Teun A. van Dijk

The Reality of Racism
On analyzing parliamentary debates on immigration[1]

Introduction

With this paper I want to celebrate the work of Siegfried J. Schmidt. When I just typed his name, I made a significant typo: I wrote SiegFRIEND... It was with him that I shared the beginning of text grammar, text theory and discourse studies, and who was the scholar who invited me for my first ever scholarly conference, in 1969s in Mannheim (Schmidt 1970).

And to show that scholarship is unpredictable, the topic of this contribution is as far removed as one can imagine from the topic of the paper I contributed to that first conference, which was about semantic literary analysis (van Dijk 1970): It will also be about discourse and also involve a bit of semantics, but basically it will not be about what fascinated Siegfried and me then, namely a new theory of literature, but about racism. It is this kind of Reality I would like to address here, this kind of European Reality that of course will not be celebrated here, but critically analyzed, as we try to do in Critical Discourse Analysis.

_____

1 Eine ausführlichere Version dieses Textes ist über den Autor erhältlich [G. Z.].

Aims

The aims of this paper are practical and descriptive rather than theoretical. Within the framework of the project "Racism at the Top", directed together with Ruth Wodak, and which deals with the ways European politicians speak about immigration, one of the recurrent general questions was "How to analyze parliamentary debates?" and more specifically: "How to isolate among hundreds or thousands of possible discourse structures those that express or confirm racism"? (Wodak/van Dijk 2000).

This paper is the result of one of several attempts to answer that question. It provides a sample analysis of a debate on asylum seekers, held on March 5th, 1997, in the British House of Commons. The debate especially deals with the issue of benefits for specific categories of asylum seekers, after an earlier discussion about whether certain inner city boroughs of London (such as Westminster) will have to pay for the extra costs for reception of those refugees who are entitled to benefits. The debate is interesting because it nicely shows the various political and ideological positions being taken by right-wing conservatives, more moderate conservatives and Labour MPs (Labour was still in the opposition then).

Racism and Discourse

Although this paper has no theoretical pretensions, a few words need to be said on the relations between discourse and racism. The systematic analysis given below deals with many properties of text and talk, analyzed specifically within the context of a parliamentary debate. How do such discourse structures relate to something as complex as racism?

I define 'racism' as a social system of inequality, consisting of two main subsystems, namely a social system of discriminatory actions at the micro level and group dominance at the macro level, and a cognitive system of racist ideologies controlling specific ethnic or 'racial' attitudes (prejudices). This cognitive system of biased social representations is at the basis of the racist social practices of the dominant group. One of these social practices is discourse. And it is discourse that also plays a fundamental role in the reproduction of racist ideologies throughout the ingroup.

Indeed, through specific discourse structures recipients form mental models of 'ethnic events' which then may be generalized to more abstract attitudes about immigration. Thus, when a conservative MP below tells stories about social welfare abuse of East European refugees, such stories could possibly be

the basis for an overgeneralization that characterizes prejudices about Eastern Europeans. It is my contention (supported by a considerable amount of psychological work) that some discourse structures are more efficient in the formation and retrieval of mental models and social representations about immigrants than others. (For details about this theory of racism and its relation to discourse, see Van Dijk 1993a.)

Method

What I did was simply go through the text, clause by clause, and sometimes sentence by sentence or paragraph by paragraph, and try to categorize any relevant *functions* such units have within the speech itself, within the broader discourse on immigration or more generally in society.

Easiest was the categorization of recognizable moves and strategies, e. g., those of derogation (negative other-presentation), ingroup favoritism (positive self-presentation), the use of specific metaphors, lexicalizations, hyperbolas, which I also analyzed in earlier work on racism and discourse (Van Dijk 1984; 1987; 1991).

The hardest was to find some system of moves and strategies of typically *anti*-racist interventions, a topic on which we need much more analysis, also in discourse analytical terms: What properties of talk make speeches seem anti-racist - apart from *not* derogating refugees or other immigrants?

