

Contemporary phenomenon of racism and its manifestations in public discourse

Monika Frèjutė-Rakauskienė

*Institute for Social Research,
Saltoniškių 58, LT-08105 Vilnius,
Lithuania
E-mail: frejute@ktl.mii.lt*

The article deals with the concept of race and racism and forms of their manifestation in modern society, with the focus on manifestations of racism in public discourse. Different approaches to analyzing racism in public discourse are presented. Also, by giving examples from Lithuanian media, the universality of “neo”-racism definition and the influence of the mass media in creating and reproducing racial and ethnic stereotypes and prejudices are discussed.

Key words: race, racism, ethnicity, public discourse, mass media

INTRODUCTION

The article presents an analysis of the contemporary manifestations of racism and its forms in the context of the modern social processes such as migration, globalization and new technological capabilities. The most common division between “classic” and “neo”-racism is discussed. The universality of the concept of “neo”-racism in the context of the Eastern European countries is questioned as it is sometimes treated as related to a massive increase of non-European immigrants in the Western European countries. By challenging race as an ethnic concept (the attitude to race as a form of ethnicity), we attempt to find a theoretical definition of contemporary racism. The importance of making distinctions among personal, ideological, and societal racism when analyzing the different manifestations of racism is proposed, because it is supposed that “neo”-racism has assumed more covert and institutional forms of manifestation.

Although it is accepted that racism is not only a linguistic practice and that an analysis of racism could also encompass various institutional practices, social scientists believe that racism is socially constructed and strengthened by public discourse (political debates, mass media (news, articles, TV/radio programs), textbooks, etc.). Examples of current research of the Lithuanian mass media dealing with local manifestations of racial and ethnic stereotypes and prejudices will be provided to highlight the influential role of the mass media in creating of and manipulating ideologically preconditioned visions of the antipodes “us” vs. “them” and reproducing “threatening” social images of different ethnic and religious groups.

Social scientists’ attempts to analyze the contemporary forms of racism and their manifestations in the public discourse and different approaches to analyzing racism in public discourse are presented.

To study the items formulated above, methods of typology and comparative analysis are applied.

PHENOMENA OF RACE AND RACISM: “CLASSIC” AND “NEO”-RACISM

Social scientists agree that the concept of race is widely spread, fluid, constantly changing, and thus hard to define. Among social scientists, substantial debates about racism as a disappearing phenomenon and about revising the definition of racism to include the idea that racism is an ideology that takes a number of different forms are going on (Miles 1999: 349; Winant 2000: 181–184). They emphasize the difficulties in finding the most common definition of racism and thus most of the scientists deal with the different forms of the theoretical content of the concept of racism that were widened over the definition of race which contradistinguishes black and white (e.g. classic, new, differentialist, elite, overt, covert, individual, institutional, cultural, raceless, etc. racism concepts) instead of the different forms of contemporary racism manifestations that constitute not only such racist practices as Apartheid, colonialism, segregation, Holocaust and anti-Semitism. The “classic” racism (based on biologically determined features) and the “neo”-racism (based on cultural features) are the most common divisions in the definition of racism. Before starting to describe “neo”-racism, it is important to note that it deals with the contemporary practice of “European” racism (van Dijk 2005) which is sometimes related to a massive increase of non-European immigrants (Balibar 2004a). English cultural theorist Stuart Hall stresses that the “demise of the essential black subject” is now associated with a huge variety of syncretic ethnic identities that have emerged because of migration (Hall 1992b cited by Law 1996: 47). From another point of view, which is not contradictory in the

sense of the object of racism but in the sense of the causes of new racism in Europe, contemporary racism in Europe is not an invention (having in mind anti-Semitism and discrimination of the Roma), but the continuation of a long tradition (Barker 1978; Delacampagne 1983; Fredricson 2002 cited by van Dijk 2005).

Researchers of contemporary phenomena of racism call “neo”-racism “raceless”¹ or “differentialist”² racism (Balibar, Vallerstein 2004). The prototype of “raceless” racism is anti-Semitism as the basic theme of such racism is impossibility to meet the cultural more than the hereditary biological differences (Balibar 2004a: 34). It is important to notice that, according to Montagu, “it [racism] fails in its attempts to prove that the source of group differences lies in the biological field, it falls back upon justification in terms of divine purpose, cultural differences, disparity of educational standards or some other doctrine which would serve to mask its continued racist beliefs.” (Montagu 1972: 159 cited by Miles 1999: 349). It could be stated that the practice of racism continues even with a new ideological content (prevalent covert and institutional instead of overt and individual forms of racism, nowadays we are talking about the dominant groups but not the superior “races” in the societies)³. Thus it could be agreed that the concept of “race” is widely disappearing but racism as a process continues in new ideological forms (Miles 1999: 354).

