony:	There is just a lot of folks in this town that's not happy. Uh, part of the flipside is even, even all the businesses and things going on right now, it's -- and even in the black community, a lot [unintelligible], it was harder for, uh, the black population to have a business in Georgetown.
129	Unidentified female:	Yes.
130	Tony:	And it's important and a lot of them feel that when the Hispanics came in they was given more of a easier hand because of everything that was going on. I mean, you look at TV sometime, it's -- and I realize they [come] in real fast and all that, but it makes me feel and even some of the people in the community that, uh, we've been here a long time and we didn't never have similar opportunities. And it is, uh -- you know, a lot of them have went for business. A lot of them have tried to get different homes in some of the same areas and tried to buy homes in the same areas the Hispanic population [bought] and, and it wasn't happening. But then all of the sudden it's happening. I mean, I don't -- I can go around the community and I can remember the people in this town that was in these communities when I grew up, you know. But there's nobody, there's nobody left no more. [unintelligible] [moved on] [unintelligible] Georgetown or whatever. I mean, there's nothing wrong with it. They had the right, but it was basically that was a time there was certain communities that we couldn't even move in. But now it's --

131	Michael:	<p>There was a, uh, a coworker of mine, an African American coworker and we, uh, we taught school together. And about 10 years ago many of the churches, this one included, tried to do a lot of outreach into the Hispanic community. And I was talking about that with him one day and he says, "You know, we've been kicked around for hundreds of years in this country and nobody ever cared about us." You know, you could see that it bothered him and this was a man of, of great faith himself. And I'd never thought of it that way. How it has impacted Georgetown, though, is I think, I think people for the most part are accepting it. Uh, they may not like some of the things that happened and some of the, you know, uh, urinating in the streets and stuff, you know. Those things aren't pleasant. But I think as time has gone on, uh, different people, whether they're Guatemalan, Mexican or Haitian -- I think those are the three main, uh, nationalities that we have here -- I think people pretty much accept them. I don't think there is any -- I don't know of any -- community, uh, lash back of these folks being here.</p>
132	Nicole:	<p>I think that, uh, some of it is that the Hispanic community grew so fast, but it really brought to light problems that have existed in Sussex County for a long time. People have, uh, not had adequate water or plumbing or sewer in certain towns, in certain areas of Sussex County; haven't been able to find jobs; haven't been able to get a ride to the doctor. It wasn't a language thing or a citizenship thing. I think that it really brought to light a lot of poverty issues that have existed in our county for a long time that we just lived with; that we were just used to because we kind of grew up here. And I think the Hispanic community, we focus a lot on that community, but it has really brought to light that there are issues. Our neighbors have these issues.</p>
133	Mike:	<p>As Tony was saying earlier, you know, it, uh, it brings to light the racial issues that have existed in this county for a long time and the discrimination and the prejudice. Uh, and so when this, this, this new influx of immigrants came into the community, uh, it just made more visible what was already here with the African American community.</p>



134	Ella:	<p>The African American, uh, community -- now I was born and raised in Georgetown, but I get a little upset at times at what's going on in Georgetown and I think the officials of Georgetown are really insensitive. They are only sensitive to a certain group of people. And we have been asking for a lot of things for years. We asked for subsidized daycare and we didn't get it. And, uh, they do it now. The government backs daycares and stuff. We couldn't get that. A lot of -- I have friends that would try to set up businesses on Main Street. Well, they couldn't do it. And, uh, the few that did have businesses, they had to close up by eight o'clock. And they couldn't run their business after eight o'clock. And now, you can stay open all night long. And I think the town has catered more to this population and it has become insensitive to blacks. And, uh, to the other -- even Haitians do not have the privileges that the other Hispanics have. And even a housing issue. I have, uh, [known] people because I go around to the homeless shelters and, uh, we donate things to the homeless people. And it's been, uh, people that have been pushed out of homes because the greedy landlord wants to, uh, rent the houses to the Hispanics because they are taking advantage of this, uh, population. So they will put you out, put you out on the street just to rent to them so they can get the benefits of the money. I see as a get rich scheme and they are pushing blacks out. And if you go in the homeless shelters you can count on one hand how many Hispanics are in homeless shelters. But you go there and you'll see more whites and blacks in homeless shelters than you will Hispanics.</p>
135	Facilitator:	Thoughts, suggestions before we move on?
136	Tony:	<p>I think if the Christian communities come together, uh, I think they can make, help make a great impact on what's going on in Georgetown. And I really believe that, uh, in our church we support, we do a lot of things to try to work in our Hispanic communities. We don't speak that much Spanish, but we try to do things to work together as a team that I think is very important. Like I said, we all came on different ships, but we're in the same boat now. It's here now so we have to deal with what we have, but we have to deal with it in a way that nobody be hurt, you know. Nobody be hurt and that's very important to me because, uh, everybody have feelings, you know. I don't feel that nobody should be hurt or damaged because of the language barrier or the color or whatever. Because I think everybody is important. So I believe as the Christian communities come together, I believe it will make a greater impact on what's going on in Georgetown.</p>

137	Facilitator:	<p>Okay. Let's move on towards three, all right? This is a matter of priorities, putting economics first. Again, limit the number of newcomers. You know, their arrival impacts those who are already here. Uh, it costs American citizens. Competition from immigrants keeps wages down and even takes jobs away from Americans. We pay higher taxes to support education and social services for income. So what are some of the things that we can do? Keep out immigrants who would take American jobs or take jobs from Americans. Focus immigration strictly on skilled workers. Help out taxpayers in communities where immigrants settle. Stop illegal immigration; toughen up. I mean, you know, it's the porous border. Dangerous drawbacks from tradeoffs; again, immigrants get blamed for problems they do not cause. People who have no safe haven from tyranny. There will be no workers to do the unskilled jobs Americans refuse to accept. And the notion that immigrants are a critical part of this economy. All right? So approach three, thoughts?</p>
138	Mike:	<p>Well, I think first dovetailing into what was just said on the, on the last piece, immigrants in Georgetown, at least in my view, have been an economic benefit to this community, at least in the sense that they have provided skilled or unskilled employees to a number of employers, particularly in the poultry industry. Uh, now in the construction industry. If you go around to all this housing development in the area, most of these construction crews, uh, if you're a homebuyer and you want to go talk to them about how they're building your house, then you need to take an interpreter with you. Uh, I think they've been, uh, an economic benefit to, uh, uh, in the real estate market where a, uh, property can be rented to folks. Uh, substandard property can be rented and profits made off of it that, uh, that wouldn't necessarily be, be rented to, uh, to other people. So I think in, in those regards and probably other regards, uh, they've been a -- at least they're coming here and people are hiring them. So whoever is hiring them and whoever is making money off of them through rental and other means, are economically benefiting. Whether or not the average citizen is economically benefiting is, is another question.</p>
139	Jack:	<p>This can be so -- point three can be basically insignificant financially. Uh, this wave of export of jobs, the immigrants can actually help the United States as a nation in the future because at the rate we're sending work away and you know where, China, uh, around the globe, uh, we're going to have to look to these people and hope they come here just to be able to compete with -- you know, a third of the people in India are making less than a buck a day. So, uh, let's hope we have lots of immigrants come here that will work for less than \$25.00 an hour if we want to save this nation as we know it.</p>
140	Sylvia:	<p>Isn't that sad, though, that we want to bring in immigrants so we can pay them less to compete?</p>

141	Jack:	Sure, it is sad.
142	Sylvia:	That is --
143	Jack:	But, you know, the buck goes --
144	Sylvia:	It's depressing.
145	Jack:	And we, we chase that dollar; business, people that run businesses.
146	Sylvia:	Well maybe we should look at the, uh, globalization of the marketplace now.
147	Jack:	Sure, yep.
148	Sylvia:	And maybe do some restrictions on that. I don't, I don't know, but it just seems really sad to even suggest that we need to have more immigrants so they'll take the lower wages. There should be some kind of system in place so that they don't get paid less than an average American would get paid.
149	Jared:	That's easy enough; you start paying \$10.00 a pound a chicken --
150	Female Voice:	Right.
151	Jared:	At the grocery store.
152	Sylvia:	I just won't eat chicken.[Laughter]
153	Jared:	That's all it is. I mean, and being in production business and farming, uh, and we usually, uh, you get the cheapest labor you can, you can because you don't know what you're going to get when you take that product to the market. You're going to get whatever somebody wants to give you and it's based on what they think they can sell it for out in the public. So if you only want to only pay \$3.00 a pound for chicken, then the farmer is only going to get about 25 cents a pound because somebody else has got to absorb that cost. And this is the whole thing. We are a nation of cheap, cheap food, cheap products, cheap gas. You think gas is high? We are cheap. Everything we have is cheap and expensive. And how does it happen? Because we import from foreign countries where they have cheap labor and the only way we can stay in existence is, like you said, we've got to come in with labor that is comparable and we pay a lot more than foreign countries. And then it all comes back to one thing; you the public, what are you willing to buy and are you willing to pay for it?
154	Jack:	Yeah. There was that slogan years ago "Buy USA." How many people -- I mean, you see the slogan on a very few products today. But how many people actually go buy USA? Not if it comes from, uh, China.

155	Kim:	Well, what people do is they go out to Wal-Mart and look for the rollback signs. "Oh, I'm going to save this," or it's been discounted this much.
156	Linda:	I don't think anybody wants to go back to \$400 VCRs or -- because that's what would happen if they were made in America. We'd be paying that.
157	Facilitator:	Uh, I can hear another forum coming on.[Laughter]
158	Linda:	No, but, but, but what the gentleman was saying that if the immigrants come here, now they may not be getting \$25.00 an hour, but they're not getting \$2.00 an hour. They're getting something comparable. And maybe we're getting them at a discount rate, but it, it rolls over into the goods where we're able to have the chicken at a decent price. The farmers can -- and they're still making much more money than they would have made in Mexico.
159	Facilitator:	Help me out here. And I don't want to be too specific to Georgetown, but I have to be. From what I understand up and down the shore, 85 percent of the labor force in those plants -[Abrupt ending of the tape]
160	Jack:	They can't compete up here so they have to go South because somebody is paying them.
161	Ella:	A lot of the workers that leave, uh, in these chicken factories didn't leave on their own accord. A lot of times they were like pushed out. But, uh, as far as cheap labor, uh, that was the intention of the, uh, companies to have cheap labor. Because I can remember a few years ago with Purdue when they first brought them into Georgetown, Purdue thought they could pay them \$4.00 or \$5.00 an hour. Well that didn't work that way because they got some lawyers. They got some lawyers that was on their side and they had to end up and pay. So they pay everybody the same starting wages now, but they were assuming they could bring them in and pay them \$2.00 or \$3.00 less than what they paid every -- that didn't work out. Because as they learn and they get smarter, they know when you're cheating them. And eventually you're going to have to pay them top wages anyway. As they get educated you're going to have to pay them top wages anyway. But, you know, Purdue was just -- they didn't do their homework. They just figured they'd pay them \$5.00 an hour. See, they did that when the Puerto Ricans and all came and Mexicans came over years ago. That don't work today. That don't work today because they know when they is supposed to get a certain wage because they will ask and you will eventually have to pay them top dollars.

162	Phil:	I think this whole, uh, immigration on economic basis is part of a larger problem of globalization. And, uh, I think the trend is inexorably towards bringing rich countries down to lower levels by exporting jobs or importing cheap, cheap goods. And I don't really think it will come here and willing to work in a chicken factory for, for less. The time will come when you can import the chicken from Brazil or China for even cheaper and so they'll be no chicken jobs.
163	Fred:	Talk about the economics, uh, well if, if we were to try to stop the immigration; if we were to try to close our borders up more, I mean, that's a cost in itself. I mean, how much does it cost to put people out on our borders to watch or to put a fence up, you know, that they can't get through? And they'll find a way to get through the fence anyway if they want to get here, you know, badly enough. Uh, so the economics to the government of trying to reduce it or keep it at, at some level, you know, that, that would impact us also. But, I mean -- and it's not just here in Georgetown, I think, or here in the United States. I mean, because this -- the guest workers and the things that, you know, all of the countries that are Westernized countries that, that they deal with that because they bring in people to work at the jobs that supposedly others won't, won't take. Uh, but it does have a benefit to us here, I think, in Georgetown. Uh, and it is slow. It's been, it's been taking a long time, but I think, you know, because Sussex County is growing itself and so it helps in getting, uh, accommodations and, and maybe it does help us change our laws and, uh, so that we do provide better housing, but the better housing is for everybody that comes to the area. Yes, it will impact the immigrants first, but, I mean, it's going to help everybody. I mean, we need better housing for everybody, not just, not just them. And I think, you know, that's an economic cost also. So, I mean, everything has got a cost and I don't know which one, which is better, which is not. I think we have benefited, though, you know, it's been slow to happen. And I think we will continue to benefit from it.

