

6. Examples

Now we have dealt with the theoretical aspects of the relations between discourse and ideology, let us have a look at some examples. These will be taken from a debate in the British Parliament (House of Commons), held on March 5, 1997.* 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). That is, on the one hand we find an anti-immigrant attitude which we associate with a form of political racism, and on the other hand various humanitarian, or anti-racist ideologies that control more tolerant attitudes about immigration.

To make the examples as practical as possible for future reference (so you can search for discourse properties by name), we have not ordered them by level as we did above, but by name of the relevant structural category, also because some categories belong to various levels of analysis. Of each of the categories we first classify it by one or more levels of analysis, then we briefly summarize its definition, if necessary repeating some of the theory given above, indicate what ideological functions it may have, and finally give one or more examples. Since the examples come from one debate, not each category can be illustrated with an example of course -- but for completeness we mention it anyway, even without an example. Sometimes the examples are summarized in the description of the category and (to save space) not actually quoted. In the description of a category sometimes other categories are mentioned, and these will then be written with capitals, so that you know that that category is defined elsewhere in the list.

Apart from an alphabetically ordered set of analytical categories that are used to illustrate the ideological based properties of discourse structures, the following may also be taken as a brief summary of some properties of *political* (and especially parliamentary) discourse and rhetoric. That is, as we have seen above, ideologies usually translate into more specific social opinions and then to discourse within a specific social domain, such as politics, media, work, business, education, research or the law. In our examples then racist and anti-racist ideologies especially are articulated in the crucial political domain - crucial because it is here where it is decided who will be able to (legally) enter the country or not.

The examples are followed by C for a Conservative speaker, and by L for a Labour speaker. Many of the quotes come from the lengthy speech of Ms. Gorman (Conservatives) who took the initiative of the debate, and whose populist speech pitches the poor British "rate-payer" (tax-payer) against foreign refugees whom she largely defines in negative terms. Indeed, as we shall see in many of her and other conservative interven-

* The complete text of the debate can be found in the Appendix.

tions, the overall discursive strategy based on racist ideology is that of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, where WE are the (white, original) British, and THEM are immigrants, refugees, and minorities, and by extension those who defend them (like Labour, and specifically the "Loony Left").

Categories of ideological analysis (alphabetical)

ACTOR DESCRIPTION (MEANING). All discourse on people and action involves various types of actor description. 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 this debate is on asylum seekers, this is also true in our examples. 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 (il)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 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

[†] These examples can be found in the text of the debate in the examples by searching for the number of the example between parentheses.

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. In other words, anti-immigrant ideologies may be expressed in discourse by emphasizing that the Others are a (financial) burden for us:

(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).

(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 a social one, as the following examples show, although even then the implication is often financial:

(5) There are also about 2,000 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.

CATEGORIZATION (MEANING). As we also know from social psychology, people tend to categorize people, and so do speakers in parliament, especially when Others (immigrants, refugees, etc.) are involved. Once groups have thus be distinguished and categorized (with lexically variable terms, see below), they can be attributed positive or negative characteristics (see below). Most typical in this debate is the (sub)categorization of asylum seekers into "genuine" political refugees, and "bogus" asylum seekers, a categorization formulated in the following ways:

- (7) There are, of course, asylum seekers and asylum seekers (Gorman, C).
- (8) I entirely support the policy of the Government to help genuine asylum seekers (Gorman, C).
- (9) ... those people, many of whom could reasonably be called economic migrants and some of whom are just benefit seekers on holiday, to remain in Britain (Gorman, C)
- (10) The Government's reasoning was the same then as it is now: they still talk about economic migrants and benefit scroungers (Gerrard, L).
- (11) But the escalating number of economic and bogus asylum seekers who have come here, not because of persecution but because of the economic situation in this country and the benefits it affords them, has caused great concern (Burns, C)