According to Yinger, race is one of most important factors of collective identity. He defines race as one of the strains of ethnic groups in which members differ by biologically inherited features like skin color, lineament, or appearance, and he defines the ethnic group as part of society in which the members identify themselves (or agree with the forms of identification imposed by others) with the common culture of that group, the activities of which are often determined by culture and pedigree (Yinger 1976). If the contemporary form of “cultural”

racism is based on the exclusion and generalization of “others” according to cultural inheritance, how could it be that we are faced with racism (racialization of groups with different identities) but not with other forms of xenophobia or ethnocentrism? To avoid theoretical confusion, David Theo Goldberg suggested the concept of *ethnorace*, because “the (self-) ascriptions of specific groups thus engendered as races turn out in their contours to be quite like those which are supposed to be biologically determined.” (Goldberg 1999: 372). According to David Theo Goldberg “this is so is largely the result of interpreting cultural connectedness in terms of some form of what Sollors has named descent relations” (Sollors 1986 cited by Goldberg 1999: 372). He thus argues that at times race and ethnicity can be used synonymously, except that race could not be explained in terms of ethnicity. It is important to stress two facts about racism that could probably distinguish racism and other xenophobic manifestations. The first is one that is mentioned earlier – that racism is a historically formed tradition which developed a system of domination and social inequality (van Dijk 2005; Balibar 2004). Teun A. van Dijk understands domination as the “power abuse of one group over another and is enacted by two interrelated systems of everyday social and sociocognitive practices, that is, by various forms of discrimination, marginalization, exclusion or problematization, on the one hand, and by prejudiced and stereotypical beliefs, attitudes and ideologies, on the other hand” (van Dijk 2005).

Another important statement about race is that it serves us to naturalize and generalize the groups and rationalize the order of difference as a law of nature that may be of human and not necessarily of biological nature (Balibar 2004: 255). For example, the French scientist Balibar gives an example of xenophobia against immigrants in France (which he calls racism). French people find it hard to differentiate Algerian, Tunisian, Moroccan, and Turkish people (they are all Arabic people to them) and therefore use the generalized stereotypes about immigrants against all these ethnic categories. He argues that “immigrant” becomes a connective (more general) category containing both ethnic and class criteria that can include foreigners, but not necessarily all foreigners and not necessarily only foreigners (Balibar 2004: 255). It is important to stress that most social scientists deal with postcolonial societies (e.g., France, Germany, England, the Netherlands, etc.) with historically deep religious divisions (Christianity and Islam), and a large number of immigrants, but they do not speak about the societies (e.g., Eastern European countries as Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, etc.) that experienced recent, sudden social and ideological changes and face the aforementioned problems of “old” democracies such as immigration, rights to asylum, and problems with the assimilation or integration of immigrants. Thus, dealing with the manifestations of racism and for a deeper analysis of the various racial categories in different countries, I would like to emphasize the importance of historical context (Winnant 2000: 185). Below, we shall talk about the presumb-

¹ Social scientists give as an example the French society where the negative attitudes toward the non-European immigrants are based on the antipathy to their way of life and traditions (i.e. people differentiate the groups and individuals into hierarchical order not according for their racial inheritance but according to their capability to assimilate) (Balibar 2004a: 31).

² “Differentialist” racism is a concept (sometimes used as a political theory to explain the prevailing aggression towards non-European immigrants) synonymous with the notion of “cultural” racism which emphasizes cultural differences (lifestyles, customs, habits, manners) and creates a threatening image of the mixing and interbreeding of cultures and ethnic groups (Wodak, Reisigl 1999: 181; Balibar 2004a: 31–35).

³ Carmichael and Hamilton, in their book *Black Power* (1968), distinguished between overt and individual racism and covert and institutional racism. Covert and institutional, as distinct from overt and individual, relies on attitudes and practices to keep black people in disadvantageous situations. The main concept of institutional racism was prejudice with a dominant social psychological paradigm (Miles 1999: 351–352).

le manifestations of “neo”-racism in the context of Eastern Europe, dealing with the case of the Lithuanian media analysis to show the influential role of the mass media in reproducing and manipulating stereotypes about the ethnic and religious groups.