164	Marissa:	I, I also think that, uh -- I haven't been in Delaware long -- in the United States long enough to know how everything was before, but I think, uh, over the last few years, uh, this town has experienced a lot of change anyhow and it's not only the immigration from -- people from other countries or, in this case, Hispanics, but also even just in this part of the, the state immigration from other states. I see a lot of discomfort in, in the town and in, in the county of, you know, people saying, "It bothers me that it used to take me 15 minutes to go to work and now it takes me 30 minutes to go to work because of traffic." Uh, it bothers them that they cannot go to the beach in the summertime because it's full of, you know, people from other, other states. So I think, uh, this county has experienced a lot of change, uh, and people, as, as I said, uh, have gone through a lot of discomfort throughout it. But during those years that hasn't been able to stop. Uh, growth in the county hasn't been able to stop, immigration hasn't been able to stop. And I really don't think there is much that, you know, we can do to stop it, but follow, you know, the economic rules. It's just part of the same economic growth of the county.
165	Jack:	To add a little humor, I've been here 35 years and we had one traffic light. Now we have two. [Laughter]
166	Tony:	And you can look at even in the poultry industry, you've got them moving from one plant to the other plant. Eventually, they're going to move out of the plant. See, I'm not going to sit here and say that they pushed all the African Americans out of the plant. Some of them left on their own for various reasons, but I know one thing about the poultry plants, it's a big health issue. Believe me, a health issue because of the carpal tunnel, the hands, the feet. Uh, it's real hard work. I started in the plant when I was -- in 1973. I think I've worked in every chicken plant in the State of Delaware. You know, you leave one and you go to the other and that's the way it was. And this is the same thing that's going on now. But, uh, eventually if a better opportunity comes, people will move in toward it, but right now I think what's pushing a [lot of them out] is, is the health issue. They're not trained even when they go -- I mean, this is, I think this is, this is really serious when a person can put a person inside of a, a chicken plant and they're really not trained. I done seen them lose their arms. I done seen them lose their legs. I done seen them lose fingers and whatever. So this is really serious. That's why part of me is saying, "Why bring people and put them in a situation where they're, you know, in harms way." You know, [they expect] [unintelligible] some time, you know, to work. This work has got to get done. [The only way] that we can get this work done, whether you're legal or illegal. You know, so --

167	Sylvia:	Which brings to light an American value that wasn't mentioned in the beginning, discount prices, money. That's a big one and no one even said it. Also, speaking of Hispanic employment, there's a movie called, uh, Where'd all the Mexicans Go? And it's, it's based in California. And one day all the Mexicans disappear and it shows how they all are like desperate without their work because they all disappear from the orchards and from the maid services and the painting. They just all disappear. And it's, uh, kind of an ironic movie.
168	Melanie:	A Day Without a Mexican?
169	Sylvia:	Yeah.
170	Facilitator:	I'm not -- yeah, yeah.
171	Linda:	Hidden treasures.
172	Facilitator:	Right. And so again, flip that around to this approach where it says, "We need to focus on our immigration on only those with skilled labor."
173	Sylvia:	I think it's the American way. Excuse me, that's it.
174	Facilitator:	What do you mean by that?
175	Sylvia:	Uh, that is what's important. Like he was saying, it's all about the dollar (162, Phil, Declarative 2.1.2). How we can get the cheapest labor or the most for the least amount, for the least cost. The most benefit for the least cost.
176	Linda:	But approach, approach three is saying only bring the elite of the immigrants.
177	Female Voice:	The doctors.
178	Linda:	And I don't think that's, that would be right.
179	Ed:	But isn't that dollar what you're coming here for? What, what these workers are coming here for?
180	Tony:	That's right. [unintelligible].

181	Ed:	I mean, you're, you're saying that it's an evil, but that's, that's what they're coming here for. I mean, we have to realize that we're operating, whether we like it or not, in a global economy. And when we make decisions here locally, we need to do them with an eye towards that global economy. Uh, it's like Fred said, I agree that we ought to make, uh, it a little more restrictive for people to cross our borders. And when you do that, uh, you have to consider the cost. It's a daunting task to if you make it more restrictive, then you're going to have more illegals. Uh, so it's a, it's a just a gigantic task to be done.
182	Jack:	And some of, some of you will remember when they put, they put up the Berlin wall and how was it ever going to come down? But it was torn down by their own people. We could put a wall all along the southeast, southwest portion of this country, but, you know, they'll find a way in. Somebody said that.
183	Marissa:	And also you need to have a balance because if you, uh, bring immigrants, only professional immigrants, you're going to have immigrant professionals teaching in universities. You're going to have professionals in the medical field. You're going to have professionals in economics and science. And then what is going to happen with the American people? Are those the ones who are going to work in the poultry plant? And then there is going to have -- there is going to be another problem. You need people at all different levels. Uh, you need the, you know, the [first] line workers, you need professionals, you need doctors. I mean, we have a great shortage in the, in the medical field and what is happening? We're bringing doctors, but you're -- you know, you don't see as many white American doctors anymore because there are a lot of doctors from other, from other places. And people even doesn't -- don't like that. Where is my typical American doctor? I see Chinese doctors. I see, you know Iraqi doctors or from other places. So if you only bring the skilled, you know, uh, immigrants, that's going to cause another problem.
184	Phil:	And you're also draining those countries of their skilled people.
185	Jack:	Good point.
186	Phil:	I mean, all the Philippine nurses here are -- there is no, no Philippine nurses left, you know, in the Philippines.
187	Ed:	Along that same line, I, I had a gentleman who worked here in the chicken industry in Georgetown. Uh, he rented an apartment from me and, uh, I got to know him pretty well. And I asked him where he came from. I believe he came from -- my memory is that he came from Guatemala, I believe. And I asked him what he did before he came here. He was an attorney.
188	Male Voice:	Is that right?



189	Ed:	He was an attorney in his own land, but he's coming here and working in the, in the chicken industry. So, I mean, it's, it's not always the dregs that are coming here to work in our industries.= declarative
190	Facilitator:	So even the unintended consequences are the drain --
191	Phil:	Yeah, there's definitely a brain drain.
192	Facilitator:	Brain drain.
193	Phil:	And I think the U.S. benefits from that economically. Uh, you look in the graduate schools and most of the graduate students, at least in engineering, are, are foreign students. And, uh, the Americans aren't, aren't there. They aren't, uh, they aren't in the graduate school.
194	Jack:	But there's a counter that you buy electronic gadget from India and you make a call because it doesn't work. The other day somebody called, they thought they were talking to Illinois or someplace and they were talking to somebody in New Delhi. So there's a brain drain. And I said, I said, "Was, was that -- did it sound like an American person?" And they said, "No, it's somebody that had an English -- had an accent." And he was solving our problem in Georgetown, Delaware.
195	Nicole:	I called Verizon and I called AOL last week and both of those phone calls, one was in India and one was in the Philippines.
196	Fred:	And if you do -- because the premise of what we're doing here is what is, you know, what happens if you do that? What's the result of this action? And what they said about bringing in just the elite, then you're draining the other countries of their knowledgebase or their people that can earn the money to pay their taxes. So then they're looking for aid and so we end up sending aid. You know, is that it or not? Yes. You know, because now they don't have the base. But where are these elite getting their, their expertise? I mean, they come here and get trained anyway. A lot of them are trained here or do graduate level work here. That's where they get their education. Uh, so then are we causing another consequence on, you know, those that, that have been here and want, want the spot in those education courses or so are we causing more or not? I mean, so that is something else that's weighed and I don't know if we discuss it here or we, or we don't discuss it. But, I mean, there's a lot of potential of economic costs, you know, one way or the other. And, you know, when they come here with their expertise they also want the same salaries and they continue to push up the salaries and the costs like everything else, which then means the lower technical stuff is shipped overseas. Or we think, you know, it's sent over there, uh, but, you know, but sometimes it comes back and sometimes it doesn't. So, I mean, that's, that's a consequence also.
197	Facilitator:	I think that's a J-1 visa.
198	Fred:	Yeah, the --

199	Facilitator:	The J-1 for the skilled labor [unintelligible].
200	Fred:	Yeah. In the industry I used to be in we had to -- if we brought in someone with a green card, we had to show that we couldn't get that expertise somewhere else. And it was in telecommunications. And the expertise is here with, you know -- it's just it was quicker to, to do that than necessarily find someone that wanted that position necessarily. I don't -- you know, I hate to say it that way, but, uh, you know, you know, they wanted to carry a different title than programmer, so if I needed a programmer, it was easier to get somebody on a green card than to get someone who is going through an engineering school because they wanted to be system engineers writing programs.
201	Facilitator:	[unintelligible].
202	Fred:	Yeah. [Laughs] Uh, but, you know, so they -- you know, we elite ourselves, too, uh, based on our knowledge and on our education. So someone with the same education, been educated here, will take the job as the programmer, instead of the system engineer. And they end up doing the same thing.
203	Marissa:	Well, this is the land of opportunity and immigrants are taking advantage of that opportunity. Because, you know, whether it's less, it's a lot greater than, you know, the opportunities they have in their home countries. So, uh, people are taking advantage of, of any opportunity available in this country.
204	Facilitator:	All right. Let's start trying to put this together, okay? As you sat here through the night -- I mean, and the way I like to do this is kind of like, you know, you just spent an hour-and-a-half really working through three different ways to talk about immigration. So I want you to take a minute, just a minute to yourself -- a little quiet time here -- and think about individually have you heard anything different? Did you hear anything that, uh, might have struck you or something like that? And then we'll go on. [Extended silence]

205	Marissa:	Maybe one of the things that a lot of the times we all make a mistake in is making generalizations. When we talk about Hispanics, we talk about cheap labor. We talk -- we think about, you know, people who do not speak English. Uh, people who are, you know, we relate them to poverty. Uh, and that's some of the mistakes that we make a lot of times when we talk about immigrants. When we talk about immigrants, a lot of the times we think illegal immigrants. So, uh, you know, there are many differences. And even talking about Hispanics, uh, or the Hispanic immigrants from different countries. We have different, different, different people. We have people from, uh -- coming from rural areas of those countries with very, uh, low education. And that's when we run into problems. When we even translate documents, they don't even read Spanish. And we also have the, the, uh, other populations who are professionals in their country and because of the economic situations in those countries, a doctor is, you know, driving a taxi and is just looking for, you know, a place where he can, uh, practice, uh, medicine. So if the United States gives the opportunity, of course, that doctor is going to take that opportunity. So there, there are a lot of different groups and we, we generalize a lot of the times, uh, you know, populations.
206	Jack:	One of the benefits of this program, this lady directly across from me has been there, done that. She comes roughly 10 years?
207	Unidentified male:	Eight.
208	Jack:	And I respect and I'm in awe with people who have been there. He's worked in every chicken plant in Sussex County. So when you hear people who have been there, done that, I can't see how you could not respect and be swayed by their experience and decisions. Good program.
209	Fred:	There certainly are no easy answers are there? We, we have, uh, discussed -- actually, in all three questions we covered some of the same information. And I don't think that, that there is an easy answer. I think it's going to be difficult. Uh, but I think we will, we'll get through this, too.
210	Facilitator:	Others, individually, did you hear anything that kind of personally struck you in this conversation?
211	Ed:	One of the things that struck me is, uh, whether you're talking about in economics, uh, whether it's, uh, somebody that's taken a job from you, uh, whether it's in education, I think you have to look back at the desire of the immigrants. Uh, they're coming here because they desire employment. They want to do the things that we Americans won't do or can't do. Uh, when we look at our education, I'd like to ask Tammy because I'm really concerned about what you said. Because in my experience, most, uh, children of immigrants that are in school have the desire to learn. That's something that a lot of our own children don't have. And is that becoming -- does that create a problem to you?

212	Tammy:	No. I didn't want -- I didn't mean to give the impression that they don't have the desire to learn.
213	Ed:	Uh-huh.
214	Tammy:	My -- where I'm coming from with this tonight and my interest in this is they have a strong desire and they come to school very willing to absorb and to do everything they're supposed to do and learn. It's they come in at a disadvantage and the disadvantage is placed upon them, in my opinion, by this state and by the federal government. And the gap is so huge that they, that they have to, you know, close; that I have to close.
215	Ed:	I just wondered about that because my daughter is a new teacher this year and she's teaching inner city Philadelphia.
216	Tammy:	Uh-huh.
217	Ed:	And there -- it's her feeling that there's virtually nobody in her class that has a desire to be there. There is no parent that has a desire for them to be there and the administration doesn't help her.
218	Tammy:	Yeah.
219	Ed:	So that's a, that's a --
220	Tammy:	No, I didn't -- no, it's not like that at all. And for me, it's very frustrating for me, and this is just a personal note, but I take my job very seriously and I love what I do and I think what I do is very important in the life of this community and in this country as a whole. And part of what I feel is important is that I be able to communicate with the parents of those children with whom I work. And so it's very frustrating for me to not be able to communicate. And it's very frustrating for me that, that they -- I, I have the impression that parent, the parents feel intimidated because it's a, it's a state institution that they're coming into. So it's very hard to, to, to close that gap and to become in partnership with the parents of these children. But the children themselves that I've had experience with are, are wonderful children and they, you know, they assimilate into the culture very, very well and they assimilate into the culture of the school. It's that there's so much they need to know in such little amount of time.
221	Nicole:	I think the school district is doing a wonderful job, but the sad thing I see, I have a really good friend and she has two kids and the kids go to school from 7:30 to 3:30. They go to the Boys and Girls Club after that. And then they come home and do homework after that. These kids are literally studying English, trying to learn English, trying to read, trying to do math, trying to do worksheets from 7:30 in the morning until 7:30 at night. I don't remember doing that when I was in the second or the third grade. And, and the poor kids are, are really exhausted, but they have this state test hanging over their head and their whole year long they're, they're trying to get ready for it.
222	Tammy:	Thank you for saying that word. [Laughter]

223	Facilitator:	Let's do this because we're winding down. Shared sense of direction; walking through here are there any, any themes that you think you could pull out of tonight that, that if we were just talking about immigration in this country, where we need to be?
224	Jared:	I would say that it's a very complex issue and there are social ramifications, there is political ramification and economic ramifications. Uh, we cannot put them under an umbrella. We cannot group these things. There are individually, uh, concerns in different areas. It's different in Chicago, the cities, as it is in, here in, uh, Georgetown. It's different in Florida. It's different in Texas. It's different in California. Uh, it's really hard to make a policy that covers all those things and I just don't think it can be done. What it's going to take is people sitting down, working together, trying to understand the issue that they're dealing with in their local area and resolving it.
225	Facilitator:	Others?
226	Linda:	I got the sense that we all felt they were very valuable and that I didn't hear any strong like, uh, feelings of, "No, they shouldn't be here," or "There's too many of them." It seemed like we all would welcome and are welcoming immigrants here.
227	Jack:	It's my understanding that, uh, this program is in four locations around the United States. You're going to -- we're going to end up -- well, whatever. The point being that the federal government needs to regionalize and listen to people like this and then the legislators from the states need to recognize and almost deal with it within their geographical region. But to do a federal, uh, edict that this is the way immigration is going to happen is, uh -- well, it took 10 years to get to where we are now, just in our little locale, so it's not going to -- we're not going to get instantaneous response by Congress voting another law.
228	Ella:	I agree with, uh, that gentleman there. Immigration is not just a one, one thing or one decision-making process. Uh, I feel the lawmakers -- it's not the Hispanics or any other immigrants that come to this country that I feel created a problem. I think it's the people up top; the lawmakers and government and all that has really created the problem. And whenever you have immigration you can't say they are responsible. It's how the people handle the immigration issue. They're not responsible for what happened in Georgetown among the other people. It's -- I feel it's the lawmakers. The ones that are in charge of the town have neglected other people for, uh, just one people. And we should make things fair to everybody and I'm for everybody. You know, I don't care what, uh -- I don't look at people as faces, colors. I just look at you as a people and whatever the immigration issues are, you should handle them with everybody's needs, uh, in concern.
229	Facilitator:	Next question, tradeoffs. Are there any tradeoffs or things that we are willing or not willing to do with regards to immigration?