COMPARISON (MEANING, ARGUMENTATION). Different from rhetorical similes, comparisons as intended here typically occur in talk about refugees or minorities, namely when speakers compare ingroups and outgroups. In racist talk, such comparisons typically imply the negative score of the outgroup on the criteria of the comparison, as in the typical everyday argument: "If we go abroad *we* learn another language" in an argument or story in which "foreigners" are accused of not wanting to learn "our" language. In anti-racist talk about refugees such comparisons may favor the outgroup or their case, e.g., when the speaker claims that, compared to "our own" daily experiences, those of refugees have been incomparably worse. Similarly in anti-racist discourse, "our" own country may be compared negatively (e.g., as to their hospitality for asylum seekers) with other countries. Another well-known comparative move is to compare current immigrations (refugees, or anti-immigration policies) with similar situations in the past. Typically, the refusal to accept refugees will be compared to the refusal to help the Jews during the Second World War. Here is another example of a comparison that explains why not all asylum seekers can talk about their experiences upon arrival in the UK:

- (12) Many soldiers who were tortured during the second world war found it difficult to talk about their experiences for years. That is no different from the position of people who have been tortured in Iran, Iraq, west Africa or anywhere else. The issue is not simple. They feel a sense of failure, a sense of humiliation and a sense of defeat. (Corbyn, L).

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". This means that racist ideologies often combine with nationalist ones, in which the unity and the interests of the nation are placed before any internal, political divisions among US. In other words, in-group unification, cohesion and solidarity (WE English) against Them. 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. This is a very typical political-ideological move in arguments that try to win over the opposition. In this case it 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:

(13) The Government, with cross-party backing, decided to do something about the matter (Gorman, C).

COUNTERFACTUALS (MEANING, ARGUMENTATION). "What would happen, if...", is the standard formula that defines counterfactuals. In argumentation they play an important role, because they allow people to demonstrate absurd consequences when an alternative is being considered, or precisely the compellingness of a story about refugees and their experiences when WE would be in the same position. As a warning or advice, counterfactuals are relevant in political debate in parliament to show what would happen if we would NOT take any measures or formulate policies or a law. In our debate, counterfactuals typically occur on the left, and support the viewpoint of Labour to soften immigration law. Here are a few more extensive examples that clearly show the argumentative role of counterfactuals, for instance by eliciting empathy when people are put in the place of others. They are clear examples of what me might call a humanitarian ideology:

(14) I suggest that he start to think more seriously about human rights issues. Suppose he had to flee this country because an oppressive regime had taken over. Where would he go? Presumably he would not want help from anyone else, because he does not believe that help should be given to anyone else (Corbyn, L).

(15) If that happened in another country under a regime of which we disapproved, the British Government would say that it was a terrible indictment on the human rights record of that regime that prisoners were forced to undertake a hunger strike to draw attention to their situation (Corbyn, L).

(16) Even if we accepted the Government's view--which I do not-- that only a tiny proportion of people who claim asylum are genuine refugees, we cannot defend a policy that leaves genuine refugees destitute (Gerrard, L).

DISCLAIMERS (MEANING). A well-known combination of the ideologically based strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, are the many types of disclaimers. Note that disclaimers in these debates are not usually an expression of attitudinal ambiguity, in which both positive and negative aspects of immigration are mentioned, or in which humanitarian values are endorsed on the one hand, but the "burden" of refugees is beyond our means. Rather, disclaimers briefly save face by mentioning Our positive characteristics, but then focus rather exclusively, on Their negative attributes. Hence our qualification of the positive part of the disclaimer as 'Apparent', as in Apparent Denials, Concessions, Empathy, etc.:

(17) I understand that many people want to come to Britain to work, but there is a procedure whereby people can legitimately become part of our community (Gorman, C). [Apparent Empathy]

(18) The Government are keen to help genuine asylum seekers, but do not want them to be sucked into the racket of evading our immigration laws (Gorman, C). [Apparent Benevolence]

(19) I did not say that every eastern European's application for asylum in this country was bogus. However... (Gorman, C) [Apparent Denial]

(20) Protesters may genuinely be concerned about refugees in detention, but the fact is that only a tiny proportion of applicants are detained (Wardle, C). [Apparent Concession].

DISTANCING (MEANING, LEXICON). One of the ways US-THEM polarization may be expressed in talk is by words that imply distance between ingroup speakers refer to outgroup speakers. This familiar socio-cognitive device may for instance be expressed by the use of demonstrative pronouns instead of naming or describing the Others. Also in this debate, thus, Conservatives will often refer to refugees as "those people".