Of course, it was impossible to mention *all* local properties of this debate, and I focussed on those that are possibly relevant for a characterization of debates on immigration. Many analytical categories are not specific for debates on immigration, but generally characterize the dynamics of parliamentary debates, such as the relations between MPs of government parties vs. the opposition. Indeed, such properties are typical of political discourse. Interesting here and in our project are especially those structures, moves or strategies that seem quite *typical* (though perhaps not exclusive) for debates on immigration.

I introduce each category, briefly define it, and then give some examples for some categories (not all relevant categories have examples in this debate). Each example is followed by the speaker and the party (s)he is a member of (C for Conservative, h for Labour). Many quotes will be taken from Mrs. Gorman, a conservative MP who took the initiative of this debate. I shall try to focus less on those categories I already have extensively described and analyzed before (even when very relevant also in this debate) and try to focus especially on those that have received less or no attention. For reasons of space I do not

report here on formal categories, such as those of syntactic structures (actives vs. passives), and only briefly deal with the large group of rhetorical and argumentative structures (for a discussion of these formal categories of analysis in parliamentary debates, see Van Dijk 2000; for argumentative moves in parliamentary debates, see also Van Dijk 1993b). That is, I shall mainly focus on relevant semantic categories, because these are most directly related to underlying attitudes and ideologies.

To facilitate the practical use of this analysis, I have ordered the categories alphabetically and added after each category which 'level, or 'type' of analysis it requires (like 'meaning'). Sometimes a category belongs to two or more levels or types (for instance, metaphor is both part of a rhetorical and of a semantic analysis).

Categories of Analysis (Alphabetical)

Actor Description (Meaning). All discourse on people and action involves various types of actor description (Van Leeuwen 1996). Thus, actors may be described as members of groups or as individuals, by first or family name, function, role or group name, as specific or unspecific, by their actions or (alleged) attributes, by their position or relation to other people, and so on. Since these debates are on asylum seekers, this is also true for them. The overall ideological strategy is that of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Descriptions of Others may be blatantly racist, or they may more subtly convey negative opinions about refugees. In anti-racist discourse, the opposite will be true, and asylum seekers will primarily be described as victims of oppressive regimes abroad or of police officers, immigration officials and more generally of prejudice and discrimination at home. Besides this characterization of *Them*, ingroup-outgroup polarization will typically reverse that role for ingroup members when conservative speakers describe "our own" people as victims (see *Victimization*). That is, descriptions are never neutral, but have semantic, rhetorical and argumentative functions in the expression of opinions and standpoints about the (11)legitimacy of immigration. Of the large number of actor descriptions in this debate, we cite a typical one in which negative other-presentation and positive self-presentation are combined so as to emphasize the contrast:

1) "In one case, a man from Romania, who came over here on a coach tour for a football match - if the hon. Member for Perth and Kinross (Ms. Cunningham) would listen she would hear practical examples - decided

The Reality of Racism

that he did not want to go back, declared himself an asylum seeker and is still here four years later. He has never done a stroke of work in his life. Why should someone who is elderly and who is scraping along on their basic income have to support people in those circumstances?" (Gorman, C).

Authority (Argumentation). Many speakers in an argument, also in parliament, have recourse to the fallacy of mentioning authorities to support their case, usually organizations or people who are above the fray of party politics, or who are generally recognized experts or moral leaders. International organizations (such as the United Nations, or Amnesty), scholars, the media, the church or the courts often have that role. Thus, also Ms. Gorman thanks a colleague (a "honourable friend") for supporting her, and adds: "He is a great authority on the matter". And for a concrete example of a woman who has stayed illegally in the country, she refers to the *Daily Mail*, which also shows that Authority often is related to the semantic move of Evidentiality, and hence with Objectivity and Reliability in argumentation. And Mr. Corbyn (L) attacks Ms. Gorman, who claims that Eastern European countries are democratic now and hence safe, by ironically asking whether she has not read the reports of Amnesty and Helsinki Watch. Similarly, he refers to the "Churches of Europe" who have drawn attention to the exploitation of asylum seekers. Precisely because the overall strategy of Labour is to attack conservative immigration in moral terms, it is especially progressive discourse on minorities and immigration that often has recourse to the support of morally superior authorities.

