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Abstract The article proposes the analysis of migration problems (and the European crisis currently associated with them) using two anthropological categories of "a foreign" and "an enemy". After identifying the essence of both concepts and connections between them, the basic mechanisms of transformation of a foreign into an enemy are presented. Particular attention is paid to the mechanism of creation of an enemy, in the context of which such phenomena as infrahumanization, dementalization, dehumanization or extreme attribution error are described. The main causes of reluctance towards migrants are also presented, and against this background concerns about radical Islam, which brings with it tangible civilizational threats. The last part discusses the strategies of coping with "foreigners" by human collectivities. It presents the history and fiasco of erecting walls, and as the alternative - a strategy of cognition and understanding is proposed. The essence of the phenomenon of the excluded common area is also outlined, i.e. discordant argumentation of adversaries of migrants (who perceive the phenomenon of migration only from the point of view of threats) and those calling for help for migrants (who pass over possible threats in silence). The securitization policy is also criticized as fundamentally harmful to constructive / humanitarian solution to the migration issue.
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INTRODUCTION

The current situation related to the new "migration of peoples", although it may surprise contemporary man, is not unusual in the scale of history of humankind that from the very beginning was a migrating species – a kind of homo viator. Migration has been embedded into people's lives from the earliest times. At the same time, it was a catalyst for anthropogenesis, and then for civilization development. In parallel with this development, refugees constantly knocked on someone else's door while escaping from deadly hunger, invaders' savagery, cruelty of war, tyranny, despotism or other varieties of barbarism. From the point of view of those who stood and still stand on the other side of these doors, these newcomers have always been strangers. It can be said that the appearance of "others / foreigners" among "us" is a universal and timeless phenomenon, affecting all nations and social groups with greater or lesser frequency or intensity.

The recent migration crisis has put the attitude towards refugees/migrants at the front of a cultural war in which the delineation line is quite clearly drawn - the Church and leftist circles on the one hand, on the other the right wing, with the nationalist right in particular. The invoked arguments from both sides are imbued with ideology. So far, scientific support for solving this problem has failed, hence the need for a fruitful discourse also at this level. Perturbations connected with successive waves of migration into Europe and attempts to resist them require vacuuming of two, slightly suppressed mechanisms of political correctness as well as concepts - "a foreigner" and "an enemy". Their application allows for more insightful consideration of migration problems.
I. CATEGORY OF "A FOREIGNER" IN SCIENCES AND SOCIAL RELATIONS

Primitive ancestors’ migrations were not related to the "foreign" category. Initially, people lived in their own communities and their contact with others - due to the small population of the globe - was a rarity. Individual communities rather avoided each other and did not cross paths with each other on the vast no man's land. As Immanuel Kant summed up: "originally no one had more right than another to be on a place on the earth". Migration began to be increasingly connected with the problem of a foreign together with the growing number of people on the Earth, as well as the more and more stronger process of its colonization. The category of "an enemy" became more and more concretized as well.

A "foreigner" is someone who does not belong to ours, is not familiar, thus goes beyond the given and somehow accepted order, does not fit in it, deconstructs it or situates himself outside its borders [44]. An attribute of foreignness is a different body shape/color, different smell, different clothes, different speech, different behaviors, customs, different instruments/artifacts, etc. In the eternal opposition "our-foreign" foreignness becomes a background to homeliness, ordinariness, oursness and less or more surprising contrast between what is known and ours. By its very nature, foreignness is a denial of homeliness. "Foreignness" is always relative, referred to specific locations, and at the same time defined by the prism of the opposition to the ontology of homeliness and the term "homeliness". Bernhard Waldenfels concludes that, firstly, something is foreign if occurs outside of its own area and, for example, is personified in the word "foreigner". Foreign is also what belongs to someone else. Thirdly, what is of a different kind is seen as foreign [43]. In his opinion, the experience of a foreigner shows certain ambivalence - it also appears both as a temptation and a threat. "It is a threat," he writes, "since it creates competition against something own, it can be defeated; it is a temptation as it brings to life possibilities which to a lesser or greater extent were excluded by the order of own life"[43]. We know too little about foreigners to properly read their intentions, correctly interpret their behaviors and react adequately. Thus, when one does not know how to behave, how to act in a situation that has not been arranged by him/her and which is beyond control, he/she feels anxiety. Therefore, experiencing contact with a foreigner can prove risky and attractive at the same time.