DRAMATIZATION (RHETORIC). Together with hyperbolas, dramatization is a familiar way to exaggerate the facts in one's favor. Positions in immigration debates, thus, tend to represent the arrival of a few thousand refugees as a national catastrophe of which we are the victims (see VICTIMIZATION). Thus, Ms. Gorman claims to feel "great worry" about Labour's aim to change the current law, and finds such an aim "extremely irresponsible."

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 (see DISCLAIMERS), the expression of empathy may be 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..."). In 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:

(21) 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).

(22) So far as I am aware, no hon. Member has been woken up by the police at 4 am, 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).

EUPHEMISM (RHETORIC; MEANING). The well-known rhetorical figure of euphemism, a semantic move of mitigation, plays an important role in talk about immigrants. Within the broader framework of the strategy of positive self-presentation, and especially its correlate, the avoidance of negative impression formation, negative opinions about immigrants are often mitigated, especially in foreign talk. The same is true for the negative acts of the own group. Thus, racism or discrimination will typically be mitigated as "resentment" (in our debate used by Nicholson, C), or "unequal treatment", respectively. Similarly Ms. Gorman in this debate uses the word "discourage" ("to discourage the growing number of people from abroad...") in order to refer to the harsh immigration policies of the government, and thus mitigates the actions of the conservative government she supports. Similarly, the Labour (Corbyn) opposition finds the condemnation of oppressive regimes by the Government "very muted" instead of using more critical terms. Obviously, such mitigation of the use of euphemisms may be explained both in ideological terms (ingroup protection), as well as in contextual terms, e.g., as part of politeness conditions or other interactional rules that are typical for parliamentary debates.

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 (see above), 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:

(23) According to the magistrates court yesterday, she has cost the British taxpayer £40,000. She was arrested, of course, for stealing (Gorman).

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

(25) 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. Here are two fragments that illustrate both the conservative and Labour type of storytelling, respectively:

(26) The Daily Mail today reports the case of a woman from Russia who has managed to stay in Britain for five years. According to the magistrates court yesterday, she has cost the British taxpayer £40,000. She was arrested, of course, for stealing (Gorman, C).

(27) The people who I met told me, chapter and verse, of how they had been treated by the regime in Iran--of how they had been summarily imprisoned, with no access to the courts; of how their families had been beaten up and abused while in prison; and of how the regime murdered one man's fiancée in front of him because he would not talk about the secret activities that he was supposed to be involved in (Corbyn, L).

EXPLANATION (MEANING, ARGUMENTATION). Characteristic of anti-racist discourse is the (empathetic) explanation of possibly illegal acts of asylum seekers or other immigrants. Social psychology uses the notion "Ultimate Attribution Error," according to which negative acts of ingroup members tend to be explained (away), whereas the negative acts of outgroup members tend to be explained in terms of inherent properties of such actors (e.g., because they are unreliable or criminal) . The inverse is true in anti-racist talk, which focuses on the terrible circumstances of their flight which leave asylum seekers often no choice but to break the rules or the law, as is the case in the following example:

(28) If one has grown up in Iraq and has always been completely terrified of anyone wearing any type of uniform, it is fairly unlikely that--after managing to steal oneself out of Iraq, possibly using false documentation, aliases, guides and other measures--one will trust a person wearing a uniform whom one encounters when first arriving at the airport. It is more likely that one would first get out of the airport and then think about the next step (Corbyn, L).

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, which cannot all be specified here. Thus, as we see have seen above, 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:

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

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 has become so conventional, that it is virtually a standard-argument or TOPOS (We can't take them all in):

(30) 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).

GENERALIZATION (MEANING, ARGUMENTATION). Most debates involve forms of particularization, for instance by giving EXAMPLES, and Generalization, in which concrete events or actions are generalized and possibly abstracted from, thus making the claim broader, while more generally applicable. This is also the way discourse may signal the cognitive relation between a more concrete example as represented in a mental model, and more general opinions such as those of social attitudes or ideologies. The problem of examples, even when persuasive and compelling stories, is that they are open to the charge of exceptionality. It is therefore crucial that it be shown that the given examples are not exceptional at all, but typical or representative, so that they may be generalized. This may happen with standard expressions, such as quantifiers for nouns ("most", "all"), or expressions of time and frequency ("always", "constantly") or place ("everywhere"). These properties of the dynamics of singularity and generalization are also typical of immigration debates, since it is politically crucial that negative examples as reported by the press, constituents or the police may be shown to be typical and of a general nature, so that effective policies can be developed. The same is true for the opposite case, in which negative experiences of asylum seekers in their own countries or in their new countries can be generalized, so as to support the argument for empathy and policies to help them. Note also that (over)generalization of negative acts or events are the basis of stereotyping and prejudice. Of course, the opposite may also be true as part of positive self-presentation: Current acts or policies that are found beneficial are generalized, typically in nationalist rhetoric, as something 'we' always do. Here are a few examples:

(31) Such things go on and they get up the noses of all constituents (Gorman, C).

(32) In the United Kingdom there has been a systemic erosion of peoples' ability to seek asylum and to have their cases properly determined (Corbyn, L).

(33) If someone has a legitimate fear of persecution, they flee abroad and try to seek asylum (Corbyn, L).

(34) I heard about many other similar cases (Corbyn, L).

(35) First, it matters crucially that this country honours, as it always has, its obligations under the Geneva convention (Wardle, C).

HISTORY AS LESSON (TOPOS). As we have found also for COMPARISON, it is often useful in an argument to show that the present situation can be relevantly com-

pared to earlier (positive or negative) events in history. Such comparisons may be generalized to the more general topos of the "Lessons of history", whose argumentative compellingness are taken for granted, as were it a law of history:

(36) History shows that unless we stand up for human rights wherever they are abused around the world, eventually it will come back and our human rights will be abused (Corbyn, L).

HUMANITARIANISM (TOPOS, MACROSTRATEGY). 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 in terms of its overall underlying ideology: humanitarianism, that is, the defense of human rights, 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.

HYPERBOLE (RHETORIC). As is the case for DRAMATIZATION, hyperboles are semantic rhetorical devices for the enhancement of meaning. Within the overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, we may thus expect in parliamentary debates about immigrants that the alleged bad actions or properties of the Others are expressed in hyperbolic terms (our bad actions in mitigated terms), and vice versa. Sometimes such forms of hyperbole are implied by the use of special METAPHORS, as we observe in Ms. Gorman's use of "opening the floodgates" in order to refer to the arrival of many asylum seekers. Similarly, to emphasize that asylum requests take a long time to handle by the courts, she will call such a procedure "endless". And conversely, on the left, Labour speakers will of course emphasize the bad nature of authoritarian regimes, and like Mr. Corbyn, will call them "deeply oppressive", and the conditions of refugees coming from those countries "appalling". Similarly, within the House he also deems a racist question of a conservative MP "totally ludicrous". Note though that, as with many moves studied here, their interpretation may depend on political point of view: What is exaggerated for one group, may be the simple and objective truth, and the "correct" way of referring to an issue, for another group.

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, socio-political and cultural conditions on implicit-

ness, such as those monitored by politeness, face-keeping or cultural norms or propriety. In debates about immigration, 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.

ILLEGALITY (ARGUMENTATION). For many conservative speakers, most refugees are or remain in the country as "illegals", or otherwise break the law or do not follow procedures. This also means that such law and order arguments may be part of the strategy of negative other-presentation, and in particular of criminalization. Such criminalization is the standard way minorities are being characterized in racist or ethnic prejudices:

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

(38) It is equally important that abuse of the asylum rules by the large number of people who make asylum applications knowing that their position as illegal immigrants has no bearing on the Geneva convention should be debated openly, so that it is fully understood and tackled (Wardle, C).

(39) ...because there are many attempts at illegal immigration using asylum techniques, fraudulent documents or other methods (Shaw, C).