230	Ed:	I, I for one, as I said earlier, I think that we should tighten the controls on our borders. Uh, but I also said that that in itself creates other problems. It's going to create more cost, uh, to the federal government for protecting our borders. And I think the tradeoff for that is that, uh, we, as the residents of the United States, the people, Americans here, uh, are going to have to resign ourselves to the fact that there is going to be a cost to that. And, uh, we're going to have to pay higher costs, uh, for whatever the product we might be looking at or considering.
231	Tony:	If they don't be very careful by handling the situation even in Georgetown, sooner or later they'll end up building maybe a bigger prison. Because of people not -- if people don't have better laws and do the right thing, they're going to handle things their way and before you know it, they're going to end up building more prisons and things like that for people so. . .
232	Facilitator:	All right, one last question. If you were going to have this conversation again where would you start? Where would you start? If you had to start to put down a building block that you're going to have a -- you kind of covered it broadly tonight, okay? Say, say you're in charge. You know, you missed, you missed the deal. You didn't show up to the meeting and they all appointed you to the committee, where would you have your first conversation regarding immigration? What is the most important thing that you would, you would want to try to get on the table and figure it out to move forward? Where would you come back and what would you talk about?
233	Ed:	I, I think the logical starting place would be economics, because that's where it's all going to end up. That's what's going to make the decision in the end anyway.
234	Facilitator:	Others?

235	Mike:	I think the, the, the focus needs to be on differentiating between folks who come into this country through the system as a part of our immigration policies and procedures and laws and those people who don't come in through those policies, procedures and laws. And that's where -- you know, in a town like Georgetown, that's where, uh, that's where, where the rub is. And a lot of these people who come in some other way are here because the people want them here. They want them here to work. They want them here to spend. They want them here to rent housing, uh, and with all the disadvantages that it offers to those people. And so somehow, uh, I think that's where it's not, it's not folks who come in, do their applications, come in through the process, get the right paperwork, get the right, get the right cards. Uh, I mean, sure there are, there can be oversights and folks can come in who shouldn't come in like the 9/11 people, uh, but for the most part, those folks come in and they lead decent, law abiding lives. And then you have this other group of folks who come in and most of them lead decent, law abiding lives. Uh, but because of how they come in, uh, and because they don't have, uh, the legal rights that you and I have or the person who comes in through the system has, they're abused, they're taken advantage of, uh, and it creates what I think is a, is a immoral and unethical situation. It's a, it's a, it's a justice issue.
236	Facilitator:	All right. Economics?
237	Linda:	I want to talk about documentation a little bit. Uh, uh, specifically it's in the news about driver's licenses and in our country that's almost like a passport. That is, that's the big thing that, that identifies who you are. But really all they really want is, is documentation to be able to drive a car so that they can go to work. And there should be, I think, maybe some distinction between the two documents so that, uh, they can come over here as visitors or they are applying for their citizenship and until they do that, they would receive a different type of drivers license that would be -- and I think that was suggested in California. There was utter outrage by that, but I think that sort of might bridge the gap between the being undocumented and being citizenship.
238	Facilitator:	All right. Let's do this; let's wrap it up. Everybody okay? One, I'd like to thank you truly for coming out on a tough night. I don't want to be the first one to walk out the door and see how much snow is falling.

## ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ II.

### Транскрипт форума по вопросам иммиграции в Сидар-Рэпидсе.

Public Forum on Immigration in Cedar Rapids, Iowa Transcript	
1	MODERATOR
	<p>Um, uhm, The forum that we are going to be engaging in is very much about us and our interactions so I certainly think that the first order of business is for us to go around the group and let everyone do just a quick introduction...um..who you are, a little bit about what you do and why you're here.</p> <p>Now I will come back to all of you a little bit later, in a few minutes as a matter of fact, and ask you to talk more specifically about another matter, which is your personal stake in this issue. That's not for this kinda first segment, uh right now I want you to do a kinda quick self introduction and then we'll explore our stake in the issue a bit more as we get into the forum. Uh let's just start over here... right?</p>
2	JOHN
	<p>I am John Dusek, I am from Cedar Rapids. A business person... basically, in real estate development.</p>
3	BRED
	<p>I am Bred Holtman, I am a consultant at Grant Wood ATA I got involved in this through hosting this site here and had some training in past in this and am looking forward to it...</p>
4	MODERATOR
	<p>Ok</p>
5	RUTH
	<p>Ruth Bolster, retired. Here I've been at issue forums in the past, have worked for a cab agency.</p>
6	CHRISTINA
	<p>I am Christina Johnson, I come from De Moines, I am a human resources coordinator for a non-profit organization in De Moines...</p>
7	JIM
	<p>I am Jim Leech, I'm a board member of the Kettering Foundation.</p>
8	MATT
	<p>I am Matt Scarones I live in De Moines, I were and I am with the University of Northern Iowa Center for Immigrant Leadership and Immigraion. And I've been working with immigrant communities in Iowa for... close to... eight years now.</p>
9	JERRY



	My name is Jerry Ott, I also live in De Moines, Iowa, and I retired from the Iowa State Education Association a couple of years ago and have had a good fortune of being associated with Jim and other members of partners organization for quite some time.
10	JUDY
	I am Judy MacDowell, I work for Kirkby community college in the promised jobs program, a welfare reform program, and I've been a member of the League of Voters and have been involved in these issues forums.
11	COLIN
	I am Colin Hennesse, I am instructional designer here in Cedar Rapids, but I live in Iowa city, and I am also earning my second master's degree in public policy at Iowa State.
12	CHRISTINE
	Christine Sattée, I am from De Moines and I am a self-employed freelance writer.
13	MARIAM
	Mariam Andunez De Moyolo. I am an immigration attorney and I have been in practice for six years, and I represent documented and undocumented workers and corporations that wish to hire foreign workers.
14	KATHY
	I am Kathy Salazar and I am also an immigration attorney, and do similar work as Mariam has mentioned, based out of Washington, Iowa. I've been practicing for approximately five years.
15	DALE
	I am DALE Taipf originally from Chicago, the south side of Chicago, served on the city council here in Cedar Rapids, and now I'm the vice president of development for a company that builds and sells large playgrounds.
16	DAVE
	Dave Wilkinson. I work for the Iowa State Education Association, title is teaching and learning specialist and part of the work is to work with the Kettering Foundation national issue forums in an informal group, but this summer I organized a group the Iowa Partners in Learning that try to encourage public deliberation of issues.
17	MIRIAM
	I am Miriam Amer, I am an independent writer and media consultant and I am a commissioner with the Civil Rights Commission of Cedar Rapids.
18	KAREN
	I am Karen Bolderson. I am a Spanish teacher at an area school, I am also a member of IACA and I've been twice running for public office, so, I understand some of the ... political views of some of this, too. So, ok.

19	MODERATOR
	<p>Despite my shuffling of papers here one of the points that I need to uh reiterate, I will have a couple things in my lap because I need them to moderate the um the forum, but um as Milton was saying its very important that we interact with each other and we look at the speaker as we're proceeding here because the uh the essence of the forum is our interaction, not just the issue book or the frame that we're using so if you're kind a keeping materials on your lap it's important that...we not necessarily be referring to those in a... during the forum; obviously those are background materials more than anything else, so just with that in mind...we'll also I trust will get into the issue and after pretty quickly all of us will become kind of unaware of the production aspect ... that's at least that's wha'st happened in the past...and we'll keep this as uh conversational as possible.</p> <p>All of us are here, and have been invited here I think because of various roles we play especially in our public lives, but uh the point I want to make is that we are here first and foremost in the shared role of citizen. Uh President Carter when he left office said that he was returning to the ...the only title greater than the title he had held, which was the title of U.S. citizen... uh, interesting way to, to think about it.</p>

	<p>So this is a civic deliberation and it is very much intended to be a deliberative process not a uh opportunity for individual dissertation or debate and uh I will try to moderate with that uh, with that in mind. As I say to my college students in uh writing workshop which I find very similar to this kind of activity... I tell them that writing is not intended to be either a competitive or a spectator sport it is not intended to be either a competitive or a spectator sport, the same can be very much said of this, it is not intended to be a competitive or a spectator sport. We're here to participate and to pursue shared understanding and the um sincere engagement in the uh interaction is the uh only way we're going to accomplish that.</p> <p>We use an issue frame and the moderator has really two pieces of machinery to keep our conversation moving forward and keep it focused. The issue frame that you've had an opportunity to review was developed through a great deal of research and effort and work by a number of people, Jerry Ott was one of the people involved with that.</p> <p>And the issue frame helps us treat the issue as something more complex than an either/or partisan matter. And so uh the frame is intended to help us explore the complexity of this issue. We will attend to the frame and we'll try to address all of the approaches and give a reasonable amount of time to each of the approaches but we'll also try to not be tyrannized by the frame. The um the real forum is our interaction not um how thoroughly we uh we can process the uh the issue frame.</p> <p>So, with those uh, with those thoughts in mind, I would like to come back to the question that I raised earlier. Obviously we are all here to consider the issue of immigration and specifically what might or might not need to be done in terms of American immigration policy. █</p> <p>Um, I would like to hear from as many individuals in the group as would like to chime in at this point, a little bit about your personal stake in the issue. Some of you have kind of uh implied that by uh describing your position, uh ya know you're your work, and our work is certainly one aspect of our relationship to an issue but usually our personal stake in an issue may go deeper than our work role or our title. It may be tied to something more specific uh than than that.</p> <p>And so lets hear a bit about that from some people. Anyone who would really like to to start to talk first about your personal stake in this issue? What makes it particularly important to you?</p>
20	RUTH
	<p>I'll start. As the ... coordinator here in Cedar Rapids, I did get the opportunity to see the diversity of the community. ...was also extremely impressed with the number of refugees that came into our community. I was also when I was working in Chicago in a facility that had an immigration – I'm not sure raid is the right word – but an immigration raid, was also aware in the Chicago area of one business notifying immigration, when another business was having an inspection, so that...it IS a very complicated issue.</p>
21	JOHN

	I guess my... my interest is in terms of just general public policy and this is one of those issues that it tends to be kind of a third rail, a hard one that quickly can...d... I guess... people throwing fire bombs at each other about issues, instead of talking about it... so I thought it would be interesting to come to a forum like this and hopefully get some nice balanced dialogue, 'cause I do think this is a complex issue.
22	MODERATOR
	Thanks John
23	KAREN
	Many many years ago when immigrants came into this country, and I am referring to like the time of WW2, when there were a lot of people escaping from Europe... and came to our country seeking refuge from that time the Germans and many others who were threatening their very lives, their homes... and their very lives. They had to have a sponsor here in the country, each one individually and personally had to have a sponsor, a sponsor person, a sponsor family, so that they could be sure they would receive enough start in life, a place to live, food to eat, they wouldn't be on the streets and they would also begin to learn the language. I think that we're missing the boat when we're not teaching people who come here. Maybe, we don't have enough resources right now... to teach them how to assimilate into our system and without those resources and that's my concern. You know, slowing fast rising tidal wave down a bit, so that we can help the people who are coming over become assimilated into our system, understand more thoroughly how this system works, why it is so much better than the countries they are leaving, for the most part, and...
24	MODERATOR
	Is there, is there a personal, individual encounter in your experience, though, that really raises that concern for you?
25	KAREN

	<p>Well, yes, there is and it would be our son-in-law. And he is from Ireland and he is just now getting his naturalization papers, and he said that, as a matter of fact, the rate... the... the Irish ... whatever one calls it... it's the rate, the numbers of people who can actually immigrate to the States is much much lower than many other countries. Not exactly sure why. I guess he said there are too many Irishmen in the US. We were chuckling about that... But they do already speak the English language which makes it an easier hurdle for them to overcome. He said I have no problem that I live in New York, he said, I have no problem with the Polish who seem to have displaced us as the immigrants of choice, certainly there is more Polish coming into this country, but he said they are excellent carpenters, have excellent carpenter skills, he said, whereas the Irish used to carry through with carpentry work, building, now, he said, the Irish, a lot of them, are purchasing or have purchased buildings, for example, he himself is a bartender and he would like some time purchase a building himself and, you know, ... a business himself. And he said the Polish are now at this point where there are learning the skills of the trade, doing excellent, excellent work and he has no problem with that himself. But THAT's where I see it, we lower some numbers of some people, raise the numbers of other people, but are we keeping it on an equal basis, are we able to have the resources to make sure that we get these people assimilated into our system. (Theme 2) – truncated scenario</p>
26	MATT
	<p>I feel I have a personal stake on this issue, because I am an immigrant myself, I am a new Iowan, originally from Peru, but I've been living in Iowa for about ten years now, and really love this state, I feel very much a part of that, and I am very concerned about Iowa's long-term sustainability and social and economic health, and one of the most pressing problems that I see is that there is such a lack of younger workers, younger people who leave the state and am very concerned at the same time that given our aging workforce, we are gonna have huge, very concrete, very factual workforce needs, and I with my own work try to promote a welcoming atmosphere in communities, so that we are able to effectively integrate workers and have the benefit maximize as well as reducing any costs that are involved, and that's something that really drives the work that I do, and then on a more personal level, really what I find most important is that I see that really immigrants embody those Iowa values of hard work and faith and family, and so the values that I share also why it feels so like home here and that is something that we can really nurture and we can become a really welcoming state.</p>
27	MODERATOR
	<p>Does someone have a substantially different personal stake in this issue from what you've heard so far?</p>
28	DAVE