Burden (Topos). Argumentation against immigration is often based on various standard arguments, or topoi, which represent premises that are taken for granted, as self-evident and as sufficient reasons to accept the conclusion. In this debate, which focuses on benefits for asylum seekers, and on local councils that may have to pay for such benefits, the main topos is that of a financial burden: We can't afford to pay the benefits or other costs of immigration and reception:

2) "(...) an all-party document that pointed out that it was costing about £200 million a year for those people" (Gorman, C).

3) "It is wrong that ratepayers in the London area should bear an undue proportion of the burden of expenditure that those people are causing" (Gorman, C).

The Reality of Racism

4) "The problem of supporting them has landed largely on the inner London boroughs, where most of those people migrate as there is more to do in central London" (Gorman, C).

The burden-topos not only has a financial element, but also .r social one, as the following examples show, although even then the implication is often financial:

5) "There are also about 2000 families, with young children who must be supported" (Gorman, C).

6) "Presumably, if those people are here for long enough under such terms, they will have to be provided with clothing, shoe leather and who knows what else,, (Gorman, C).

Note that the burden-topos is one of the ,safest- anti-immigration moves in discourse, because it implies that we do not refuse immigrants for what they are (their color, culture or origin), nor out of ill will, or because of other prejudices, but only because we *can't*. It is not surprising, therefore, that it is widely used in EU political discourse that opposes immigration, and not only on the right.

Consensus (Political Strategy). One of the political strategies that are often used in debates on issues of "national importance" – and immigration is often defined as such – is the display, claim or wish of "consensus". Facing the "threat" of immigration, thus, the country should "hold together", and decisions and legislation should ideally be non-partisan, or bipartisan as in the UK or the USA. In other words, ingroup unification, cohesion and solidarity (WE English) against Them, should prevail over party politics and division. And precisely as argumentative move, real or apparent consensus is a means to persuade the (Labour) opposition that earlier immigration policies or regulations were developed together, so that present opposition to new legislation is unwarranted and a breach of earlier consensus politics, for instance about illegal immigration:

7) "The Government, with cross-party backing, decided to do something about the matter" (Gorman, Q.

Empathy (Meaning). Depending on their political or ideological perspective, MPs will variously show sympathy or empathy with the plight of refugees or the ingroup (the poor taxpayer). In disclaimers, the expression of empathy may be

The Reality of Racism

largely strategic and serve especially to manage the speaker's impression with the audience (e. g. "I understand that refugees have had many problems, but ..."). lo that case, the apparent nature of the empathy is supported by the fact that the part of the discourse that follows "but" does not show much empathy at all, on the contrary. Empathy in that case will be accorded to ingroup members, represented as victims (see *Victimization*). In anti-racist and pro-immigration points of view, empathy appears to be more genuine, especially since the experiences of political refugees may be demonstrably horrendous. In the same discourse, we will typically encounter accusations of lacking empathy of the Government with respect to refugees. Both ingroup and outgroup empathy may be in a generalized form, or in the form of an *Example*. Again, we give an example of both forms of empathizing, the second example at the same time illustrating a form of ingroup-outgroup *Comparison*:

> 8) "Many of those people live in old-style housing association Peabody flats. They are on modest incomes. Many of them are elderly, managing on their state pension and perhaps also a little pension from their work. They pay their full rent and for all their own expenses" (Gorman, C).

> 9) "So far as I am aware, no hon. Member has been woken up by the police at 4 a.m., taken into custody with no rights of access to a judicial system, and, with his or her family, forced to flee into exile for their own safety. It is not an experience that most British people have had, and we should think very carefully about what a major step it would be to undertake such a journey" (Corbyn, L).