INTERACTION AND CONTEXT. Whereas most other categories of analysis discussed here deal with structural properties of discourse, e.g., at the levels of meaning, style, argumentation and rhetoric, and apply especially to the way asylum seekers are being talked ABOUT, it is obvious that the debate is also a form of interaction between MPs, or between MPs and representatives of the government. Large part of the properties of this debate therefore can only be described and explained in an interactional framework, that is as inherent part of a context consisting of overall political action categories (legislation), setting (session of parliament), various forms of interaction (discussing a bill, opposing the government), participants in many different roles (speaker, recipients, MPs, representatives of their districts, member of a government or opposition party, and so on), as well as their cognitive properties (knowledge, beliefs, prejudices, biases, goals, aims, etc.). An analysis of all acts and interactions in this debate, yields the following (alphabetical) list of interactional elements and context features -- and many of these acts are ideologically based, in the same way as many social practices may be controlled by ideologies; thus an 'attack' or an 'accusation' in parliament usually is directed against the political and hence the ideological opponent. In other words, many of the following actions not only characterize political interaction in a parliamentary debate, but also what may be called 'ideological' interaction:

- Accusing other MPs
- Addressing the whole House
- Agreement and disagreement with MP
- Answering a question
- Asking a (rhetorical) question
- Attacking (member) of other party
- Calling other MP to attention
- Challenging other MPs
- Collective self-incitement ("Let us...")
- Congratulating other MP
- Criticizing the Government
- Defending oneself against attack of other MP
- Denying a turn, refusing to yield the floor
- Disqualifying a contribution of other MP
- Formulating goals of legislation
- Formulating the aims of a speech
- Interrupting a speaker
- Praising a member of own party
- Recommendation to Government
- Recommending a policy, etc.
- Reference to one's own role as representative of district
- Reference to parliamentary procedure
- Reference to present time and place
- Reference to previous debates
- Referring to (un)desirable consequences of current policies
- Remind MPs of something
- Requesting a turn
- Self-obligation of MPs
- Suggesting MPs to do something
- Supporting own party member
- Supporting the Government
- Thanking other MP

IRONY (RHETORIC). Accusations may come across as more effective when they are not made point blank (which may violate face constraints), but in apparently lighter forms of irony. There is much irony in the mutual critique and attacks of Conservatives and Labour, of course, and these characterize the proper interactional dimension of the debate. However, when speaking about immigrants, irony may also serve to derogate asylum seekers, as is the case for the phrase "suddenly discover" in the following example, implying that such a "sudden discovery" can only be bogus, since the asylum seekers allegedly knew all along that they came to the country to stay:

(40) Too many asylum seekers enter the country initially as family visitors, tourists, students and business people, and then suddenly discover that they want to remain as asylum seekers (Shaw, C).

LEGALITY (ARGUMENTATION). Part of the arguments that support a standpoint that opposes immigration, is to have recourse to the law or regulations -- which is of

course a standard argument (and hence a topos) within a legislative body like parliament:

(41) (...) there is a procedure whereby people can legitimately become part of our community (Gorman, C).

(42) The Asylum and Immigration Act 1996 stated that people whose application to remain in Britain had been turned down could no longer receive the social security and housing benefit that they had previously enjoyed (Gorman, C).

(43) In order to try to subvert the legislation, a case was recently brought before our courts and to the High Court which sought to overturn the provisions that the Government intended (Gorman, C).

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 ideological strategy of negative other-presentation. Thus, also in this debate, we may typically find such as expressions as "economic immigrants", "bogus asylum seekers", or "benefit scroungers", as we also know them from the tabloid press in the UK. 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 empathetically (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.

METAPHOR (RHETORIC). Few semantic-rhetorical figures are as persuasive as metaphors, also in debates on immigration. Abstract, complex, unfamiliar, new or emotional meanings may thus be made more familiar and more concrete. Virtually a standard metaphor (if not a topos) is the use of flood-metaphors to refer to refugees and their arrival, symbolizing the unstoppable threat of immigration, in which we would all "drown". Even more than numbers, thus, flood metaphors symbolize dangerous if not lethal quantities, as is also the case for the military metaphor of the "invasion" used to refer to dangerous "aliens". Thus, Ms. Gorman warns for changes in the present law by saying that such changes would "open the floodgates again". And once the refugees are here, they may be accused of fraud, of "milking the taxpayers", and of being "addicted" to the social services (Ms. Gorman, C). Most of these metaphors are negative, and thus fall under the overall strategy of negative other-description. This is especially the case when metaphors become explicit forms of derogation, e.g., when asylum seekers are

called "parasites" (Gorman) of the social system, that is, associated with dangerous or otherwise threatening or dirty animals, as was also the case in Nazi-propaganda about the Jews.