The term "foreign" is often used interchangeably with the term "other". They are often identified as concepts. They are synonymous. Other is a bit more than foreign, but less than own. It does not evoke negative emotions and attributions. Nowadays, the categories of "otherness" and "foreignness" refer not to the reality itself but to the way it is perceived and thought about. To a large extent they are relational, contextual and interpretative categories. The criterion of otherness is the matter of similarity, whereas foreignness – belongingness. A disabled person is perceived as different but not necessarily foreign, while an alien, though may differ in appearance, is already a foreigner due to the fact of belonging to a different identity. A foreigner who does not belong to us is a carrier of claims and provokes in his / her own way, however at the same time he / she can be a positive challenge, forcing innovation in the area of both beliefs and behaviors. Therefore, he / she can enrich us spiritually / psychologically.
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A foreigner is the one who is different, and unannounced invaded our space. Thus, "foreignness" is generally defined through the prism of dissonance that stimulates a feeling of threat. Otherness becomes foreignness when it generates anxiety and when interest and natural observation are replaced by vigilance and assessment, which in turn is associated with negative, repulsive emotions. Hence, "a foreigner is the personification of our anxieties, a materialized fear of the unknown, an expression of our helplessness towards something aiming at our sense of security" [47]. A foreigner is always a comer who destabilizes and deconstructs the existing situation, arouses embarrassment, discomfort as well as enforces caution and increased activity of defensive nature. Migrants as "foreigners" become "troublesome, irritating, unwanted - unacceptable", as noted by Zygmunt Bauman. They arouse controversy, discomfort and anxiety precisely because of their "foreignness". Their atypicality, unpredictability, along with the size of the inflow wave, may annihilate what is ours and which is particularly valued, destroy or demolish our soothing familiar lifestyle and status quo we are entitled to. Thus, the category of a foreigner has its signum, however, in parallel, it has a particular odium [16].

The provocative character of foreignness may also be manifested in such a way that at the time it is encountered, it does not so much pose a spiritual challenge, but claims and demands, sometimes even aggressively, and even may reconcile physicality and aim at physical annihilation. In this case, defensive behavior becomes the most adequate and somewhat justified. A radical form of foreignness, i.e. hostility, is being dealt with herein. Waldenfels also states that a foreigner is a potential enemy. The real immanent ability to become one and a clear declaration / manifestation of hostility makes a foreigner only what he / she de facto has been in secret since the very beginning.

Undesirable and unapproved manifestations do not encourage cognitive interest, dealing with foreignness or experiencing it. On the contrary, in response it stimulates attempts to thwart consecutive, possible behaviors of this type. In a sense, it thwarts "listening to" the message that flows from it. In this situation, strangeness is exposed as hostility [15]. In the interpersonal / social space, foreignness falls within the categories of "a friend" and "an enemy". As Z. Bauman notes, "a foreigner is this unplanned, unforeseen third: neither a friend nor an enemy and according to what we know about him / her (we know little) he / she can be both. What is worse, there is no way to find out (all the more on time or in advance) who he / she is"[7]. Therefore, a foreigner destroys not only order, but also a sense of peace and certainty.

As Stanisław Czerniak points out, "a foreigner happens to me – I can choose an enemy, i.e. “dose” its presence in the field of my actions, provoking fellows to competitive behaviors, using different strategies of fighting, cease-fire, intrigue, flattery etc. In other words, an enemy, to a much greater extent than a foreigner, may become a dependent variable of my - claiming to rationality - bills and life predictions". The confrontation with an enemy, however, refers to a different canon of reactions. An enemy does not so much pose a challenge by his / her difference and intrusiveness of claim, but clearly threatens, and in such conditions the answer to the unknown is measured with these threats. Thus – as Czerniak continues - "... my answer does not seem to be “an unspecific change in behavior” in the face of..."
a foreigner, but the sum of ventures subordinated to sophisticated scenarios of fighting an enemy" [15].

II. BRIEF ANTHROPOLOGY OF AN ENEMY

A foreigner (not ours) does not have to be of the same kind or genre (e.g. a foreign body in our eye or a creature from the movie entitled: Alien. B passenger Nostromo). An enemy, in turn, can only be a representative of our species (e.g. not only a plunderer from distant lands, but also a neighbor, a current friend, and even a brother). All other qualifications can only have a metaphorical meaning. A lion, for example, is not an enemy of man, although it may be mortally threatening. So it is a predator that threatens our existence / life, and this threat results from its nature. An enemy intentionally calculates hostile (aggressive, destructive, unfriendly) actions towards us at many different levels of our activity (also shared by him / her). He / She wants to - though does not have to - harm our interests or threaten existence. He / She strives to take over our assets, take our place, get rid of us.