	<p>Well, in my own family, the roots of how the folks got here goes back so far I have no idea. So, immigration in that sense is so distant. However, in my wife's family, her grandparents, aunts, uncles immigrated here from Sweden. And so she has personal stories of when they moved into Chicago area of the men basically working as carpenters and the women working as maids, and as cooks for wealthy Chicago families. And that the struggles that they had in terms of language and getting adjusted opened up a whole new sort of sense to me from what I had experienced; so, it's been an issue that I have interest in between looking back a couple of generations and then looking to the day what's similar what's different... and it's sometimes I think I can tell the difference, and sometimes I can't.</p>
29	JERRY
	<p>Jim, my younger daughter has been living and married in Merida, Mexico, and has been there now for almost ten years. So, we've had lots of opportunities to travel to Mexico and initially I was nervous being in a strange ... and felt awkward because of the language and have gradually overcome the awkwardness of language, but what our experience's allowed us to do is to observe first-hand the stark discrepancy between the haves and the havenots in many, many... in all parts I would guess – but the parts that we've been in Mexico, and easy to see why people of sparse means would economically seek to improve themselves by moving. So, I have ... greater empathy for... for... people whose living conditions are such that it simply drives them out of their own homes.</p>
30	COLIN
	<p>I guess I would agree with that a lot; my role in the company that I have requires me to travel, let's say, approximately 40 to 70 percent of the time to all areas of the world and I spend a lot of time working and teaching people who don't speak English and don't have the same kind of luxuries in terms of the educational systems that we have here in the United States, and so... seeing their perspective from that way and the way that I had then to design my materials that I'm training them and so forth with... hearing their stories of how much they would like to come to the United States and so forth. Makes it personal in a way that I wouldn't have known, I thought it would have been.</p>
31	JUDY
	<p>I have a story, I am working with a woman through the promised jobs program and welfare reform program, who is a battered alien. She came to the United States because of a relationship that she had developed over Internet with a man who lives here in this area. And she married the man and came here in the United States and now that he has abused her, and so she has left, she's been left now kind of on her own and I understand that she does have rights as far as being able to stay here, because of that connotation, I guess, ... it's being a battered alien, but I've read somewhat recently, I guess in Newsweek, that that is a thing that's happening quite often in the United States, that women are coming here to seek a better life and to find some stability and then things happen and that's not working out, and so then they are kind of stuck with what to do now, so...</p>
32	MIRIAM

	<p>From my standpoint, I have a foot in each culture. Half of my family has been here a long time, but they were immigrants, and part of my family is... recent immigrants. My husband is a new American, I have one foot, you know, where “we’ve been here for a long time,” one foot where it’s new. And growing up with both of these issues, I see &lt;it&gt; from both perspectives, you know, some people say “well, you shouldn’t be coming, because you should stay home or “go back to your country,” people take a look at me and my scarf and they say to me “Get out of my country!” (Challenging 0.3 people) You know, and they just see that, that’s all they see. But as far as the women coming here - there is a double sided issue there – you have women that come who come to marry and they want to stay here, and there is a battered spouse law, where they can stay, if they are battered, then there is the ones who come seeking a better life, but you’ve got men and women, I’ve traveled extensively and the people come to me and say: “How can I emigrate, well, how can I get into the US?” The only thing you can tell them is to go through the channels. But overseas the United States to some of these immigrants is a shining star, it’s going to allow them to get away from dictatorships, to have a better life, and when they get here there is a completely different reality.</p>
33	<p>MODERATOR</p>
	<p>All right. The um the frame we’re working from this morning regarding this issue essentially raises the question of whether or not it is time once again to change U.S. immigration policies for contemporary reasons. The frame offers us three different approaches, ways to look at the issue, or ways the issue is commonly seen and articulated and argued for in our society.</p> <p>And uh one of those approaches says that um yes, it’s time to change what we are doing simply because there’s too much immigration. Immigration. The face of our country is changing more rapidly than we can handle. That’s at least at least one of the stances... The fear is... literally an national identity crisis, inability to assimilate at the pace people are entering the country from other parts of the world. So that will be one of the approaches that we uh that we look at.</p> <p>A second and really quite different stance is held by people who say now wait a minute, we are a nation of immigrants from the beginning, unless you are a native American you are an immigrant, and then some of the native Americans will say now wait a minute, we are immigrants too, we just came over a different bridge you know to get here, and much longer ago, so, the, you know, the stance really from that perspective is we need to recognize and be true to a long national heritage of... welcoming accepting assimilating immigrants and building a national identity out of multinational sources.</p> <p>A third approach says um lets get realistic folks, huh, it boils down to money, it boils down to economics, and let’s look at the economics of the situation, we need to put that first, there are some things that we can handle, some things we can’t handle, we simply can’t afford to do everything we might want to do. So there may be some overlap among those three approaches, but there certainly are distinctions among them as well.</p>

	<p>But ultimately what we are really getting to is whether we can reconcile conflicts between our national heritage in relation to immigration and our current economic realities, and at the same time... especially in a post 9/11 world, address concerns about our safety and interests of American citizens. So, a pretty enormous backdrop to our conversation about this issue.</p>
	<p>And what I would like to do now is uh is really direct our attention to uh the first approach. Uhm. The first approach uh essentially saying, there is too much immigration. too much difference. too much difference is occurring uh too rapidly. uh in our society, and that essentially our current policy uh of handling immigration around three reasons. family sponsorship which is still part of ya know of our national policy. uh uhm. humanitarian refuge. uh and really a kind of recruitment aspect to the policy around preferential job skills. the that uhm kind of three part policy, complicated by illegal entry, is not handling the uh the situation that we're facing. that in fact uhm we should admit fewer immigrants in the interest of continuing to develop and preserve a national identity... ehm...</p> <p>What's your... what's your response to that approach? Is there anyone here who finds... some... identification with um with that position?</p>
34	KAREN
	<p>Yes, I think there are some identifications with that. Even ... as a teacher looking at the school calendar and the school year, holidays that we used to celebrate are either no longer celebrated or their name has changed, we don't have Christmas break anymore, we have winter break, um, in light of the fact that there are not just all Christians. This was founded as a Christian, Judeo-Christian country, and many of the immigrants ARE of that belief, but some of them are not... So, instead of going by still by the majority, we cater to the minorities, I am not saying that we shouldn't be concerned about the minorities, but there seems to be more of a catering to the minorities and more of a, of an acceptance to allow them to tell us what things, what traditions we can throw out and what traditions they want to see maintained. It hardly seems fair to have it that way. So, it's kind of like the upper cart's been upset, and some people are very disturbed by that; for example, Easter isn't called Easter break anymore, either that's spring break and... many of the other very important Christian holidays that have been observed are more or less tubed. Before immigration became a real major issue, we've had enough atheists and the agnostics in this country to to undermine some of the Christian beliefs and the Christian holidays anyway, but then you add to it other religious beliefs and it makes it even more troublesome, it becomes almost a Pandora's box. How do we deal with this?</p>
35	DALE



	<p>I think one of the most important things to get on the table... to begin with, at least to start the discussion eh, is... I think you'll find a lot of agreement around – at least in this group – that what is currently in place is not working by any means. And I don't care what answers you... trying to... you have to get that out in front.</p> <p>And, and I don't care how much money you have for enforcement, until you can address the reasons why people eh-want to immigrate into this country, you are not gonna solve the... problem. And, you know, we... I would make the differ... before it was a Christian country, it was a democratic country, and I think a lot of those things that we held as important in the past, you sort of have to throw those out of the window, because the reality is... an', an'... - I don't have a real stake in it other than just sort of a citizen, a... citizen stake... but I can see as you travel, especially throughout Iowa, eh, the complexity of the state's changed, and it's changing almost every, every month, eh, and, and, and it's... in a lot of places from what I've seen it's been a good change. I mean a lot of them... in a lot of these towns, the smaller rural towns, these folks are actually coming to help with the economic model;... if you didn't have these people coming in to do some of this work, a lot of these places would be really in a world of hurt(?)...</p>
36	MODERATOR
	<p>In your city government experience was there, was there a sense that there was, there was a strain on the system, because we were admitting too many immigrants? Or a concern especially around the kind of economic development issue you are raising in relation to small communities that we are not admitting enough or not admitting the right ones? (T 2?)</p>
37	DALE
	<p>Unfortunately, I think... a lot of immigrants don't even show up on the government... radar screen. Eh, if you are in the neighborhood you'll see the impact of ... you know, maybe ten years ago there was a heavy influx of Somali refugees, now you've got a lot of folks from Kosovo... you had, you know, if you go back twenty years ago the Laotians and the Mongs and the Hispanics were just a given. But... no, it really didn't show up, unfortunately, a lot of times what shows up in, say, government is the person that speaks the loudest, and a lot of these people who need the help and need the social services are afraid to speak, and we all know why they are afraid to speak – they might get deported, so...</p>
38	MODERATOR
	<p>So, how complicated is the issue by... the distinction between legal and illegal immigrants? Is our policy working as far as legal immigration is concerned, but not working because we cannot control illegal immigration?</p>
39	JOHN

	<p>Well, I would say it would be both, really... we always had the illegal problem, we also have a problem since about 1990, our, the rate at which we immigrate people was, went up about five times annually,... it really took off, it's not a flat one by any means, and I think that causes quite a bit of problems in terms of assimilation and also... are the people who are coming here have... are they skilled people or unskilled people, because the economics, come back to economics, unskilled their first generation, maybe, the second generation of the unskilled, probably have a net cost to society just economically, beyond the cultural ... obviously if you get a lot of high skilled, and those people work for companies like Microsoft, there's been a lot of pressure in Washington... &lt;break in the tape&gt;</p>
40	<p>MODERATOR</p>
	<p>...in this approach um is that um limiting immigration further uh further reduces our ability to um to deal with people who genuinely need refugee status. (FS 1.2) So I I'm I guess I'm also wondering, there's there's the legal -illegal difference and tension, there's also a difference, it seems to me, between immigrant and refugee. Uh they're talked about the same, they may fall into the same category, but we have a little different history with refugees than we have with non-refugee immigrants...uh...</p>
41	<p>RUTH</p>
	<p>When I was ... coordinator... the number of refugees that were coming into Cedar Rapids amazed me, it amazed me that the department of human resources had a person for refugees to help them assimilate. I think that it's good that we have, that we're open for refugees, but what the definition of a refugee is might be something that we could look at... whether it's too broad or whether we need to consider what is a refugee.</p>
42	<p>MARIAM</p>
	<p>Well, the definition of a refugee is set by the international law, by treaties that the US has signed. A refugee is someone who is fleeing persecution from his home country, because that person is being, because that person is being persecuted on the basis of race, religion or politics or belonging to a certain social group. I, my experience as an attorney representing refugee&lt;s&gt; has been very rewarding, I have represented people who were slaves in Sudan, in the Sudan, I have represented women who were fleeing their countries because their daughters were going to be... to, to... to be endangered, because of the female genital mutilation. I think that we should not change our policy on refugees. The history of this country and the position of the United States in front of the world as the open country...an open country for people who are fleeing persecution should not change.</p>
43	<p>KATHY</p>

	<p>I think our immigration policies as they stand right now are, the more restrictive you make the immigration policies, the more you are going to have illegal immigration. We've restricted refugees, there is a cap on refugees that continues to go down, because that cap is going down and also because there is now caps on family immigration, all different classes of family immigration, also caps that are being reached on employment-based immigration, and also additional restrictions above and beyond these classifications... that those restrictions are causing more illegal immigration, because people cannot get in legally. And they are trying to reunify with their families, a lot of families-based immigration is splitting up families for not only years or a few years, for months, but is splitting them up for decades. And because of the splitting up of those families that is what's causing people to immigrate illegally, because they have no other means of getting into the country to join their families. Or to get a better life.</p>
44	MARIAM
	<p>For someone, a permanent resident from Mexico, who has a wife or a husband abroad, he has to wait between seven and nine years to be reunited with his family.</p>
45	MATT
	<p>Yeah, I would reiterate to that... illegal immigration is a problem, it is a very significant problem and we, when finding a solution, we have to realize that the problem there are not the immigrant individuals, but actually the laws, and we are a nation of immigrants, but most importantly, we are a nation of laws, and right now the laws are not in sync with reality as well as our values as an immigrant nation, and what I think is something that we should definitely inform is that when immigrants come to the border they do not have a legal path and an illegal path and they deliberately choose the illegal path, the reality is that there is no legal channel right now for the immigrants to enter the country legally, if they are low-skilled, so that's why you have such huge numbers of illegal immigration and undocumented immigrants living and working now sometimes for ten to twenty years...</p>
46	MODERATOR
	<p>But should there be a legal path for anyone who wants to come in?</p>
47	MATT
	<p>Oh, abso... abso... I believe that there has to be restrictions, that the system has to come under the rule of law, and the issue is that all the undocumented immigration is occurring right now would be legalized, if those legal channels are instituted. And thus we would basically be bringing the... transforming the system which is right now ridden by human smuggling and by fake documents to one that would be legal, orderly and also humane and dignified. And to respond,... eh... I'll just finish with that... for the past fifteen years what we have been doing is actually increasing border controls, increasing security, to an about of probably 300 percent in terms of the numbers of border patrol agents, as well as the budget of the patrol agency, and we have seen is that while we have increased so much that is that illegal immigration has actually doubled, so we have been trying to enforce a policy that is not working and that's why it's important to institute those legal channels.</p>
48	DALE

	Were the caps there before 9-11 and not enforced or is this the result...
	NODDING
49	KATHY T 1 FS 1.1 Truncated 1.1.2 After 9/11 it is more difficult for high-skilled specialists to get to the US because of more border control
	Yes, right. The caps, they were significantly higher prior to 9-11. Since 9-11 the caps have been reduced to a point where it's causing people that would normally have been like for instance on employment-based, non immigrant visa H1B would be able to have come in almost immediately after the approval, where now even though they have an approved visa, they can't use it, because there is a cap, and they have to wait sometimes over a year to be able to enter, even though they have an approved visa...
50	SOMEBODY
	This is the visa... a work visa?
51	KATHY
	It's a work visa... eh, H1B is specifically designed for people that are qualified for what they call a speciality occupation, you have to have at least a Bachelor's degree to qualify for that type of visa, but I think another point to make is, you know, the United States, you know, has a policy of all people are created equal, and is it really fair to exclude people who are either low-skilled or no-skilled workers for the advantage of having highly-skilled workers... I think this goes against what this country was founded on which is to give everybody an equal opportunity to contribute to our society, and at this point by adopting the format of "we only want high-skilled, highly educated people" and that's already ingrained in the immigration system at this point anyway, but if we keep enforcing that, we are essentially shutting the door on a whole population that could potentially become great contributors to our society.
52	KAREN