Evidentiality (Meaning, Argumentation). Claims or points of view in argument are more plausible when speakers present some evidence or proof for their knowledge or opinions. This may happen by references to *Authority* figures or institutions, or by various forms of Evidentiality: How or where did they get the information. Thus people may have read something in the paper, heard it from reliable spokespersons, or have seen something with their own eyes. Especially in debates on immigration, in which negative beliefs about immigrants may be heard as biased, evidentials are an important move to convey objectivity, reliability and hence credibility. In stories that are intended to provoke empathy, of course such evidence must be supplied by the victims themselves. When sources are actually being quoted, evidentiality is linked to *Intertextuality*. Here are a few examples:

The Reality of Racism

10) "This morning, I was reading a letter from a constituent of mine (...)" (Gorman, C).

11) "The people who I met told me, chapter and verse, of how they had been treated by the regime in Iran" (Corbyn, L).

Example /Illustration (Argumentation). A powerful move in argumentation is to give concrete examples, often in the form of a vignette or short story, illustrating or making more plausible a general point defended by the speaker. More than general 'truths' concrete examples have not only the power to be easily imaginable (as episodic event models) and better memorable, but also to suggest impelling forms of empirical proof (see also *Evidentiality*). Rhetorically speaking, concrete examples also make speeches more 'lively', and when they are based on the direct experiences (stories of constituents) of MPs, they finally also imply the democratic values of a speaker who takes his or her role as representative of the people seriously. As such, then, they may also be part of populist strategies. In anti-racist discourse, examples of the terrible experiences of refugees may play such a powerful role, whereas the opposite is true in conservative discourse, where concrete examples precisely contribute to negative other-presentation. Note also, that the concrete example often also implies that the case being told about is typical, and hence may be generalized. In sum, giving examples has many cognitive, semantic, argumentative and political functions in debates on asylum seekers.

Fallacies (Argumentation). Parliamentary debates, just like any other dispute about contested points of view and opinions, are riddled with normative breaches of 'proper' argumentation, that is, with fallacies. These may pertain to any element of the argumentative event, namely to the nature of the premises, the relations among the premises and the conclusion, the relations between speaker and recipients, and so on. There are numerous fallacies, and since these are well-known, they shall not be specified here. Thus, as we see elsewhere, claiming the support for one's standpoint by referring to an *Authority* (incorrectly) implies that one's point is true because someone else says so. Similarly, the relations between premises and a conclusion may be faulty as in a non-sequitur, as in the following example where the availability of work in the cities seems to be a sufficient condition for refugees to work illegally:

The Reality of Racism

13) "I am sure that many of them are working illegally, and of course work is readily available in big cities- (Gorman, C).

Another fallacy quite typical in these debates is that of extreme case formulation. An action or policy is deemed to be condemned but only because it is formulated in starkly exaggerated terms. Here is a typical-example, which have become so conventional, that it is virtually a *Topos* (We can't take them all in):

14) "We must also face the fact that, even in the case of brutal dictatorships such as Iraq, we cannot take in all those who suffer" (Shaw, C).

Humanitarianism (Topos, Macro-Strategy). Whereas the overall strategy on the right is to limit immigration and benefits for refugees, and in particular to derogate (bogus) asylum seekers, the overall strategy of the left could be summarized as humanitarianism: the defense of human rights, and critique of those who violate or disregard such rights, and the formulation of general norms and values for a humane treatment of refugees. Since in argumentation of various kinds this may be a conventional, recognizable strategy, we may also categorize this argument as a topos (in the same way as "law and order" would be one for the right). There are many ways humanitarianism is manifested in parliamentary debates. One basic way is to formulate *Norms*, in terms of what 'we' should or should not do. Secondly, recipients are explicitly recommended to pay more attention to human rights, show empathy for the plight of refugees, condemn policies that infringe the rights of refugees, making appeals to our moral responsibility, showing understanding for and listening to the stories of refugees, denouncing human rights abuses, praising people who stood up for human rights, explicitly antiracist opinions, reference to authorities, international bodies, agreements, and laws that deal with human rights, and so on.