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 own country, its principles, history and traditions. Racist ideologies may thus be combined with nationalist ideologies, as we have seen above. 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:

(44) 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:

(45) We should have a different attitude towards asylum seekers (Corbyn, L).

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

(47) Attitudes towards asylum seekers need to be changed (Corbyn, L).

(48) 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).

(49) Europe must stop its xenophobic attitude towards those who seek a place of safety here and adopt a more humane approach.

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:

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

OPENESS, HONESTY (ARGUMENTATION). Nearly a topos because of its increasingly conventional nature in current immigration debates is the argumentative claim (or norm) that "we should talk openly (honestly) about these things". This move presupposes that dishonesty, or rather evasion or mitigation may be seen as the normatively base rate, namely to avoid making a negative impression on the recipients. Breaking these norms has increasingly been advocated during the last years as a "refreshing" view on the "cramped" debate on immigration. Thus, speakers suggest that their argument satisfies the positive values of honesty and openness, while at the same time indulging in negative other-presentation or even blatant derogation. This reversal of the anti-racist norm in increasingly more intolerant values, is characteristic of contemporary conservative positions and discourses about minorities, race relations and immigration. Here is a typical example:

(51) It is equally important that abuse of the asylum rules by the large number of people who make asylum applications knowing that their position as illegal immigrants has no bearing on the Geneva convention should be debated openly, so that it is fully understood and tackled. (Wardle, 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:

(52) 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).

(53) 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).

POSITIVE SELF-PRESENTATION (SEMANTIC MACROSTRATEGY). Whether or not in combination with the derogation of outgroups, group-talk is often characterized by another overall strategy, namely that of ingroup favoritism or "positive self-presentation". This may take a more individual form of face-keeping or impression management, as we know them from familiar disclaimers ("I am not a racist, but..."), or a more collective form in which the speaker emphasizes the positive characteristics of the own group, such as the own party, or the own country. In the context of debates on immigration, such positive self-presentation will often manifest itself as an emphasis of own tolerance, hospitality, lack of bias, EMPATHY, support of human rights, or compliance with the law or international agreements. Positive self-presentation is essentially ideological, because they are based on the positive self-schema that defines the ideology of a group. Some examples:

(54) I entirely support the policy of the Government to help genuine asylum seekers, but...(Gorman, C).

(55) I understand that many people want to come to Britain to work, but... (Gorman, C)

(56) A lot of brave people in this country have stood up for the rights and needs of asylum seekers (Corbyn, L).

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:

(57) 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).

(58) £140 million a year, which is a great deal of money to be found from the council tax budget (Gorman, C).

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

PRESUPPOSITION (MEANING). A specific type of semantic implication is presupposition, which by definition is true whether or not the current proposition is true or false. In this indirect way, propositions may be conveyed whose truth value is taken for granted and unchallenged. This will be generally the case for all forms of shared (common ground) knowledge and opinions, but in this kind of debates more often than not it is strategically used to convey controversial beliefs about immigrants. Thus, in the first example, the speaker presupposes that the recipient (Mr. Corbyn) is able to have British people share their citizenship with foreigners, whether the characteristic second example presupposes that the asylum rules are being abused of and that the position as illegal immigrants has no bearing on the Geneva convention:

(60) I wonder whether the hon. Gentleman will tell the House what mandate he has from the British people to share their citizenship with foreigners? (Gill, C).

(61) It is equally important that abuse of the asylum rules by the large number of people who make asylum applications knowing that their position as illegal immigrants has no bearing on the Geneva convention should be debated openly, so that it is fully understood and tackled. (Wardle, C).