	<p>But then sometimes this poses a problem with so many people in our country. This country has quite few yet open spaces and places for people, but eventually, if we continue growing up at a geometric rate, at which we are growing right now, I think we are gonna have major problems down the road. We can't allow everyone from every country who wants to be here to be here, it's almost like what we are doing with Iraq right now, we've helped them to become democrat... democratic country, where they have actually had an election where they could go and vote, and some of them went and voted knowing that their very lives were in danger, as they traveled the road to the polls, but helping those people to establish a democracy in their own country, helping them to get the rights and the freedoms that we have here in their homeland, a lot of them really don't want to leave their homeland, but they want to leave it because of extreme political, religious, all the other persecutions that they are suffering, they don't want to leave their family behind and some of them have to leave family behind... Many many years ago my great grandparents, my husbands great grandparents burned all the boats, so to speak, knowing they would never see their family or friends and old home country again, there was no ease of the air flights to go back and forth from country to country, so they knew when they came here all alone or maybe with their spouse that that was it, they were making an new life and that new things would happen, they would never ever see their old homeland again or their parents before they died etcetera, some of them in their aging years now had had the opportunity to go back and visit the cemeteries where &lt;their&gt; relatives had been buried, but never to have seen them again... and I think that we need to realize that it's more important for us to take democracy, the idea of a republic to the world, as it is important for us to accept so many immigrants.</p> <p>One thing that I will point out that I have learnt from our Irish son-in-law is that up until July of 2004 the green card immigrants were working and paying taxes, and paying taxes means that it goes for roads, sewers, and all the infrastructures of cities and towns; since that time, since July, they no longer have to pay any taxes...</p>
53	THAT'S NOT TRUE (several people)
	This is not true-He told me this is true-That is not true
	... 'cause this is not true.
54	KAREN
	He said that they are not having to be held accountable for that and maybe that's why some of the people are not coming forth to speak when they have issues.
55	MARIAM
	That is absolutely untrue. He is mistaken.
56	KAREN
	Well, he knows it from friends who have green cards.
57	MARIAM
	Well, we are attorneys, we actually know.
58	MATT

	Well, I am a green card holder, and I pay quite a bit of tax<es>, I mean, every year ... LAUGHTER... and every time I buy, I purchase something I pay sales tax, I pay income tax, and the state taxes...and what actually...
59	KAREN
	Do you file taxes? I mean... 'cause...
60	MATT
	Sure. If I didn't, I'd be in great trouble.
61	KAREN
	Pay taxes to the IRS...
	People talking together
62	MATT
	The same tax is applied to all persons equally. And that even undocumented aliens, undocumented immigrants, also pay sales tax, and when they are working, they are working under a social security number and they pay... everything, they pay state tax, income tax, even though they never get it back.
63	MODERATOR
	With this, with this approach um, the the contention is that that we need to limit immigration for um some specific reasons: because of the stress put on the system (T 2), because of our inability to assimilate as rapidly as we are receiving the people. Is there legitimacy to that position? Christine?
64	CHRISTINE
	Well, I am a former refugee resettlement worker and I can only speak from my own experience, but I... and as a social worker... the job was very demanding, but in the time that I worked the job it became more demanding, and I felt, again, only from my perspective that I couldn't meet the needs of my clients. It was far too difficult and I think that's a common scenario for many social workers. But the complexity of the issues in refugees that I saw – many mental health issues, medical issues, eh, employment issues... were so complicated, and I don't know that we have an adequate system set up to handle that. And I don't think we address it honestly. And in trying to... myself, as a social worker at that time, trying to express my own frustration, it was met with very much a closed door... So, I think we, you know, from both ends, we have entry, but we don't have adequate services, but really nobody's willing to address what's the solution. So, I don't... And I don't have a solution myself. So...
65	DALE

	<p>I saw that with the Somali refugees. A lot of them came to Cedar Rapids and for a couple weeks they got food, they've got money, they've got rides, they've got some furniture, but then there is a cutoff point and, I mean, it was real evident in the community when that happened. But at the same time, I've seen a lot of those folks now, they've sort of done it on their own. Not to say that it wasn't perfect, or that they didn't have rocky times, but they're working, they've got cars, have got kids now, and you wouldn't know that six or seven years ago they came to this country with literally, with what they had on their back. But I am glad you addressed that because... it was... you saw this movement, all these people, and there was no real safety net... and...</p>
66	CHRISTINE
	... at a very critical time too, very sensitive time.
67	DALE
	Yeah
68	KAREN
	<p>Even when they go to that point..., sometimes, like you mentioned, medical and health needs, ... some of the things that were acceptable in their home countries to use for medication, for example, marijuana in some countries is quite acceptable and not a problem at all, and it's illegal here. So, I mean, that makes a problem. In fact, we know that marijuana does have or at least from some studies that have shown that it has some beneficial qualities for people who are in dire pain and that small amounts should be administered to them in a hospital clinic or something like that, I don't know, I'm not, you know, personally, I don't know anyone like that, but I have read studies like that, and so, I am thinking, well, some of the people who came from the countries where either opium or marijuana or something like that was used and accepted in its use, but here it is NOT used or tolerated, it becomes a problem, how do we treat them in their pain, what can we find for them what... that it is legal and that they are feeling comfortable about using. I think that makes an issue for them, they are going in a totally different direction and then they themselves even are feeling, you know, somewhat, is this ok, is it safe for me, as opposed to what I was using at home and I knew and trusted.</p>
69	MODERATOR
	<p>That might be part of a larger issue, I think, in this approach which is the question of the ability of a local community... I think you were alluding to that uh Dale...we had the example of the Lewiston Maine example in the materials, for example, about the capacity of a local community to provide services to, and to start the process of assimilating a large number of people from a particular part of the world, coming in and perhaps arriving without very much forewarning and without much in the way of assistance from beyond the community, and certainly beyond the state to meet those, to meet those needs.</p> <p>And I wonder if that happens um as a function of policy, does that mean that our immigration policy is in effect creating differentially localized unfunded mandates?</p>
70	MIRIAM

	<p>I think within white community... First of all, let me just say one thing, the majority of the immigrants who come here, come for economic reasons, those who do come, do not come to stay on the system, they've come here for independence, that means financial independence, cultural independence, you keep saying assimilation, assimilation as far as language is concerned, but they have their own culture, what is acceptable to them, is not acceptable to us in some measure. You're talking about communities like Lewiston, Maine, they had initially like a thousand Somalis came at first, they brought their families, they found that Louistown was a wonderful place to live, and decided "Hey, this is nice, let's start businesses here!" And they brought their families, and now I think there is like five thousand of them there. And the same thing's happened here in Cedar Rapids, you have Somalis, you have Kosovars, you have the people from Bosnia. They were brought here in resettlement groups, they found it was nice, they decided to stay. Most of them have businesses, there are very few of them, who are on the system, you have... they don't want to live on welfare, to them that's very denigrating; they want to be independent financially and culturally. In our mosque here we have people from more than 34 different countries, and very few of them are on the system. You know... and I think that for communities like Cedar Rapids, Lewiston, it's not an unattainable thing to bring these people. They've added, you know, a deep richness to this city. Cedar Rapids has got a community of Lebanese that have been here for more than a hundred years, and they've added to this city tremendously. You know, ok, you have people who say "It's no longer a Christian country." So what? (LAUGHTER from some other participants) You know, that's what America is. You've got to accept us whether you like it or not. No longer calling Christmas break Christmas break, because it insults you, well, what about us? Our religion... you know, don't discount us, because we are not Christian, we are not Jewish. I don't know any Jews who celebrate Christmas.</p>
71	<p>KAREN Ok</p>
72	<p>JOHN</p>
	<p>...I am married to a Lebanese that goes to the mosque. I think one of the issues taken from the personal... and I had a fellow who was a refugee from Iraq that worked for me; and honestly I don't know anyone I respect more in the world, I mean, this guy came with literally nothing ... now he owns a lot of properties, and he has a lot of business interests, he is a hard worker... So, I think most people would say that people coming here are hard workers, you know, in general, but I also tell ya that there's limits to what this country can absorb; there are financial constraints, we have constraints socially, and I would beg anybody to go out to southern California, or Arizona, and not say that those areas have been overwhelmed with immigrants that they can't handle. You would take neighborhoods even around LA, there used to be single-family neighborhoods and now you have situations where you've got five cars parked in the front lawn. I know this from personal experience. And multiple families living in what, a house that was designed for one family, so... That's a reality. But at a personal level, these are good people, they are generally hard workers &lt;otherwise&gt; they probably wouldn't be here, but... there are... this country does have limits to what we can afford. There is not, we are not unlimited, we cannot just allow anybody in the world to, to, to... come here, because they are in need... It would be nice if we could, but... that is unrealistic.</p>



73	RUTH
	<p>And I think this frustration that's presently being shown by laws that... attacking illegal immigrants that they can't go to school, that they can't have driver's licenses, other res... that they can't go to college, these restrictions are shown in this way because of the frustration of the majority of people, and I think that it demonstrates the depth of the problem, and the fact that the solutions are ones that can be put into place, but may and cause more problems, because the solutions attack the surface rather than the underlying problem.</p>
74	MIRIAM
	<p>I think part of the problem is the numbers and concentration in certain areas. Canada allows immigration more... it is more open for people who are willing to go into areas where there isn't anybody living, or where there is a very low population. Maybe the United States should look into doing that, we have... and we have concentrations in LA, in New York, in New Jersey of the specific groups, why don't we just open up the interior of the country to these groups, say go there, we'll let you come if you go to say Nebraska or Colorado or, you know, South Dakota. I mean, areas, where there aren't many people. I think part of the problem is... ah... is that there is too much concentration in certain areas and I think that's what insulting some people.</p>
75	JIM
	<p>I will say one thing broadly philosophic&lt;al&gt; and one thing particular to your statement. Broadly philosophically, Jefferson was our godfather in thought, and the Declaration of Independence is very religious-based, we were endowed by our Creator with certain rights. But Jefferson was also... very broad-minded and his emphasis on religion was "what all the religions of the world have in common was more important than where they differed" And so Jefferson was very broad-minded, the Declaration is very broad-minded in a religious sense; it was intended to have values, but not particulars... values.</p> <p>Then when we come back to our state, we are a country of immigrants, we are also a country of migration that's internal. This is very profound, the amount of migration we do internally. The state of Iowa is a state where we're migrating out; it is also a state where immigrants are coming in and where some migrants are coming in. Migrants being people from other states. Internally we are going from the rural counties to the larger counties, but we are in a state that is going to be population shy of a working age level. And by shy I mean very shy in a very short period of time. And our state needs people, and one of the great questions is "Can we attract people from other states, which is something that we would like to do? Can we attract people that we'd like to have from anywhere?" And to, to meet our jobs needs. Obviously, we are first gonna take care of our own, but we need a whole new generation of people. Our state demographically is very old, and we are number 1 percent over 85, or number 4 percent over 65, we have this particular community just to maintain current jobs... and inability if we project out a decade, a decade and a half, unless we have people to come here. So, we have to figure out how we do that and with what kind of balance and with kind of respect. And it's a dilemma that we just have to make decent judgments about.</p>
76	MODERATOR

	<p>And one of the more recent kind of high profile welcomes on the part of our state governor where immigration was concerned was a welcome to skilled workers... (Somebody: of course) not a humanitarian welcome, not a family reunification welcome, it was a skilled worker welcome.</p>
77	JIM
	<p>Well, that's a national should-do and that's the one I might differ slightly with some things that we said &lt;here&gt; earlier... You have a decision to make as a society: would you rather bring in higher-skilled or lower-skilled? And we've made a decision as a Congress to put a little greater emphasis on the higher skilled, and that doesn't mean that there isn't a roll for lower skilled... and there isn't a roll for people of all backgrounds. But we decided that we would in a world in which more and more kinds of competitive aspects are related to higher skills and we have put an emphasis on that, and we also put an emphasis on family, and family implies any skill, and so we have a mixture of emphasis, it's no accident that we have a slight tilt towards higher skilled.</p>
78	JUDY
	<p>Working in a welfare program here in Cedar Rapids ...county, a lot of people that we see as clients are NOT immigrants. We don't have that many on our case load at all. I would say my case load is 99 percent just local people, not any immigrants. I had that one battered alien, that's here, and a couple of others, in a case load of maybe about 180. The... what Congressman Leach is talking about that the people that are coming in from Chicago, Milwaukee, that are on our rolls that we are having a problem with, so... unskilled people who are coming in to just find work here, because we are considered safe, quote, safe city, so that's kind of ... our welfare rolls, not so much the immigrants that are that population.</p>
79	MARIAM
	<p>Most immigrants are not eligible for, to receive welfare. Most immigrants are not eligible to receive any kind of means tested benefits. When someone sponsors a family member for... to immigrate here, that person has to sign an affidavit of support, and that person has to be making at least 125 percent of the poverty level to be able to sign that affidavit of support, and that person is liable if the immigrant ever receives any kind of ... benefits. That person has to reimburse the government for that.</p>
80	RUTH
	<p>I do think that our emphasis legally on the skilled is part of what causes the illegal immigration. And having worked in the Chicago area where there was a demand for minimum wage positions... those were usually filled by illegal immigrants. And if we have that need that is highly unlikely to be met by either people from the United States or the highly skilled that come in as immigrants, and I think that we have to recognize the need that we have in this country for minimum wage positions that are not going to be met by our own... native workers. I think that is shown in Iowa by the packing plants which are ... the concentrations in Iowa of eh... immigrants, and some of those probably are illegal.</p>
81	CHRISTINE