As we already know, the enemy’s cultural status remains strongly associated with the status of a foreigner. An enemy is a foreigner that created in the past, still creates and can potentially create a real threat [23]. It is therefore the subject of certain stereotypes. While the stereotype of "a foreigner" does not have to be negative (though often it is), the stereotype of an enemy always displays negative traits, which are despised by the group that has created the stereotype [38]. An enemy is the one who is not only negatively different, but first of all brings trouble. The category of "enemy" is directly related to active, intentional eradication of security.

The lexical sources of the concept are interesting from the anthropological perspective. In Polish, the word "an enemy" has strong links with other Slavic meanings (in the Orthodox language, warg means "a foe, an enemy", wrażda - "hostility", the Czech wraž is "fate", the Serbian wražda means "a murder," etc.). Even in the 17th century, this word meant "fate" and "an evil enemy" was "bad fate". The Polish word for an enemy arose from the non-existent verb to enemy, which mainly meant 'to kill'. M. Załęska notes that the concepts of ‘foreigner’, ‘guest’ and ‘enemy’, which from a contemporary point of view form three separate (semantically and legally) individuals, in ancient cultures presented close links and shaped completely different from ours semantic fields regarding interpersonal relations. Since hostility is a relational concept, in pairs of the terms "we and them" and "good and bad", usually "we" are "good" and "they" are "bad". The author concludes "the exact circumstances of the semantic change are not known, as a result of which in Latin the notion of "foreigner - guest" has changed into the concept of "foreigner - enemy" [48].

Today, an enemy is "a foe" [12]. In dictionary terms, an enemy is "one who is unfriendly, ill-disposed towards someone, who is fighting or threatening someone, an enemy, an opponent, a hosti, a murderer, a killer, homicida, occisor "[42]. Nowadays, the understanding of the term "an enemy" oscillates around such meanings as "a hostile man", "a man fighting something", "an enemy army", "a state at war with another state" or metaphorically "something that hurts someone or something". An enemy is above all a foe, an attacker, a persecutor and a ruthless, destructive opponent [31]. You can also talk about individual and collective, private and social, personified, reified or abstract enemies.
Interestingly, in phenomenology, "an enemy is someone I "know" how to treat, because I assume that he / she violates the obligatory rules of the game, and it is in them that I seek the legitimacy of my retaliatory behavior. Any retaliation is based on the rule of the symmetry of claims - a foreigner's claim may be earlier than mine in time, but it does not overtake it in the order of any reasons. In other words, an enemy is a carrier of a certain point of view, which, if it threatens my interests, I have the right to fight according to my point of view. What is more, I have the right to expect that an arbitrator who is looking at our conflict from outside may take my side in the dispute. Thus, what is foreign loses the splendor of the final situation - an enemy can be defeated, held liable, evaluated in the light of certain universal standards" [15]. Therefore, the action of an enemy violates the constituted axiological order, which in turn confirms, and in the active confrontation with the enemy even restitutes my own actions.

As the personification of evil, damage and threat - an enemy should be adequately named, illustrated and stigmatized, and even criminalized. The analyzes of ancient sources indicates that "images of an enemy, equating him / her with animals and defining with negative evaluating terms, result from a sense of superiority of own culture, and at the same time contempt for the inferiority of foreign culture, disgust with a different way of life and behavior" [36]. History is filled with examples of human communities based on creating sharp boundaries between ours and foreigners, followed by building hostility towards foreigners on this basis. A specific archetype is the mechanism by which enemies are portrayed as vile and insidious beings that cannot be trusted and should be feared. In consequence, even the murder of a foreigner loses the character of a crime; it is justified by the good of the community [39]. This is due to the specific programming of our psyche. According to E. O. Wilson, "we are strongly predisposed to be subject to a profound, irrational feeling of hostility in certain identifiable situations. Hostility dangerously easily stimulates itself and releases unmanageable reactions that can quickly turn into a sense of alienation and provoke violent actions" [45]. This, in turn, is directly related to the tendencies to aggression, since, as E. Nowicka points out "the bond based on hostility towards strangers tends to induce collective aggression based on the ideology of one's own group's superiority" [32].

The enemy's status is inextricably involves fighting, because an enemy is "an opponent taking part in a destructive struggle. It aims at causing damage or inflicts not only material (resources), but also physical and moral damage (...) and - what is important - strives to achieve victory regardless of the size and type of losses suffered by the opposing party" [35]. Therefore, enemies must be fought, even with hands of other enemies. In consequence, the existence of an enemy is manifested by hostile attitudes, which can be perceived as "socially defined (environmentally relativized, verbal or behavioral, shown or hidden) approach of an individual or group towards other people (or a person), resulting from a negative attitude, accompanied by various aggressive behaviors, irritation, anger, malice and sometimes even hatred "[33].