PSEUDO-IGNORANCE (MEANING, ARGUMENTATION). As is the case for vagueness and hedging, speakers may feign not to have specific knowledge, but implicitly suggest nevertheless that they do know, thus making claims that need not be substantiated -- a well-known fallacy. Such forms of apparent knowledge typically appear in disclaimers, such as "I don't know, but..." which despite the professed ignorance claims the but-clause to be true -- which is also a form of impression management. In our debates, these forms of pseudo-ignorance are typically used to derogate asylum seekers without any evidence, in the following case expressed in the form of a rhetorical question following an ironical accusation:

(62) In addition to the breakfast that comes with the bed-and-breakfast accommodation, they have to be given a packed lunch, presumably in case they decide to go shopping in the middle of the day or to do a bit of work on the black economy--who knows? (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:

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

REPETITION (RHETORIC). As a general rhetorical device, repetition is of course hardly specific to debates on immigration. However, it may of course play a specific role in the overall strategy of emphasizing Our good things and Their bad ones. Thus, throughout this debate we find numerous literal or semantic repetitions of the accusation

that (most) refugees are bogus, not genuine, illegal or otherwise break norms, rules or the law. Or conversely, specifically for this debate, that poor English taxpayers should pay for this. This may be so within individual speeches, or across speeches when respective MPs support the opinions of previous speakers. In some cases repetitions take a more 'artistic' form, for instance when Ms. Gorman presents two parallel forms of exploitation, that of the system and of the people: "Such people should not be exploited by people who are exploiting the system."

SITUATION DESCRIPTION (MEANING). Of course, debates on refugees are not limited to the description of Them in relation to Us. Also the actions, experiences and whole situations need to be described. Indeed, 'definitions of the situation' are crucial to make a point, because the *way* they are described may suggest implications about causes, reasons, consequences and evaluations. In this and similar debates on immigration, we encounter many forms of situation descriptions, for instance short narrative vignettes, or generalizations of what refugees "have to go through". Here are two characteristic examples:

(64) Let us return to the issues facing people fleeing areas of oppression. Currently if they arrive here, seek asylum and are refused, they have lost all access to benefits. They then have to undergo an appeal process, which can take a very long time. During the appeal process, what on earth are they supposed to do unless they are declared destitute and consequently supported by a local authority? (Corbyn, L).

(65) Those people came to this country and applied for asylum. Their applications were refused, and they appealed. They are now living a life of virtual destitution, while the Home Office ponders on what to do for them. Those people stood up for their communities against an oppressive regime (Corbyn, L).

VAGUENESS (MEANING). Virtually in all contexts speakers may use 'vague' expressions, that is, expressions that do not have well-defined referents, or which refer to fuzzy sets. Vague quantifiers ('few', 'a lot'), adverbs ('very') nouns ('thing') and adjectives ('low', 'high'), among other expressions may be typical in such discourse. Given the normative constraints on biased speech, and the relevance of quantification in immigration debates, we may in particular expect various forms of Vagueness, as is the case for "Goodness knows how much", and "widespread" in the following examples:

(66) Goodness knows how much it costs for the legal aid that those people invoke to keep challenging the decision that they are not bona fide asylum seekers (Gorman, C).

(67) Is she aware that there is widespread resentment? (Nicholson, C).

VICTIMIZATION (MEANING). Together with DRAMATIZATION and POLARIZATION, discourse on immigration and ethnic relations is largely organized by the binary 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 order to emphasize that not the Others are

discriminated against, but WE are. When used in an argument, this would typically be a type of topos. 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. Here is a detailed example of this move:

(68) 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. 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.

Final comments on the examples

The categories analyzed above 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.

Through our brief analyses of the various categories and the examples we have obtained some insight in the ideologically base 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 recommended 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.

The definition of the categories and the examples also have shown how ideologies impinge on (in this case political) discourse. Generally speaking, the categories studied are not themselves ideological: We may find populism, metaphors or euphemism both on the left and on the right. Yet, some discourse structures seem more typical of right-wing and racist talk, for instance group polarization and negative other-description, whereas humanitarian discourse typically has recourse to forms of (real, and not apparent) empathy. More generally, however, it is mostly the "content" of the various structures described above that is ideologically controlled.

7. Conclusion

In this introductory book on discourse and ideology, we started with a multidisciplinary definition of ideology, according to which ideologies are the fundamental beliefs that form the basis of the social representations of a group. They are represented in social memory as some kind of 'group-schema' that defines the identity of a group. The fundamental propositions that fill this schema monitor the acquisition of group knowledge and attitudes, as hence indirectly the personal models group members form about social events. These mental models are the representations that control social practices, including the production and comprehension of discourse.

It is in this theoretically complex way that we are able to link ideologies as forms of social cognition, with social practices and discourse, at the micro-level of social situations and interactions, on the one hand, and with groups, group relations, institutions, organizations, movements, power and dominance, on the other hand.