Implication (Meaning). For many 'pragmatic' (contextual) reasons, speakers do not (need) to say everything they know or believe. Indeed, large part of discourse remains implicit, and such implicit information may be inferred by recipients from shared knowledge or attitudes and thus constructed as part of their mental models of the event or action represented in the discourse. Apart from this general cognitive-pragmatic rule of implicitness (Do not express information the recipients already have or may easily infer), there are other, interactional, sociopolitical and cultural conditions on implicitness, such as those monitored by politeness, face-keeping or cultural norms or propriety. In debates about immi-

The Reality of Racism

gration, implicitness may especially be used as a means to convey meanings whose explicit expression could be interpreted as biased or racist. Or conversely, information may be left implicit precisely because it may be inconsistent with the overall strategy of positive self-presentation. Negative details about ingroup actions thus tend to remain implicit. Thus, when Ms. Gorman says that many refugees come from countries in Eastern Europe who have recently been "liberated", she is implying that people from such countries cannot be genuine asylum seekers because democratic countries do not oppress their citizens (a point later attacked by the Labour opposition). And the same is true when she describes these refugees as "able-bodied males", which implies that these need no help from us.

Lexicalization (Style). At the local level of analysis, debates on asylum seekers need to express underlying concepts and beliefs in specific lexical items. Similar meanings may thus be variably expressed in different words, depending on the position, role, goals, point of view or opinion of the speaker, that is, as a function of context features. In conservative discourse opposing liberal immigration policies, this will typically result in more or less blatantly negative expressions denoting refugees and their actions, thus implementing at the level of lexicalization the overall strategy of negative other-presentation. Thus, also in this debate, we may typically find such expressions as "economic immigrants", "bogus asylum seekers", or "benefit scroungers", as we also know them from the tabloid press. On the other hand, lexicalization in support of refugees may focus on the negative presentation of totalitarian regimes and their acts, such as "oppression", "crush", "torture", "abuse" or "injustice". Depending on the political or ideological perspective, both ingroup and outgroup members may be empathically (see Empathy) described in emotional terms, such as -poor people in the UK scraping along on their basic income«, -modest income-. Note also, that context (parliamentary session) requires MPs to be relatively formal, so they will speak rather of »destitution« than of "poverty". On the other hand, precisely to emphasize or mark expressions, the stylistic coherence of formality may be broken by the use of informal, popular expressions, for instance to use "not to have a penny to live on", or to use "rubbish" to defy an invalid argument or statement of fact.

National Self-Glorification (Meaning). Especially in parliamentary speeches on immigration, positive self-presentation may routinely be implemented by various forms of national self-glorification: Positive references to or praise for the

The Reality of Racism

own country, its principles, history and traditions. This kind of nationalist rhetoric is not the same in all countries. It is unabashed in the USA, quite common in France (especially on the right), and not uncommon in Germany. In the Netherlands and the UK, such self-glorification is less explicit. See, however, the following standard example - probably even a topos:

> 15) "Britain has always honoured the Geneva convention, and has given sanctuary to people with a well-founded fear of persecution in the country from which they are fleeing and whose first safe country landing is in the United Kingdom (Wardle, C).

Negative Other-Presentation (Semantic Macro-Strategy). As the previous examples have shown, the categorization of people in ingroups and outgroups, and even the division between 'good' and 'bad' outgroups, is not value-free, but imbued with ideologically based applications of norms and values. Whereas 'real' political refugees are described in neutral terms in conservative discourse, and in positive or empathic terms in Labour interventions, "economic" refugees are extensively characterized by the Conservatives in starkly negative terms, namely as "benefit seekers" and "bogus". Since the latter group is defined as a financial burden (see *Burden*) or even as a threat to the country or to Us, they are defined as the real Outgroup. At many levels of analysis, for instance in lexical and semantic terms, their representation is influenced by the overall strategy of derogation or "negative other-presentation", which has been found in much earlier work on the discourse about minorities and immigrants.