Strong emotional tension caused by the presence of an enemy and the resulting cognitive-reflective disorders lead to his / her mythologization. It is a complicated process initiated by contrast and opposition (according to the Manichean principle of "us - them"), which is based on such psychosocial mechanisms as stereotyping, labeling, heroization and demonization. The latter
seems to play the main role. J. Ziółkowski writes that "demonizing an enemy is often attributed to above-average causative opportunities. The stronger an enemy, the more he / she must be feared and the more he / she must be fought. Thus, an enemy is almost a negative demiurge" [49]. And if so, he / she is made responsible for all misfortunes or even just failures, which brings a kind of relief, as it responds (though not necessarily aptly) to the bothering question about their cause. This creates an ambivalent image of an enemy - fascination on the one hand, desire for annihilation on the other.

The enemy category becomes a way of explaining the reality segment important to a given subject. This is a mythical way on all accounts, since it is based on the simplification of the image of an enemy and the vital "piece" of the world, as well as too "easy" narration (describing and explaining) what is happening (especially in relation to the causes of phenomena - an enemy becomes a specifically understood "scapegoat"). At the same time, we are dealing here with the empirical inaccuracy of this narrative, and we can also distinguish a certain prophetic dimension - the enemy’s category structures not only the existing reality but also the upcoming one. Thus, an enemy - in the imaginary form - satisfies the special, psychosocial needs of people. Although, in fact, he / she can be tangibly devastating when becoming a psycho-cultural creation, he / she repels psycho-intellectual tensions that are associated with his / her actual or imaginary threats.

III. MAIN MECHANISMS OF A FOREIGNER’S TRANSFORMATION INTO AN ENEMY

The concepts of "a foreigner" and "an enemy" remain in a certain dynamic with each other. Under certain conditions, a foreigner becomes an enemy or becomes seen and treated as such. It is not difficult to specify three basic mechanisms of transformation of a foreigner into an enemy: 1) a foreigner’s unfriendly action (actual hostility), 2) inadequate reception of a foreigner’s intentions (imaginary hostility), 3) intentional creation of an enemy (staged or created hostility) – where a foreigner appears as a material.

The unfriendly action of a foreigner obviously gives him / her the status of an enemy. Since hostility generates hostility, a struggle becomes the immanent element of this system, which ultimately determines the categorization of a foreigner as an enemy. This situation is clear and unambiguous. In the light of the above consideration, the fact that modern migrants / refugees have displayed hostility on the territory of Europe cannot be ignored. The media showed images of young, dark-skinned people throwing stones and attacking fences on the border of Hungary, Macedonia or Spain in Ceuta. Also the behavior of residents of the so-called "jungle" in Calais has frequently had an enemy character, even for the drivers of trucks, including Polish ones.

Slightly more problems are caused by a situation in which there is a misunderstanding - inadequate reception of a foreigner's intentions. It may result from cultural and symbolic differences (e.g. the Bulgarians nod in agreement, when they disagree with a thesis put forward or a partner’s proposal), which may generate certain misunderstandings. It can also be the result of the so-called misperception [17]. As Christofer Catrambone, a British analyst and animator of help for migrants, remarked: "the tragedy of people fleeing terrorism is diminished by caustic accusations, erection of walls and the fear that refugees are coming to kill
us" [13]. Altruistic responses of Europeans are inhibited by the belief that there are potential terrorists among refugees constituting the natural personification of an enemy. As the effect, people who bear the mark of difference are denied social acceptance or ordinary hospitality.

The essence of this mechanism is based on the difficulty of distinguishing enemies from friends, and basically non-enemies. These difficulties in a natural way cause the shift of the accent on the enemy’s status. It results from the very essence of the foreigner status, which immanently contains potential elements of hostility, which has already been mentioned. This mechanism is delineated to extreme situations in which it is necessary to determine whether in the case of a specific conflict foreignness means the possibility of negating our form of existence, and whether we must separate ourselves or fight off the foreigner to save our own way and comfort of life [26].