	<p>There is something ... I wanna say, too, though, about those jobs as... at one time those jobs were higher paid jobs, and then the wage floor has reduced such that it's not ... it's not a livable wage anymore. Also, I think there are fewer union protections, so when workers are there, they are not protected, and so... ah...eh... there is an economic situation that's so complicated eh, to me, I, I think... eh... oh, I've lost my train of thought...</p>
82	JOHN
	<p>I think that's an excellent point, though, that puts tremendous, it's, it's, I studied economics and, and, you know, when you have extra supply, it does force wages down. And it does hurt people who are already here, eh blue collar that live here unskilled ... I don't think there's any question that across the country... you know, there's isolated places where this won't be true, you know, maybe in Iowa, 'cause we're labor short, yes... but around the country it's forcing wages down, and it's putting a lot of pressure on the blue collar that are, that are here already.</p>
83	MODERATOR
	<p>Well the second major stance on this issue is that, is that we should um raise the quotas in effect on on ya know all three prongs of the immigration policy—family sponsored, skilled worker, humanitarian, that we should ya know we should raise all of those. Is our ability to do that, to respond to that position affected by our inability to control illegal immigration? If we had less illegal immigration would we be able to raise those quotas?</p>
84	JERRY
	<p>Well, I think a factor, Jim, that, maybe the elephant in the corner, is that as an American consumer I want cheap goods. You know, the example that, some might be familiar with, would be having roof put on your house. You can choose a company that pays fair wages, fair benefits, deals with the benefits that you were talking about, or you could choose another company that would be... substantially less expensive to engage... ah... you know, and as an American consumer I might choose, choose the cheaper one. As a tradeoff for that choice I am also creating a vacuum, so to speak, that attracts people that would work for less, a lesser wage. Food, housing, you know, I think every quarter hotels, every place, you know, what we want is something cheap and we are seemingly unwilling to pay the difference between fairness and cheapness. And I find that disturbing and, and... you know, I really... that seems to be a major part of the issue that we don't talk about.</p>
85	SOMEBODY (a female)
	Well, people get exploited at a certain point... too.
	BREAK IN THE TAPE
86	JOHN

	...the lowest price, let's talk about the lowest legal price, maybe, so, as long as you are getting the best price, maybe, you don't pay more, 'cause you don't have an option; it is really shameful that a company like Walmart, they can say "We didn't know", well, come on... they surely knew, there were hundreds of thousands of people who were working there, we could do something about that, we need to do something about that...
87	MODERATOR
	So do we want to talk heritage and humanitarianism as long as it serves capitalism?
88	DALE
	What we don't talk about... we crouch it a lot in economic model, but I think really where – at least for me... and maybe for some other folks here – I think ... a lot of this discussion here about the quote immigration problem is based on color. And it's based on race. Immigration's fine when everybody looks like you, but when all of a sudden people look a little different I think that's when we've put some of these caps on some of these... I guess some... some caps on some of the quotas. On so many people who come into this country. What concerns me is the terrorism problem. And, and, and I really... I think what I heard earlier is that most immigrants who come in this country come in wanting to work and pay taxes and wanna be, they don't wanna be illegal, they don't have problems going through the system if the system is set up to accommodate 'em, I also think this country to some extent we can handle, we see that they are not on welfare rolls per se, and so the drain the fallacy that they are a drain on the economy that's out there might not be as true as what a lot of people think, and so when you come to places like the heartland and when you see that conflict, I think it's based more in the fact that people just look different.
89	KAREN

	<p>I would tend to disagree with that. ‘Cause my mom worked in the SCS – it was called SCS at that time, soil conservation service, - in Marion several years ago, twenty years ago, and at that point time there was Affirmative Action already taking place, she saw as a secretary there three young men that were coming in to interview for a job, they were all high school age and the one who got hired, no, you know, no more credentials than any others, in fact he was lacking in some, was a black person. And my mom said that was fine with her, because she had done a lot of work with a lot of black women when she did waitress work and when she went to the...Pepsico company in Chicago, and she found them to be excellent workers, but she said that she was sorely disappointed that this young man didn’t show up for work, the boss who had hired him made a point that he should quote “a feather in his cap” for hiring this person. So, that was an affirmative action decision, it was not one based on equality. We could go back to our constitution, we talk about being created equal, and then we throw that out of the window just like the young women who were not able to enter Michigan University because they were white, their grades were actually higher than those who were of another race, a minority race, and yet those young women weren’t allowed into the school, they were not until President Bush and some of the people in this administration entered into that and discussed that situation, and asked for these merits to be weighed out... So, I think we wanna be really careful, it’s a fine line to walk, we definitely wanna be accepting, I grew up accepting people of all colors, because my mom always had that viewpoint, because she’d worked with people of other colors and other cultures, we had ... my father was a serviceman, so we were over in Tehran, Iran, when I was only a year old. We’ve had foreign-language visitors, foreign visitors who speak other language to our farm, ... to two hundred visitors... enjoyed them thoroughly, we’ve had some of them to our dinner table, we had... have hosted for an exchange student to go to high school. I’ve thoroughly enjoyed that experience.</p> <p>So, I just feel that it’s a fine line, because when we bring someone else in to do the job, then we are displacing people who have been here for many many years before, if we are bringing in immigrants, people who are vying for these same jobs. Who is gonna get the job and who is gonna go without? There’s always been...’cause there is not enough jobs to go around.</p>
90	MIRIAM
	I think you are mixing your groups here. You are talking about affirmative action, we are talking about immigration. Two different issues completely.
91	KAREN
	Entirely different
92	MIRIAM
	Completely
93	KAREN
	At times?
94	MIRIAM

	Completely different. You've got immigration 'cause people want to come here for a better life, you've got affirmative action to balance out the workforces of people that are already here. I think a lot of people take immigration issues... if it is someone from Europe – fine! – if they are white, with light skin, blond hair, hey, let them in! But they are not, they are dark-skinned people from Latin America, people from the South America and Central America, and the Arab countries...
95	KAREN
	Sure...
96	MIRIAM
	After 9-11, the government's response to 9-11 forced a lot of people from the Arab countries, from the Muslim countries underground; those who tried to come in and do the right thing and take the paperwork, they were, some of them were in the grey area, they were scooped up, a lot of people in our community just disappeared! Completely off the radar, gone! Either they were deported or they just went underground. I think the US's response to immigration, the government itself, I think, there is a huge imbalance right at this moment, this very moment. My husband was lucky enough to come here 15 or 20 years ago, and he came as a student and he went through the system and got his paperwork. But we got married when he had his green card, and they gave him an incredibly hard time... I've got a brother-in-law right now; he and my sister have two children, and... they were hauled into court no less than 20 times to prove that they were married. They have two children, how can you not? My sister is pregnant and she is going to have a baby any day, and the court had a gall to look at her and say: "Is your marriage real?" (NO LAUGHTER) You know, I mean, the immigration system is very unbalanced in this country, completely! Especially after 9-11. I think the, I think that you're mixing your groups when you say affirmative action and...
	KAREN tries to respond, but MATT forcefully takes the conversation over.
97	MATT
	I would like to say that it is very important to realize that unfortunately there is a small minority of people that do oppose immigration on racial issues, but as to the majority of people that oppose immigration are not racists, and actually do because they are concerned about a lot of social and economic costs. And what I really appreciate for this type of forum to take place and this debate... because it is so crucial in terms of the issue to overcome the misinformation that drives a lot of times the very negative view of immigration which is unfounded. For example, you know, I completely agree with you by hearing a lot of us ...giving undocumented immigrants no free ride, and not on taxes... Of course, I am gonna oppose it, that is why we have such a hot burning issue, but I think that the issue here is that there is a lot of misinformation and unawareness, and lack of debate...
98	SOMEBODY (a female, MIRIAM?)
	Absolutely
99	MATT

	<p>...and once a debate takes place actually we realize that immigrants... the contributions outweigh the costs, the costs are very real, but the contributions or the potential contributions, if we actually integrate immigrants successfully, over the long term would greatly outweigh the costs and most importantly there is that shared ... that is what I believe the most important to the issue of immigration is that we have common ground of those shared values, in a lot of ways it's who we are as a nation. And over a long term it is really... a benefit to everyone.</p>
100	<p>JOHN</p> <p>One of the issues, though, it is... short term... you know, what ARE the economics of that? And I don't know if we have good numbers, I can tell you, I've read... And I've stated that sort of earlier... I think that first generation, it's possible that they actually cost us, but by the second and third generation, they are hard working people, they get educated, most of these folks ... The guy that worked for me is... from... eh, Ir-Iran... his kids went to college, now he is hoping for better, that's what parents want... better... and then by the second-third generation, usually &lt;it&gt; is much better... this has been our history. The problem is, the first generation, low skilled, there is a lot of costs associated and so when you roll through the economics... it gets very complicated, are there a net winner or a net loser, and... I would say that we really don't know.</p>
101	<p>DAVE</p> <p>I think you ... point... short-term/ long-term. I mean where would this country be today without the massive immigration that took place in the early 1900s? Would we be as wealthy a society as we have? And there were certainly ... economic costs back then, and at that time my sense is society was a little less welcoming and supporting them, opening arms to help. But I do think the short-term and long-term cost is a good measure. I think also that issue of concentrations. You can overwhelm ... probably makes sense. And I think that one of the public services that deals... pays the toughest cost, the most cost is schools. Because we really do have, in particular in this state – and other states too, – a commitment to all kids. And we want them all to do well. Heard the superintendent of the Des Moines schools talk the other day: in Des Moines they have kids speaking native languages, forty seven native languages,... who are attending school. And so some of them are English-full others of them are not, and they really need help to work through there. And that is a very direct expense and cost. What's interesting, you know, is usually we see those kids a few years later and they have assimilated in terms of language very effectively and very well, but it is a cost upfront. To help prepare them to be a part of society and help make their own contribution to our greater society's growth.</p>
102	<p>BRAD</p>

	<p>One question that keeps coming back to me, and I doubt if I have nearly the knowledge of immigration law and how it's created and so on and so forth as most people do here, but I am really questioning how is our immigration law formed? I don't know. When you think about most important things that are really important and have a lot of impact on our society, what do we hold for beliefs? What do we believe about immigrants, about immigration, about people's rights? Whatever it may be, I am wondering are those written down somewhere? Like you said, I think you have to have discussion like this to create those... but what are these decisions being based on is what I'd like to know. Obviously a lot of them are short-term, economic, foreign policy, whatever, but ... I am just wondering how those laws are created. Do we have a set of beliefs and who decided on those beliefs, and this is just a question that keeps coming up to me.</p>
103	RUTH
	<p>Well, along that line we keep talking about 9-11 and the changes made after that, was that Congress, was that President, who decided that things would be different after 9-11?</p>
104	SOMEBODY (a female)
	<p>Congress.</p>
105	SOMEBODY (a female)
	<p>I think Congressman Leech could...</p>
106	LAUGHTER
107	JIM
	<p>As a national law-making body Congress does make laws in this area. There are certain discretions ... to the executive branch. But I would like to stress something beyond law. We are the country, but we are a culture, a culture is bigger than government. And when it comes to immigration, for example, you have individual issues, you have family issues, you have community issues. And America is in one sense one great large community with many subsets of communities, and when it comes to immigration, it's community that's more important than law, over law, undergirds everything. And so how we approach things is based upon rules; these rules can be followed or not followed, but they also get subjected to how communities react. And it's the cultural American community that's bigger than your government or your subset of local governments. America is after all just a great big family.</p>
108	BRAD
	<p>It brings us to the second question that has been rolling in my head all morning... is we have national guidelines...</p>
109	JIM
	<p>Yes</p>
110	BRAD



	What parameters are there for states, counties, cities... people were talking about whether areas that need a lot more people, ... areas that are heavily populated... What kind of local parameters are available? Just a question?
111	JIM
	... you are an expert <gestures towards Matt>, you are the authority here...
112	LAUGHTER
113	MATT
	Well, that really speaks to your questions about the short-term cost and, you know, how to approach that. I think those short-term costs vary a lot community to community based on a fundamental question of what we do about it and what immigrants do about it. Because immigration is a two-way street. That is if we welcome immigrants, immigrants also have responsibilities to integrate into the community. And there is a lot of things that local governments, the private sector, the faith-based community can do in order to facilitate that process and minimize the costs by providing English classes, by harnessing a volunteer force, by educating the popula... by holding discussions like this. And once that is instituted effectively, I can see that you can actually minimize the costs and actually impact everybody in the community, immigrant and non-immigrant, positively.
114	MODERATOR
	One factor that you're focusing on here though is that: entry is a function of national policy, but effect is local. And there are, there are layers, you know, of complexity in between: The uh need for services, the uh influence on culture, the stress on the education system. You know, that's a local, local function. And far more of the money, especially for education, comes from the state than from the national, yet a different national policy says that a local school may be very negatively affected by test scores of a concentrated subpopulation of students, which could be affected by national entry and selective settlement. We do know that um.. immigrants don't necessarily settle uh or distribute equally across the country. Ample, ample evidence to that.  So, just because Iowa may, quote, need population, also want to be selective about that population, doesn't mean that it's going to be able to accomplish those effects no matter what national policy allows in the way of national entry.
115	MIRIAM

	<p>There is a lot of misinformation within the immigrant community also, about how they can immigrate, how they can become legal. Some of the things, it astounds me some of the things that people come and ask me, you know, how can I make myself legal. Just recently there has been some talk about some form of amnesty and there were people coming to me and saying “How can I apply for the amnesty?” Well, you cannot apply for the amnesty, unless you have a certain skill or you have some basis for it. People who were here, they came on vacation and stayed. Ok, fine, did they want to stay here, they are here illegally, they are driving illegally, now they want to become legal. These people have to have some kind of a conduit into, you know, becoming legal, but if they make themselves known, they are gonna be arrested and deported. There needs to be more immigration information given into the communities so that they have the right information.</p>
116	KATHY
	<p>I, I agree with that. I think that immigration laws are so incredibly complicated at this point that people don’t even know where to start. And they can’t do it on their own anymore, if they file a piece of paper that they shouldn’t have and it gets them into trouble or if they file it a wrong time, it gets them into trouble, which is, they are so confused and so misguided on what to file, when to file, how to legalize that they end up either staying illegal or they end up filing the wrong paper and getting deported. It’s, I mean, it’s a vicious cycle is that the laws are so restrictive and are so complicated. As I stated earlier it’s enforcing the mentality “I’ll just stay illegal then.”</p>
117	MODERATOR
	<p>A number of our fellow citizens who might be, um, kind of torn about the difference between legal and illegal immigration, um, might be differently disposed toward legal immigration policy if the illegal immigration issue was handled differently, and yet they are very reluctant or very resistant to the idea of sanctioning illegal entry by providing amnesty. Uh, is the amnesty issue a significant part of the uh the policy concern here?</p>
118	DALE
	<p>I think it’s a matter of allocation of resources. I see the government allocating a lot of resources on the enforcement side. I mean, you read every day about uh tearing the family apart, and at the back of my mind I am thinking “So, you’ve got a US attorney, his staff tied up in this sending one student home” versus maybe if that money was allocated on the educational side to teach people how to become legal, maybe you might just get more of the benefit.</p>
119	MARIAM