Norm Expression. Anti-racist discourse is of course strongly normative, and decries racism, discrimination, prejudice and anti-immigration policies in sometimes explicit norm-statements about what 'we' (in parliament, in the UK, in Europe, etc.) should or should not do:

> 16) "We should have a different attitude towards asylum seekers" (Corbyn, L).

> 17) "We should think a bit more seriously about how we treat those people" (Corbyn, L).

> 18) "Attitudes towards asylum seekers need to be changed" (Corbyn. L).

19) "It is wrong to force them into destitution or to throw them out of the country, often with no access to lawyers or anyone else" (Corbyn, L).

Number Game (Rhetoric, Argumentation). Much argument is oriented to enhancing credibility by moves that emphasize objectivity. Numbers and statistics are the primary means in our culture to persuasively display objectivity. They represent the "facts" against mere opinion and impression. Especially in discourse about immigration, also in the mass media, therefore, the frequent use of numbers is well-known. The very first attribute applied to immigrants coming to the country is in terms of their numbers. These are usually given in absolute terms, and when speaking of X thousand asylum seekers who are arriving, a speaker makes a stronger impact than when talking about less than 0.1 percent of the population. Similarly, when arguing against immigration and the reception of refugees, as in this debate, we may expect a lot of figures about the costs of benefits. Ms. Gorman's main point in this debate is to show, with many numbers (see also financial Burden), that local councils can't pay for so many refugees:

20) "It would open the floodgates again, and presumably the £ 200 million a year cost that was estimated when the legislation was introduced,, (Gorman, C).

Polarization, Us-Them Categorization (Meaning). Few semantic strategies in debates about Others are as prevalent as the expression of polarized cognitions, and the categorical division of people in ingroup (Us) and outgroup (*Them*). This suggests that especially also talk and text about immigrants or refugees is strongly monitored by underlying social representations (attitudes, ideologies) of groups, rather than by models of unique events and individual people (unless these are used as illustrations to argue a general point). Polarization may also apply to 'good' and 'bad, sub-categories of outgroups (as is the case for friends and allies on the one hand, and enemies on the other). Note that polarization may be rhetorically enhanced when expressed as a clear contrast, that is, by attributing properties of Us and Them that are semantically each other's opposites. Examples in our debate abound, but we shall only give two typical examples:

21) "Now they are going to be asked to pay £35 to able-bodied males who have come over here on a prolonged holiday and now claim that the British taxpayer should support them« (Gorman, C).

22) "It is true that, in many cases, they have made careful provision for themselves in their old age, have a small additional pension as well as their old-age pension and pay all their rent and their bills and ask for nothing from the state. They are proud and happy to do so. Such people should not be exploited by people who are exploiting the system,, (Gorman, C).

Populism (Political Strategy). One of the dominant overall strategies of conservative talk on immigration is that of populism. There are several variants and component moves of that strategy. The basic strategy is to claim (for instance against the Labour opposition) that "the people" (or "everybody") does not support further immigration, which is also a well-known argumentation fallacy. More specifically in this debate, the populism-strategy is combined with the topos of financial burden: Ordinary people (taxpayers) have to pay for refugees. Of the many instances of this strategy, we only cite the following:

23) "It is wrong that ratepayers in the London area should bear an undue proportion of the burden of expenditure that those people are causing" (Gorman, C).

24) "£140 million a year, which is a great deal of money to be found from the council tax budget" (Gorman, C).

25) "Why should someone who is elderly and who is scraping along on their basic income have to support people in those circumstances?" (Gorman, C).