As is shown by the turbulent and dramatic history of humanity, an enemy can also be generated artificially. Especially in the political sphere, taking advantage of appropriate propaganda, an enemy can be "anointed" and announced in every case. The use of this category serves the identity discourse, it allows social groups to unite around power, legitimize ruling elites and motivate crowds of people to expected and desirable behaviors. This is necessary in the conditions of political struggle. It is sufficient when religious, economic and ethnic or any other opposites serve as a basis to transform into a political opposite to divide people and create enemies [37]. At various stages of the human history, people uncomfortable for a given power, for various reasons (religious, political, economic, etc.) were 'anointed' as public enemies. As the late lamented Zbigniew Wodecki sang (to Jan Wołek’s words): *Fear, people, great fear. We need to designate an enemy, Otherwise, Ladies and Gentlemen, we will kill ourselves.*

Thus, an enemy can be created intentionally, instrumentally. "The enemy institution – as M. Falco states - does not have to carry a real threat, and can only serve immediate needs of political elites. We can conventionally call such an enemy an institutional enemy or an imaginary enemy, as opposed to an enemy who carries with him / her a real threat to a given community and acts to its detriment" [20]. In turn, E. Karolczuk asserts that "in history individual people, social organizations, social relations, objects and phenomena of nature, as well as the products of human fantasy have been announced enemies. The choice depends on theoretical and program assumptions of a given political force, historical conditions, tradition and immediate political needs. Everyone presents his / her enemy as ill-founded and at least morally suspect. Meanwhile, anyone can be made an enemy when preaches the truth as long as it violates one’s interests. In order not to become someone’s enemy, the subjective conviction about innocence or friendship is not sufficient“[25].

In the process of creating an enemy, the techniques of infrahumanization, dementalization and dehumanization are used. We talk about *infrahumanization* when more of the secondary emotions (that is, specifically human, higher, social) are attributed to the own group than to the majority of foreign groups. Own group is positively distinguished due to its fullness of humanity, while foreign groups are devalued and human properties are assigned to them to a lesser extent. As a rule, we "show" more sympathy / warmth and at the same time more often and more willingly we attribute positive character traits to “ours” than to "others". On the other hand, we absolve perpetrators of failures or morally doubtful behaviors when
they are "ours", and we charge them with responsibility when they are "foreigners". Infrahumanization is connected with the sense of superiority of our group over other human groups, mainly in terms of emotional and intellectual sophistication, but also creativity, level of psychological complexity, etc.

Dementalization consists in denying that foreigners have internal life (psyche), and so they are sentient beings (emotionally sensitive, capable of intensely feeling different emotions) that live intentions, think, are capable of self-reflection, imagine, plan, make conscious choices, etc. Basically it means that people are no longer perceived as psychological subjects, but as creatures "devoid of soul", automatons (mechanical creations). Dementalization amounts in refusing inner life to "foreigners" (e.g. the ability to experience emotions), negating human psychic potentials, stressing that "aliens" are deprived of certain typically human predispositions (emotional, intellectual, communicative, and ultimately - moral), connected with the fact that man is a self-aware, intelligent cultural being [41].

The starting point to understand dehumanization is the differentiation between the category of "man" and the category of "animal", and thus the extraction of those aspects, for which people resemble each other, and at the same time they dominate over animals and distinguish themselves from them. This concept is often identified with the concept of infrahumanization or treated as its most advanced form. Denying foreigners uniquely human psychological skills is basically a tool of domination over other groups and justification of intergroup violence. However, this is not only the legitimacy of our inhumane influences, but also our way of separating ourselves from discriminated groups (for example, immigrants illegally working in the country) or victims of military activities that our armed forces carry out in the occupied territories. Psychologists pay attention to the "usefulness" of dehumanizing victims of own group. Dehumanization dulls empathy in relation to suffering "foreigners", exempts from moral responsibility for unworthy or even cruel treatment, eliminates guilt and makes even an assassin feel a person being dignified, just and moral. Dehumanizing "foreigners" facilitates the transition to a ruthless attack and the use of the most extreme means against an opponent (can effectively eliminate the collective enemy threatening the physical existence of own group, its sovereignty, position in the system of power, etc.). Some researchers even suggest that the tendency to dehumanize "foreigners" has psycho-evolutionary roots. They echo the old processes of adaptation of human groups in the conditions of competing with other groups for survival and for limited environmental resources. In any case, dehumanization serves not only to justify direct extermination, but it is also a tool that legitimizes structures of power and oppression [11].