	<p>Well, there are not a lot of ways to become legal. If you are here illegally and you do not have a close family member who is a US citizen or resident – well, resident doesn't do it – citizen, or if you do not have an employer who is willing to sponsor you for residency, then there is really very little that you can do. I think that immigration policies has to change... have to change, the immigration law has to change and address the needs of people who are already here. I have a client, a Mexican couple who came here as farm workers... they came here as... they were obtaining temporary residency. And their daughter is valedictorian and they do not know how to read and write. I mean it's that kind of stories that really illustrate the plight of these immigrant children and young people who are here, who came here when they were two years old, and they have no papers. They graduate from high school and they cannot continue their education. We are losing this generation of very bright people, very well educated, with a strong moral values, because there is no way for them to continue to go to school.</p>
120	DAVE
	<p>Mathematics are gonna make the point that we are the country of laws. And that really struck me the way he said that, and there is that sense that we should expect folks to follow and obey the law, and so there is a part of me that says 'If you haven't followed and obeyed the law, and therefore, you shouldn't be able to gain entry.' On the other hand, it appears that our approaches have failed in terms of our ability to enforce the law. That it may be one of those embarrassing times that you kind of say "Well, let's just start over again." And try a fresh approach. And maybe an amnesty, maybe an approach that help us to be able to get the step to move on to something that will work. So, in that sense...</p>
121	MATT
	<p>Yeah, I definitely agree we are a country of laws ... and the reason why America is a country where the rule of law is paramount is because our laws got through a democratic process make sense. Or they can be changed to make sense. And right now the current system that we have is broken is really is antiquated is not consistent with reality and also with who we are as a nation in terms with our values. And in 1986 Ronald Reagan confronted head on the problem of illegal immigration and instituted an amnesty. What happened at that point is that it gave eh legal status to undocumented immigrants in the country, but did not address the issue of future flow of people. Especially relatives of those people that were granted amnesty in 1986. So, since 1986 undocumented immigration has actually doubled. So, I am actually very optimistic at where we are right now in terms of legislative reform, because we are identifying that it needs to be a two-pronged solution that takes into account a legalization for those immigrants who are here undocumented, of course, after it will be determined what type of civil penalties they would have to go through, but also is taking into account the future flow of immigrants by instituting those legal channels at the border, so that people can come and have their legal venue and right now, as I was saying previously, the illegal activity would be greatly reduced. I mean the fact that people will have a legal option, and any immigrant you talk to... they would, by God, want to follow the legal option.</p>
122	MODERATOR

	So that amnesty, actually, just uh dramatically increased the pressure on the family sponsored portion of legal immigration because it created that many more potential sponsors, legal sponsors...(MALE VOICE: for family) for family immigration.
123	MARIAM
	And I think that ... really ... I think people can sponsor mother, father – if you are a citizen – you can sponsor children. I think perhaps some of those categories, like, for instance, a US citizen can sponsor a brother or sister. I think some of those categories perhaps we should get rid of and allocate those to families that are young families that are apart like, add those numbers to spouses of permanent residents and children under 18, who right now have to wait between 5, 7 and nine years to get here.
124	MODERATOR
	Well part of the opposition from some our fellow citizens to opening the doors wider to people to who are seeking to improve their lives is the perception that there's a negative affect on people here who are also seeking to improve their lives. Um that the negative affect is greatest on existing low wage earners. Poorly educated. The reduction in fact of the minimum wage.  I'm hearing at least some acknowledgment that that's a credible concern.
125	CHRISTINE
	There's... For me there is some confusion too about the responsibility of business and corporate society too in terms of hiring, and we see, especially in Iowa with agricultural need for hiring... of more workers, migrant labor, but also hiring of illegal immigrants – so, is the corporation company responsible for being sure that they are approaching things legally? And then to me they have some responsibility at hand too, but I don't really see how they become penalized, so it becomes so complicated, they obviously know that they are hiring illegal workers, I think it must be pretty plain, and yet when we do... there is so many situations that we see that are so inhumane, you know, we see people who try to come up here in box cars, and you know they've died, you know, from... heat... and there is just so many contradictory policies and contradictory approaches that bothers me, and the effect on people is really what bothers me, you know. For everyone.
126	MODERATOR
	I think there's a real sense that our approach to illegal immigration has been really escalated human tragedy in the process of trying to illegally immigrate, I think that ya know that's a big concern. But your comment also I think gives us a transition to the third approach in the material we looked at , which is essentially say, ya know let's just get honest about this, it's an economic matter. Let's treat it economically. Lets's just talk about the economics of it and establish our priorities in economic terms.  And the people who take that position say, ya know, say we need to reduce, we need to screen, ehm, we need to eh screen so that we can focus on skilled workers and keep out unskilled workers competing for low paying jobs and so that we can target assistance to communities and states where immigrants really settle. It's an interesting position, it's an interesting, ehm, kind of, point of advocacy.

127	RUTH
	<p>I think that we are spending too much money on the borders and not in heartland, and as I indicated at the beginning I was in a facility where there was a raid and there were undocumented workers, within a month a... a good percentage of those were back working, and they did not... you know, they flew in, they did not come through the border, so that that... I don't think that we're putting our resources in the correct place, and I think we also, what we said about employers, although I also have worked for an organization that required a green card and had several people tell me "Well, I have to have fifty dollars before I can get the green card," this would not have been a legal green card, so that... there are a lot of economic problems that we're facing. I think that we need these workers, the question is how to have them in this country in a humane way and not hurt the people that are presently here and working, that's a real dilemma...</p>
128	MODERATOR
	<p>We have some tendency to think that we can and should be able to work on all fronts simultaneously so the allocation of resources is an interesting issue. You kind of cited a ratio I think earlier that said that we have tripled the investment in border security and illegal immigration doubled. What we don't know is if we only doubled the investment, would illegal immigration have tripled? (LAUGHTER) You know, we don't know the dynamics of how that works or how it might work with a different allocation of resources.</p> <p>Is anyone saying here that we should uh simply give up on the issue of border control and illegal immigration ...when we are concerned about terrorism, we are concerned about uh a number of other things?</p>
129	MIRIAM
	<p>I think that that the money that are allocated toward the borders, it just gives more impetus for the illegal immigrants, for undocumented immigrants, to get here, to be more creative about how they are gonna get here. But it also makes them more victims. She cited the the people that died inside the train car. You know, in this country once you are here, as we said earlier, there is not legal avenue for you to go through to become legal. Why not put the money there, you know, take off the border guards, because they are just gonna get through, they are gonna say "hey if I can't go this way, I am gonna sneak out in this way" But once they are here, they NEED the venue, put the money there, put the money toward the teaching of the language, towards the legal avenues of, of... you know, making them citizens or green card holders. And giving them a place to stay and a place, you know, to fit in.</p>
130	CHRISTINA

	<p>I might add to that is instead of dealing with one individual at a time ... make it put the money towards families. And the subject of families has come up many times, the whole sense of community. Instead of bringing just one person at a time, be it an unskilled worker or a highly skilled worker. I would advocate for the option – and I am not skilled in public policy and immigration law, so don't ... all those things aside, strictly from a I guess an employer and a humanitarian point of view – promote the family, a family that the skilled worker that comes over or unskilled family comes over, but I think they want the same things that everyone else has, and that is to, to come here, have an education, get a decent job, raise their children. The, the first generation, the ones that we... that may have less of a chance to fully assimilate into the, into our culture to me are visionaries. I see these people as having a vision. They may never even be around to experience it, but I think they have a vision that their family... their culture will be just a little bit better off here, than what it was in their homeland, and I cannot even imagine the emotional thought process that they must have had to go through to have to come to those terms. I think that's quite remarkable.</p>
131	MIRIAM
	<p>When you focus on just the families, though, you are discounting the people who send money home to their family who come here to earn a living ...sends money home to his extended family. And by saying only him and his family can come here, you are destroying the lives and the economics of an extended family, not just one person or two people.</p>
132	MARIAM
	<p>And that is precisely where we need a change in immigration laws; President Bush has talked about this potential visa, three-year visas for people who just want to come here to... pick up lettuce, just want to come here to work at a meat-packing plant, just want to come here to do unskilled jobs, if they have a job offer and they come here for three years, and then they go back home. And many people they.. they just want to do it. They .. want to come here and work .. and then go back. They need legal means to do so.</p>
133	MATT

	<p>To that plan... I'd just like to address the two issues... I guess one is the enforcement, national security ... we were talking about, 'cause you were talking about people who come here and work in agriculture or meat-packing companies. Then automatically the question arises "Are they going to be taking jobs from low-income native-born Americans that could be there too?" And the reality is that if you look at immigration, actually immigrants tend to automatically automatically allocate to the sectors of the economy where there is actually less competition. I mean, it has been proved by the National Academy of Sciences, tons of independent research; immigrants tend to allocate to those areas where there is little competition, where actually workers are NEEDED. Now, once, if they are undocumented, of course, they are prone to lower wages, which does... may have an impact on general wage pools. So that is another reason why the system is broken. We urgently need immigration reform that would give workers... a legal status that can then allow them to demand higher wages and better working conditions, not just for them, but for all workers. And that way they could link arms with native-born workers in terms of improving wages and working conditions for everyone within eh... regional parameters.</p> <p>Now in terms of border security and enforcement, I think immigration reform should definitely have very strong enforcement, because that's national security, it's a great concern, not just to native-born Americans, but to immigrant Americans. I am VERY concerned about the safety of my community and terrorism. The thing is that right now, by having such huge illegal activity, such limited legal channels, you have so much underground activity of human smuggling, and that is actually a national security concern. So, by instituting legal channels we would drain that swamp of illegal activity and actually improve security at the border. And there has to be also significant enforcement increase, once you institute those legal channels in order to deal with, with that issue.</p>
134	DAIL
	<p>It.. it helps me, because yesterday the headlines in the paper were "Al-Qaeda finds that the best way to get into the country now is the Mexican border." And we talked a little bit earlier about removing the border guards to some extent, that simply is not gonna fly in this country in this ... age, but your point about illegal trafficking, that's how they are gonna come in. And so...</p>
135	MATT
	<p>And do you want the border patrol to be focused on intelligence to prevent terrorism or to be concerned with stopping children and families at the border?... It's just not the rational allocation of resources for national security at some point.</p>
136	MODERATOR
	<p>Let's come back to an earlier point for just a minute too though If I'm a someone who is wanting to look at this as an economic issue and take a hard-line economic position on it and you are telling me that's not being sufficiently humane to... accommodating of someone who is working here... perhaps even working here illegally and sending all of their wages that they can out of our economy back into another economy... that's hardly an argument for that being a good thing...</p>
137	MARIAM

	Well, that's not the case with most immigrants, most immigrants want to come here and make a life here for themselves and their families, but there are some immigrants who want to come and work and they pay taxes, while they live here they invest in the community, they make a life here for a while, and then, you know, they go back home. They are not... they need to live here, so they need to spend money here.
138	KAREN
	They are buying for themselves, whereas their family back home that they are sending the money to is buying things in their home country, and not, not in the United States. Is that what you're saying?
139	MIRIAM
	... you are saying... by doing... by sending money back to their home country, they are shoring up their own economy, so that they don't have to come here and work. You know, you've got a symbiotic relationship here. When this happens. And... I wanna say one this about this terrorism thing, people are forgetting that one of the largest terrorists in this country are illegal drugs. You know, you've got a lot of that coming into this country, you don't have... by any generous measure, if there is ten thousand Al-Qaeda, you've got nothing compared to the illegal trafficking of drugs that's coming into this country. And I think people are forgetting that.
140	DAIL
	Oklahoma city, American bomber. You know.
141	JOHN
	I think on the enforcement, I'd like to see more enforcement at the company level . I think companies... if you had to prove you are American citizen, it's no different than, you know, how we handle alcohol, you know, if we don't allow people in this state under 21 in a bar, without... yeah, do some get in with a good fake ID... or... do they get..., you know, do somebody can forget to check, yes, but in general ... we probably handle 98% of that problem to keep people under 21 out of the bar, then... you could just do the same thing ... 'cause I do think they are coming here for economic reasons, but if they couldn't get the job, unless they were legal, I guess they wouldn't get the job, they would slow down. And I am totally sympathetic with your argument, but we just can't allow, everyone wants to come here, they don't have a right to come here, and we can't handle it, because not only physically, but economically, socially, this country, we have to have some constraints on how many people come here.
142	CHRISTINE