Please note however, that this is merely a very general picture of the nature and the role of ideology in the mind, in discourse and society. Many dimensions of the theory of ideology remain unexplored or obscure. For instance, we only have vague ideas about the internal organization of ideologies, or how they monitor the development of other socially shared representations of a group. We do not even know how to represent the "content" of ideologies, even when we provisionally adopted the classical representation in terms of propositions. We assume that basic norms and values are involved in the formation of ideologies, but how exactly this happens, we don't know. One basic assumption is that ideologies are defined for social groups, and not for individuals or arbitrary collectivities of people, but what social conditions a group must satisfy in order to be able to develop an ideology, we don't know exactly. Indeed, the very fact that a collectivity of people has an ideology and other shared social representations may precisely define the identity that makes them a social group. In other words, as is often the case for complex theories, we may have generated more questions than answers, and new developments in psychology and sociology may change our theoretical framework considerably.

It is also within this, still speculative, multidisciplinary theory of ideology that we examined the ways discourses express, confirm, instantiate or constitute ideologies. We have seen that both in production and comprehension of discourse, ideologies usually operate indirectly, namely at first via attitudes and group knowledge for special social domains (such as politics, education or the labor market), and at the level of individual discourses of group members, via their ideologically biased mental models of social events and social situations. These personal representations of events finally interact with (possibly also ideologically biased) context models participants dynamically construct of a communicative situation, and both kind of models then give rise to the ongoing production of ideological text and talk.

Finally, we examined how such underlying, socially shared representations as well as personal models may influence the structures of discourse. Most clearly this happens at the level of content or meaning of discourse, that is, in *what* people say: The topics they select or avoid, the standard topoi of their argumentation, the local coherence of their text or talk, what information is left implicit or expressed explicitly, what meanings are foregrounded and backgrounded, which details are specified or left unspecified, and so on for a large number of other semantic properties of discourse.

The overall ideological, group-based principle we found operative here is that information that is favorable for or about the own group or unfavorable for the outgroup will tend to be topical, important and explicit. Information that portrays us in a negative light (or the Others in a too positive light) will tend to remain implicit, not topicalized, hidden, vague and little detailed.

The same general principle explains how also the other, formal, levels of discourse may be involved in expressing or rather in 'signaling' ideologies, namely through processes of emphasizing or de-emphasizing ideological meanings. Intonation and stress of words and sentences may thus make meanings more or less salient, as may do visual structures such as page lay-out, size and type of letters, color, photographs or film. Syntactic structures by definition are about the order and hierarchy of words, clauses and sentences and hence -- where they allow optional variation -- they are able to emphasize or de-emphasize meanings, such as the agency and responsibility for specific actions. Similar remarks hold for global schematic structures, such as the overall formats of conversations, stories, news reports or scholarly articles, whose conventional categories may be deployed in such a way (order or hierarchy) that they emphasize or de-emphasize the ideological meanings they organize.

And finally, at the level where discourse is defined as structures of local and global speech acts, as sequences of turn taking and interruptions, as false starts and repairs, as agreeing and disagreement, as storytelling and argumentation, in sum, as action and interaction, ideologies also operate at the level of 'meaning', that is, in *what* is being done. The abstract forms of talk, debate and interaction may be quite general, and independent of ideology, but what is being done and how may well depend on group membership and hence on ideology.

Note finally that the links between discourse and ideology run both ways. Not only do ideologies influence what we say and how we say it, but also vice versa: We acquire and change ideologies through reading and listening to large amounts of text and talk. Ideologies are not innate, but learnt, and precisely the content and form of such discourse may be more or less likely to form intended mental models of social events, which finally may be generalized and abstracted to social representations and ideologies. Indeed, in specific discourses (such as catechisms and propaganda) we may learn some fundamental ideological propositions more directly. The social function of ideologies is to control and coordinate the social practices of a group and between groups.

Discourse is the most crucial of these social practices, and the only one that is able to directly express and hence convey ideologies. A theory of ideology without a theory of discourse is therefore fundamentally incomplete. And conversely, to understand the role

of discourse in society, we also need to know their fundamental role in the reproduction of social representations in general, and of ideologies in particular.