The breakdown into "ours" and "foreigners" results in accentuation, that is, highlighting differences between members of own group and members of "foreign" groups as well as the so-called ultimate attribution error (Diagram 1) consisting in attributing successes of "foreigners" to external factors (independent of them), and their failures to internal own ones, while in the case of "ours" we do the opposite [40]. Members of a given group recognize themselves as better than others and at the same time can be convinced that only they have all the necessary qualities that make them human, while the foreigners’ humanity is more flawed, closer to animal nature. Infrahumanizing "foreigners" can be a mechanism that prepares a fertile ground for their subsequent dehumanization, delegitimization, and in extreme cases
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– annihilation and extermination. It is also an important mechanism for strengthening the group's internal power [18].

Table 1. The essence of the ultimate attribution error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive results</th>
<th>Own group</th>
<th>Foreign group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal attribution</td>
<td>External attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. outstanding abilities)</td>
<td>(e.g. good luck)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative results</th>
<th>Own group</th>
<th>Foreign group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External attribution</td>
<td>Internal attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g. bad luck, sabotage, diversion)</td>
<td>(e.g. lack of aptitude, laziness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The consequence of such mechanisms and actions is the dehumanization of newcomers, placing them in the category Homini sacri, which means people stripped of both religious and secular meaning and values. Dehumanization paves the way for the exclusion of these people from the circle of beings who have human rights, and leads to (tragic) shifting the migration problem from the sphere of ethics to the sphere of security, crime prevention, punishment, defense of order, etc. Even the prohibition of harming another human being is a common component of ethical or religious systems, "many ideologies postulate the need to exclude some groups of people from the normal validity of moral norms, which leads to dehumanization of victims. 'Heretics', 'infidels', 'subhumans', 'class enemies' - each of these labels meant hundreds of thousands or millions of victims murdered in accordance with a suitably cut scope of validity of moral norms" [46].

What is happening now – basically the rise of a criminal, cosmopolitan state entity (Daesh), bold terrorist attacks in the heart of the West and migration of peoples into Europe – is another paroxysm of globalization. As noted by Czerniak, one of the features of globalization is that it destroys any foreignness. Peripheral ("foreign" to the dominant or even victorious civilization) cultures, languages, customs, traditions and identities perish. What remains (market, television, Internet) is well known to everyone and is not a "challenge" from behind the system, the mainstream of events. Globalization is based on the primacy of one system and intense efforts to tame a "foreigner" within its framework. What is excluded by the system loses grounds for continuing. " Anything foreign is brought to the dead end of history, loses the right to any claims, at best becomes an open-air museum artificially kept alive for didactic purposes. If this is the case, globalization will favor entering various varieties and scenarios of hostility into positions that foreignness once occupied, before it was forced to leave them" [15]. By reducing foreignness, globalization fosters hostility.

Fear and aversion towards "foreigners" is a characteristic archetype. In a sense, we have an evolutionary imprinted mechanism, according to which we perceive every stranger as a threat and too often, in response, as an object of our aggression. The ancient Romans used to say hospes, hostis - every foreigner is an enemy. This archetype is "a mixture of rational and irrational impulses so far-reaching and so deeply rooted that they go beyond individual experience, and even beyond historical memory. They turn not only against known enemies, but also to all
foreigners. In fact, members of ancient, medieval and modern societies used almost interchangeably the words “a foreigner” and “an enemy”. In all epochs, people were horrified having “barbarians at the gates”. This deep fear remains (sometimes not without reason) the basic element of contemporary foreign relations” [34].

In this context, contemporary reluctance towards emigrants stems from four main sources:

- a sense of threat from terrorism (especially Islamic);
- economic burden resulting from the "handling" of "foreigners" who arrived in their society;
- previous failures in the process of social adaptation of "foreigners", creation of enclaves and ghettos (it is in particular associated with Islamic communities);
- appropriation of “our” European space.

A distinguishing feature is the reluctance to migrants of the Islamic provenience. The fear of radical Islam and its extremism plays a fundamental role herein. Its most characteristic features include: 1) the global nature of threat, 2) direct proportionality of threat to the possibility of intervention in the Arab world, 3) unpredictability of threat (terrorist groups such as Jama’a Islamiya, Boko Haram or ISIS hit where it is the easiest and most spectacular), 4) intensification of threat – the worst will come, 5) ineffectiveness of defense through classic security measures (network structures, secret recruitment of bombers, interim and occasional nature of actions, unpredictability), 6) adoption of the face of terrorism of complete break-off instead of terrorism of negotiations [14].