	<p>But I think that the reason why companies continue to do it is that they want cheap labor. I mean, that's the bottom line, and there is not an interest in NOT HAVING cheap labor. So, I don't... And to me, when you have cheap labor, that opens up rights for so many different abuses. You've got workplace abuse, you've got many different situations... I cited one example, where... if you make too little, then you don't have enough to live off, then you have too many people living in one house or one apartment, and that's not a humanitarian situation. So, again, you know, like you, I would like to see companies be more responsible and think about the net impact on a community. Ok, if you have eight people living in an apartment, you know, then, you know, what are the social implications of that? Likely, they are going to have a lot of stress, and when you got a lot of stress, then you got police issues, you know we have to THINK, you know, practically about things too.</p>
143	<p>Somebody</p> <p>oh there's the forms of gr...</p>
144	<p>CHRISTINE</p> <p>They are ... and you're here...you know... police department having a difficult time coping. There's ... again, you know, everybody seems to... there's a... a certain level of responsibility that I think companies..</p>
145	<p>MODERATOR</p> <p>What do you hear ... from business people from corporate America .. ahm Do you not want .. ah.. illegal immigration stopped for workforce reasons?</p>
146	<p>JIM</p> <p>Ahm.. There are 3 business reasons for .. ah..that business people talk about. One is labor cost. Second is labor talent, because ... H1B visas for high-technical people. There is a third, that is surprise. And that relates to a work force that doesn't have some problems as they've been brought up in the American society ... and for example what I have heard of business people tell me when they drug test .. they were given a percentage of native Americans fail, virtually no immigrants virtually ever fail the drug test. And that doesn't mean drugs don't come from abroad, they do. And some were ... to gains that are tied to national groupings abroad. But virtually no legal or illegal immigrant that comes to this country has a drug problem. And that is a stunning circumstance that the business community is looking at.</p>
147	<p>COLIN</p> <p>I think tied with some other business concerns and economic concerns that we've heard this far is that ah whatever the... ah penalties and so forth need to be appropriate with the violator, for example Walmart is often been thrown out and so forth is a violator and so forth. But Walmart as a net itself has more economic power than most of the Europe (LAUGHTER). And so if they have a ... ahm... if they have a penalty that would be the same as the company I work for it would be a drop in a bucket for them to sustain their illegal or legal immigrant community that they have</p>
148	<p>KATHY</p>

	There is employer sanctions in place with the immigration law and.. eh... the... but the hypocrisy of that is that the sanctions are really enforced against employers. You get... the deportation system with regards to immigrants is <...> trying to get immigrants out of the country but the employers who are attracting and pulling this immigrants into this country for these low-wage jobs are not getting the sanctions that under the law they are supposed to receive.
149	MODERATOR
	So it is possible that as long as we keep the focus on.. on failures at the border we are talking about the failures of that kind of sanctions?
150	KATHY
	Right.
151	MARIAM
	Yeah...
152	JERRY
	And I think, Jim, particularly the guest worker ... ah... proposal is .. eh... it's ironic that the United States has a long history in.. in guest worker ideas. During the Second World War the United States literally contracted with Mexico to bring in large number of the workers ... I don't know how humanely they were treated and what the circumstances were but these folks came back and forth freely as I understand. They visited their family, did what they wanted to with the money, some taxes were collected. But then at the end of that program I believe about 1965... well, after the Second World War, of course, people certainly became 'illegal' by definition even though their habits of crossing back and forth were regular. So they were surprised by their new ... new status and then I believe the 1984 law when suddenly realized that we've got this emerging problem of ... ah...but it is not a new thing for the United States to have jobs that need to be filled and not a new thing to have a strategy to look out to fill those jobs. And I have ... my cynical side of me says: 'the part of the strategy to fill these jobs is to make it just difficult enough for people who need work so that the healthy one and the strong ones... and other ones that get here and the others, you know, then stay back'. And that... I am very very unhappy in this terms about that situation.
153	DAVE And then, the paradox, Jerry, that the World War 2 (was this during the World War 2?)
154	JERRY
	Yeah, during WW2, I think 1942 < ...>
155	DAVE
	At the same time ... same time... that we are taking Japanese Americans, we are moving them from society and putting them into internment... camps and the paradox... for... I think we continue to have... that sort of split personality as a country where we worry about the terrorist on the one hand ...
156	JERRY

	But my point on that is that.. there was a national policy to address job shortage as opposed to the one to one employer to desperate person relationship
157	Somebody
	Yeah, yeah
158	Somebody
	A good point
159	JUDY
	I'd like to talk just a little bit about education. Immigration, because of student visas, and then colleges rely on those very highly, very strongly, and our college has students from about every country and I noticed that an ESL class is taught in our building, and I know that the numbers have gone down with those students. So, ... that would be maybe something to think about too, that colleges and our education system, the higher education system relies a lot on those student visas.
160	SOMEBODY
	And it's also the 9/11effect
161	JUDY
	Right.. and it's harder and harder for those students to come to the United States, to get good education and go back and... work in their home countries, too
162	MODERATOR
	<p>A couple of tensions that I think have been present here that I'd like to address just a little bit, and then .. wrap up..we're getting short on time here.</p> <p>One of them is, given the differential location of immigrant populations, especially recent immigrant population, and especially immigrant populations easily identified for ethnic characteristics... right... you have differential effects within a state, somebody who lives in Storm Lake ya know or Columbus Junction feels differently about this issue than somebody who lives in Center Point, ok? And you have differential effects in much larger geographic senses... in... in the Southern California, New Jersey example, in ... you know... in a material we looked at which suggest because of the ethnic nature of New Jersey immigrant population compared to the Southern California immigrant population the economic effects are really different. You know, that sort of thing. So as citizens you know, with this issue differently present before us... and... in kind of localized ways, you know, clusters of ways differentially affected by it how do we move toward even an increased understanding, shared understanding of the issue much less position on the issue when for very, you know, real reasons we relate to it quite differently. It's omnipresent or minimally present, ya know, in our lives?</p>
163	BRAD
	I kind of get back to my question about how much freedom there is in local sites in allowing or not allowing people, and I guess I am just not aware of how that works...

164	MODERATOR
	Well a state or a municipality can't disallow entry but a state or a municipality is very affected and it's that conundrum that really is problematic. Entry is a national policy but people who settle national policy may not live with the immediate local effect... you know...
165	JOHN
	I think we've all cited some positives, and there is negatives, you cited some, I've cited some, but I think ... I don't think anyone really knows the... the net. Net net of the benefits and the costs, and I think it does vary by city, I think it is related to unskilled or skilled, and the particular labor market at Cedar Rapids, I can... I know where some illegals are in this town and what they are doing, and I think they are displacing people here, and maybe something at the federal level we could do ... employ academia to actually take us study to actually understanding impact, I don't think we know.
166	MODERATOR
	<p>Jim talked about a larger philosophical issue of ... you know... philosophical perspective earlier and the other tension that I want us to think of a little bit I think is in that vein. We tend to talk as citizens, uh depending on how we see our domain of citizenship. Do we see ourselves as local citizens, state citizens, U.S. citizens... We're obviously talking in terms of U.S. citizens here in terms of some aspects of policy, but we're also talking in as local citizens in terms of how we live with, you know, the issue daily.</p> <p>There is also an increasing need today to think in terms of world citizenship. How strongly do we believe that American citizens have justifiably rights by virtue of being here and being citizens that people not here, wanting to come here don't have?</p> <p>[Pause at end of question]</p> <p>Whe... where are we on that issue, and how large is the discrepancy on those rights?</p>
167	JIM

	<p>Well, let me say... this is a truly American philosophical circumstance, not shared by the rest of the world, that is the Declaration of Independence talks about rights, given by a Creator to everybody. Life, liberty, pursuit of happiness are not intended to be uniquely American. They are given by the Creator to all souls on this earth under the American philosophical creed. In that regard then you have a problem of do you have the right or the obligation to insert your view in others, and that is a matter of judgment that comes in many different circumstances. And it is very difficult both under international law, as well as under some sort of moral imperative. What are the obligations of Americans toward North Korea? Which we have a situation where a Stalinist government exists. The Congress has moved very slightly to say on refugee status "we will consider certain North Korean refugees potentially for immigration into the United States." But that's a very slight thing, it might involve 15 hundred people.... Very minor. But do you go further? And governments have to think this through in a practical sense is it possible, in a legal sense, you know, is it correct? People have to think about it. Coming home to this country we have issues of refugee status that come under our law, also from international statutes that becomes our law once we sign and concur on an international treaty. And so we do have obligations that expand. And then as very thoughtfully presented by you, Jim, the effects are local. All effects of national law are always local. And to some degree they are deep, to some degree they are slight. And then every situation is different, I mean, one can find, for example, your distinction between short-term and long-term, some new immigrants are all pluses for our society in an economic sense, some are liability to our society, and every situation is totally different. And so we as a society have to take each individual situation, make collective judgments on generalized policy, and it is VERY difficult.</p>
168	MATT
	<p>I am very optimistic in terms of where we are on immigration, because I don't see it as an either or, but more as a both and, and what we do at the local level it's can greatly be impacted positively by the federal action in terms of immigration reform that institutes those legal channels in place. And immigration itself is a mixed blessing of challenges and opportunities we can do it at the both local and national level is to actually maximize and take advantage of opportunities, and minimize the challenges. And I just want to make my final comment, it is the philosophy of who we are as Americans. Four hundred years of the American history we already had waves after waves of immigration, the Irish, the Norwegian, the Dutch, and every new wave of immigrants was accused of stealing jobs, of diluting... American culture, of having greater cost. After four hundred years of immigrant history in America, we're one of the most strongest, most prosperous nations in history. I think that has been throughout our immigrant history, we need to educate ourselves about that. Rationally and that way seek a solution in the best interest of everyone which I believe would be comprehensive immigration reform.</p>
169	MIRIAM

	<p>This tough salad that we have that's America, I think the more diversified an area is, the opinions of people in that area towards immigration are affected by that diversity. I think, I came from the East Coast, when I moved to Iowa, I've never seen so many blond people in my whole life. LAUGHTER When I got here I found a totally different type of mentality than back east. I think a lot of immigrants feel the way that I feel. If you don't want the immigration to the extent that we have it now, take the plaque off the statue of liberty "... you poor... be free." If you don't want us, take that off. Because this is America, this country was built on the immigration policies, on the immigrants who came here, and its future lies with those immigrants.</p>
170	CHRISTINE
	<p>But also the same time – and I respect THAT very much – but at the same time, there is... every system can only be healthy with some sort of good limit, you know, some sort of rules... to me, we can't just endlessly meet everyone's needs, because... and yes, we are a country founded on immigration, but then to me it seems important that we be able to treat people in a humanitarian way, when they come here. And with so many conflicting situations with employments, with law, I don't think we've done it adequately, so, so... in welcoming, we haven't provided a true welcome, you know, it's conflicting, and I'd like to see us create something that isn't so conflicting.</p>
171	KAREN
	<p>...we think of pockets in Iowa, we think of pockets across the country, like the Appalachias that are very, very poverty-stricken and need a lot of financial help too to get themselves bettered.</p>
172	MODERATOR
	<p>Alright. We are about out of time. I think uh in response to a couple of comments that have just made here, one of the things to think about is that as we move toward understanding and possibly judgment [...] resulting in different policy, umm [...] conversations like this, it seems to me, are hopeful [...] uh are encouraging. And this sort of civic deliberation strikes me as a much better way to move in that direction than some of the experiences we have with debate, dissention and partisanship so, I [...] there's reason to be encouraged by the interaction this morning um, it seems to me. And to conclude, um I I had hoped to uh have just a few minutes for us to talk a little bit about uh what we think we might have heard from voices not present today [...] the missing voices here. Which is one that I'll, ya know, I'll certainly ask you to take away with you and and think about. Who wasn't here? Who wasn't uh represented in this discussion and what do we think we might have heard?</p> <p>But I would like uh, if anyone is in a in a position to do so, to invite a couple of people to simply uh identify something you've heard today that you will ponder beyond today. [...] Something that you've heard in the interchange that you'll take away with you, [...] you'll be chewing on this next week. You, know, you'll be you'll be listening for more of what some other people might have to say about that.</p>
173	COLIN

	<p>One of the things particularly helpful for me was the information provided by the two practicing immigration attorneys with regard to the requirements for people to come. Prior to this immigration was a mild topic of concern for me, but I didn't know necessarily that someone had to sign an affidavit of support and so forth. I assumed that, but I didn't know for sure. And so that alters my perception of that people are draining our welfare system and so forth, because apparently they are not, and ... that is very helpful for me to gain that kind of understanding, because as others have mentioned to there is a massive amount of misunderstanding and misinformation. I think wholeheartedly that that's really where there needs to be a lot of attention, to correct those misinformations.</p>
174	<p>MODERATOR</p> <p>So as always the uh the accuracy of information is a concern.</p>
175	<p>BRAD</p> <p>Certainly...in my personal situation, the more we talked, the less, I realized that, I know about it, but I am really motivated right now to learn more.</p>
176	<p>MODERATOR</p> <p>Getting some glimmer of what we don't know is not a bad result of a conversation [.] obviously so [.] Anyone else?</p>
177	<p>JUDY</p> <p>I think the point that you made about the... how the federal law affects us locally, we know it happens, but to kind of hear it said is, is good, because I think that all the laws are made in Washington and we are quite away from Washington, but they do affect us locally.</p>
178	<p>MODERATOR</p> <p>To paraphrase in some ways I think of the old think globally, act locally that also may relate to what we can do about this issue. We have to think about it on a global scale but we have to act locally.</p>
179	<p>JOHN</p> <p>I can think of about six other issues that [LAUGHTER] and we would have the same sort of dialogue ... social security [LAUGHTER]</p>
180	<p>MODERATOR</p> <p>... which is the part of the point of the national issues forum.. that's a great idea</p>
181	<p>JIM</p>

	<p>... further refine that a national law... local effect. Basically law is abstract, but there is no area of law where there is more humanness in effect. And it affects the individuals involved the most profound aspect of their lives – can someone immigrate into this country? Can someone come under the law in such a way that they are part of a community? And there is in my particular job, there is absolutely no aspect that is more individually effect-oriented than that that’s related to the question of “can you become a part of our society?”</p>
182	<p>MODERATOR</p>
	<p>In identifying with this issue a little bit from another perspective, I am reminded that in the long sweep of our human history suggest to us that there will come a time when leaving this country and to go to another country will be the desired ideal. And I know if that happened very quickly rather than over a longer period of time it was suddenly desirable to emigrate to Canada. And Canadian policy said that families could emigrate as long as the family member of a family &lt;...&gt; was a skilled worker. And I was a skilled worker and I was pursuing immigration to Canada. I also know that the size of my family would dramatically increase which complicates that solution, you know, in interesting ways..</p> <p>So how we perceive it, how we think about it on a personal level a personal perspective is uh is really significant to our consideration of issues.</p> <p>Thank all of you for your ... your participation this morning and for you time and effort to be here.</p>