Reasonableness (Argumentation Move). A familiar move of argumentative strategies is not only to show that the arguments are sound, but also that the speaker is 'sound', in the sense of rational or reasonable. Such a move is especially relevant when the argument itself may seem to imply that the speaker is unreasonable, or biased. Therefore the move also has a function in the overall strategies of positive self-presentation and impression management:

26) "(...) those people, many of whom could reasonably be called economic migrants,, (Gorman, C).

Victimization (Meaning). Together with *Dramatization* and *Polarization*, discourse on immigration and ethnic relations is largely organized by the binary

223

The Reality of Racism

Us-Them pair of ingroups and outgroups. This means that when the Others tend to be represented in negative terms, and especially when they are associated with threats, then the ingroup needs to be represented as a victim of such a threat. This is precisely what happens, as we also have observed in conversations about "foreigners" in which ordinary speakers apply the move of *Inversion* in order to emphasize that not the Others are discriminated against, but *We*. In this debate, the ordinary and especially the poor and elderly taxpayers are systematically represented as the real victims of immigration policies, because they have to pay for them.

Conclusion

The categories analyzed in this paper show something about the reality of discourse and racism – and anti-racism – in Europe. They show how powerfully the ideologically based beliefs of Europeans about immigrants may impact on discourse, for instance through the polarization of Us vs. *Them* and the strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation which largely control all properties of racist discourse. Antiracist discourse precisely tries to undo some of this harm not only by avoiding such discourse, but by reversing the strategies, for instance instead of generalizations of negative properties, it will argue that one can *not* generalize, or that there are explanations of some observed deviance.

Finally, through our brief analyses of the various categories and the examples we have obtained some insight in the role of political (parliamentary) discourse and its specific structures and moves, and how such discourse plays a role in the broader social-political issues of immigration. On the conservative side, thus, we witness how refugees may be marginalized and criminalized, and further immigration restrictions imposed, by playing the populist trick of wanting to protect the "own people". This move is especially ironic when we realize how little the Conservatives would normally be concerned about poor old people. Detailed and systematic analysis of discursive strategies in parliamentary debates may thus uncover at the same time some of the subtleties of politics, policy-making and populism.

For a broader theory of discourse, this paper has finally shown that a largely semantic analysis may come up with a number of strategic properties of discourse that are not standard features of meaning analysis, or that some well-

know moves and strategies (such as that of positive self-presentation) may have such a powerful role in racist talk and text.

References

Pettigrew, T. F. (1979): The Ultimate attribution Error: Extending Allport's Cognitive Analysis of Prejudice. Personality and social Psychology Bulletin, 5, 461-476.

Schmidt, S. J.(Ed.) (1970): Text, Bedeutung, Ästheik. München.

Stephan, W. G. (1977): Stereotyping: The Role of Igroup-Outgroup in Causal Attribution for Behavior. In: The journal of Social Psychology, 48 (101), 255-266

Van Dijk, T. A.(1970): Neuere Entwicklungen in der literarischen Semantik. In: Schmidt, S. J. (Ed.): Text. Bedeutung. Ästheik. München, 106-135.

Van Dijk, T. A (1984): Prejudice in Discourse: An analysis of Ethnic Prejudice in Cognition and Conversation. Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1987): Communicating Racism: Ethnic Prejudice in Thought and Talk. Newbury Park, CA.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1991): Racism and the Press. Londo /New York.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993a): Elite Discourse and Racism. Newbury Park, CA.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993b): Political Discourse. In: Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.): Elite Discourse and Racism. Newbury Park, CA, 49-115.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000): On the Analysis of Parliamentary Debates on Immigration. In: Wodak, R.; Van Dijk, T.A. (Eds.): Racism at the Top. Wien (work in progress).

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996): The Representation of Social Actors. In: Caldas-Coulthard, C. R.; Coulthard, M. (Eds.): Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis, London, 32-70.

Wodak, R.; Van Dijk, T. A. (Eds.) (2000): Racism at the top. Wien.

The Reality of Racism