In relation to the last property, the offensive Jihad plays a special role. Its essence is not so much providing security at the borders of Muslim lands, but sending armed troops to the lands of infidels, terrorizing Allah’s enemies and successive achievement of the state when only “Muslims or people subordinated to Islam will remain on the globe” [3]. One can therefore speak of a modern variation of predatory identity along with the accompanying processes of ideocide and killing the civilization [2]. Numerous analysts and commentators on the modern world [21] point to the humanitarian expansiveness of Islam, signaling the threat of total Islamization not only of Europe but also of the whole world. One cannot forget, that radical Islam is just one of the forms (resulting from a specific, belligerent interpretation of the Koran) of Islam, and all the followers of Muhammad cannot be blamed for its crimes. It is regrettable, however, that the world of Islam does so little to eliminate or even marginalize this trend.

IV. ATTEMPTS TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF CONTACT WITH A FOREIGNER

The first human strategy to respond to a foreigner was the retreat initiated by fear. In turn, in the settlement era, the main strategy for dealing with uninvited guests was the separation and erection of walls. When there were difficulties in defeating (final) an external enemy, attempts were made to isolate him / her. The first civilizations already tried to separate themselves from an enemy. An example is the defensive Amorite Wall (Muriq Tidnim) over 1,600 years older than the Great Wall of China (whose construction began in 215 BCE). It was erected during the reign of Shu-Sin, the penultimate king of Sumer and Akkad from Ur III dynasty. Although its course is not exactly known, the remaining records indicate that it was
about 280 kilometers long. Most likely, it was not a wall in the form of one compact structure, but rather a strip of connected fortifications, however its erection and maintenance was a huge engineering and logistics undertaking. The wall connected the Euphrates valley with the Tigris valley in the central Mesopotamia and stretched eastwards, already in the land of Subaru. *Muriq Tidnim* did not stop the influx of the Amorites, just as many centuries later the Chinese Wall did not stop the Mongols, but the very idea of separating itself from hostile nomads and thus separating the civilized world from *barbaricum* was significant [36].

The idea of defensive function of a wall has accompanied man for centuries. The Roman *limes*, especially the Hadrian’s Wall, on the border with the Scottish lands gained considerable fame. In the purely military (operational) sense, the last meaningful examples concern the so-called Siegfried Line, Maginot Line or so-called Pomeranian Line. History points to the insignificant effectiveness of this strategy, except maybe the walls of defense fortresses, which often resisted specific attacks. A wall cannot solve human / social problems because it is a manifestation of another order. Contemporary walls erected on the borders of Israel, the USA, the African exclaves of Spain (Ceuta and Manila) or closer to us Hungary only modify the nature of problems without solving them. They do not refer to sources but only to their symptoms.

Already two centuries ago, Immanuel Kant stressed the importance of the principle of mutual hospitality, i.e. "rights of a foreigner, that after arriving in the land belonging to someone else he / she was not treated hostile by them. And if that coming would mean damage to them, they could dismiss him / her, but as long as he behaved peacefully in the place he / she had chosen, they were not allowed to be hostile to him / her"[24]. Kant called for the replacement of hostility with kindness, courtesy and hospitality. In principle, in mutual hospitality he saw the possibility, prospect of universal peace that would put an end to the long history of wars that would destroy all humanity.

The current approach to the migration crisis, in particular of the most active participants of the discourse, points to the **phenomenon of the excluded common area** (in relation to the law / rule of the "excluded middle" appearing in logic). It shows that in the dispute adversaries use only contradictory argumentation, not referring to the common premises (Diagram 2).

---

**Fig.1. The phenomenon of the excluded common area in the perception of migration**

Source: own study
Opponents of emigrants perceive this phenomenon only from the point of view of threats. What an evocative expression was the saying of Viktor Orban: "all terrorists are migrants", or the words of the Governor of Texas Greg Abbott: "we can not allow the mercy shown to any group to endanger everyone’s safety." On the other hand, those who call for help usually ignore (or rather, in principle, they stay silent on possible threats), which, however, cannot be underestimated for the common good.

Numerous studies claim that the issue of migration is becoming the subject of securitization as a kind of preventive and remedial policy at the same time. It is quite a controversial political theory focused on solving security problems within formal structures (basically states). It is here - in the context of migration - that the security problems of the state collide with global human rights [4, 1, 9]. Aside from its general assumptions, Z. Bauman presented a clearly negative opinion regarding its application for migration issues. In his opinion, "the policy of securitization" allows for suppressing in advance the remorse that might occur in observers looking at the suffering object of this policy. It leads to the "adiaforization" migration problem (i.e. the exclusion of migrants and what is happening with them from moral evaluation).

When public opinion is once classified as potential terrorists, migrants go beyond the limits and scope of moral responsibility - and above all beyond the space of compassion and the reflex of responsibility. In fact, many people trained by the policy of securitization feel - consciously or not - that they have been relieved of responsibility for the fate of unfortunates and the pressure of moral duty, which otherwise would torment observers (...) apart from the fact that 'securitization' is morally soulless, repugnant, blind to social problems, largely unfounded, and often deliberately deceptive, it can also be accused of facilitating tasks of groups recruiting real (as opposed to alleged or falsely accused) terrorists" [8].

Bottom-up reconciliation activities can be an alternative to soulless securitization. If good will exists, contact with "a foreigner" should initiate the effort of understanding, not rejection, although the situation of meeting with him / her inherently poses a risk. The main obstacle on the way out of reciprocal alienation is the refusal to engage in dialogue, which may result from mutual indifference or mutual hostility. Both attitudes eliminate the necessary solidarity and constructive coexistence. The way to prepare for a meeting with any "Other", for its coming, is to become accustomed to not oursness and foreignness, which is the purpose of discovering and learning another [19]. As E. Hobsbawm observes, "xenophobia and racism are just a symptom, not a prescription. Communities and ethnic groups in modern societies are condemned to coexistence, regardless of the rhetoric of ideologues dreaming of returning to a pure nation" [22]. From the anthropological point of view, there is no doubt that - whether we like it or not - we are all descendants of migrants, which cannot be ignored when solving migration problems.

CONCLUSION

The current situation of European mentality meets the criteria of the classic Greek tragedy. This bears out a clear clash of altruism and genuine willingness to help with the need to defend identity and possession (characteristically, even some Islamic communities speak against accepting refugees from this cultural area). In this context, the sealing of borders and the need to 'manage' refugees already
present in Europe are two different things. On the one hand, Europe cannot - which is obvious - accept the surplus of all the poor and disappointed from Asia or Africa. On the other – the United Europe cannot leave Greece, Italy or Spain with the current "baggage" of migrants, which has often taken the form of a humanitarian catastrophe.

As the inflexible advocate of improving human fate wrote, "we are approaching (or maybe even have already arrived) to divide the paths of the possible course of events: one leads to prosperity based on cooperation and the other to collective annihilation. Nevertheless, we are still not able to sensitize ourselves, take actions and plan enough to achieve the already existing - and rather irreversible - level of global interdependencies that cover our entire species. This makes the choice between survival and extinction dependent on our ability to “live close to others” in peace, solidarity and cooperation, among foreigners whose opinions and preferences may differ from ours” [8, pp. 82-83]. Militant ethnocentrism has to be ended up and the issue of migration must be looked at calmly and above all objectively. A rational, cool approach is needed - instead of ideological anger. Humanity has found itself in a crisis, and the way out of it leads through interpersonal solidarity and humanitarian activity of people of good will.
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A foreigner as an enemy ... at our borders and erected walls (anthropological reflections)


OBCY JAKO WRÓG... U NASZYCH GRANIC I WZNOSZONYCH MURÓW (refleksje antropologiczne)

Streszczenie: Artykuł jest propozycją analizy problemów migracji (a obecnie także związanego z tym europejskiego kryzysu) przy wykorzystaniu dwóch antropologicznych kategorii „obcego” i „wroga”. Po zidentyfikowaniu istoty obu pojęć
i powiązań między nimi przedstawione zostały zasadnicze mechanizmy tranzycji obcego we wroga. Szczególną uwagę zwrócono na mechanizm kreacji wroga, w kontekście czego opisane zostały takie zjawiska, jak infrahumanizacja, dementalizacja, dehumanizacja czy krańcowy błąd atrybucji. Przedstawione zostały także zasadnicze przyczyny niechęci do migrantów, a na tym tle obawy odnoszące się do radykalnego islamu, który niesie sobą wymierne zagrożenia cywilizacyjne. W ostatnim punkcie przedstawione zostały strategie radzenia sobie przez ludzkie zbiorowości z „obcym”. Przedstawiono historię i fiasko budowania murów, a w alternatywie – zaproponowano strategię poznania i porozumienia. Zarysowano także istotę zjawiska wyłączonego obszaru wspólnego, czyli rozmijania się argumentacji przeciwników emigrantów (którzy postrzegają zjawisko migracji wyłącznie z punktu widzenia zagrożeń) oraz nawołujących do pomocy migrantom (którzy przemilczają możliwe zagrożenia). Krytyce poddano także politykę sekurtyzacji, jako zasadniczo szkodliwej kontruktywnemu/humanitarnemu rozwiązaniu kwestii migracji.

Słowa kluczowe: migracja, inny, obcy, wróg, dehumanizacja