RACISM IN PUBLIC DISCOURSE: APPROACHES TO ANALYZING RACISM IN PUBLIC DISCOURSE

Although racism as a social phenomenon can manifest itself in various ways (in practice, discourse and imagination), social scientists emphasize the importance of discourse studies, because most consider that categories of race and ethnicity are constructed and modified in public discourse (political debates, mass media, and textbooks) (Barker 1999). Social, ethnic, and religious groups are racialized by the dominant discourse practices (van Dijk 2005; Hall 1996). According to Teun A. van Dijk, the analysis of racism in discourse is part of a multidisciplinary analysis of the system of social inequality that aims to examine the conditions, the consequences, and the precise functions of such texts and talks in the society (van Dijk 1999: 148). I would like to emphasize the actuality of the mass media in the social sphere of individuals, among the other forms of public discourse. Social processes such as globalization and technological innovation (since they allow for a greater accessibility and transparency of borders) become a powerful leverage for reproducing social images and creating ideologically preconditioned visions of antipodes “us” vs. “them” and influences public attitudes by manipulating stereotypes and stigmatizing influences (Anderson 1999). A critical discourse analysis approach interprets discourse as a form of social action, arguing that the events of discourse are conditioned by social structures and at the same time gives power to them, and formatting them thus allows for the highlighting of everyday social life problems expressed through communication and social interaction (Telešienė 2005: 2).

There exist two approaches that consider the influence of discourse in constructing social reality: social scientists see the discourse as a real action constituting reality, and sociocognitive direction representatives believe that reality is separate from discourse because it is individually and socially perceived (Wodak, Reisigl 1999: 195). Representatives of the sociopsychological approach (Loughborough Group of sociopsychologists Wetherell, M. and Potter, J.⁴ and Positionist theory⁵)

⁴ See more in Wodak, R.; Reisigl, M. 1999. “Discourse and racism: European perspectives”, *Annual Review Anthropology* 28: 175.

⁵ This theory comes from the alternative psychological branch called “discursive psychology”, which was applied in the linguistic analysis of feminist studies. The theory researches how individuals or groups position themselves or others in individual, political, and cultural contexts.

look at the problem from the constructivist point of view. Sociopsychologists understand attitudes and stereotypes as not “simply mediated via cognition, but the discourse which is actively constitutive of both social and psychological processes, and thus also racist prejudices” (Wodak, Reisigl 1999: 194). Representatives of the sociopsychological approach (Wetherell, M. and Potter, J.) state that racism is not only a linguistic practice but that institutional practices and discriminatory actions should also be intertwined with the study of discourse to emphasize the ways in which society gives the way to racism and how discourse creates, strengthens, and reproduces the social formation of racism (Wetherell, M., Potter, J. cited by Wodak, Reisigl 1999: 195). The representatives of Positionist theory talked about community memory and its most important forms – the distribution of rights and duties among the members of the group. In admitting that the social identity of an individual is quite variable, positioning theory tries to investigate how these duties and rights vary and influence the everyday life of the individual (Harre, Moghaddam 2003; Harre, Slocum 1999). Socio-cognitive direction representatives see the influence of discourse through attitudes, convictions, and prejudices. For example, U. Quasthoff, German scientist who attempts to study and categorize prejudiced discourse, found that prejudices derive from the states of mind that use stereotypical convictions or beliefs as negative attitudes against social groups. According to her investigations, stereotypes start functioning as socially unifying and cohesive means in the “in” periods of rapid social change to simplify communication within one’s own group, strengthen the sense of belonging, and these stereotypes delineate the outgroup (Quasthoff 1973, 1978, 1980, 1987, 1989 cited by Wodak, Reisigl 1999: 182). These findings could be partly interrelated with the rapid ideological change in the Eastern European countries after the fall of the Soviet Union and with mass media assistance spreading and reproducing racial stereotypes. For example, talking about the post-communist countries, Teun A. van Dijk supposed that the ideologies of socialism and communism that were imposed in Soviet times were replaced by the “old”, “popular” racist ideologies of the powerful “others” (E-mail Interview...).

Teun A. van Dijk made the assumption that the parts of the long-term memory directly relevant to the production and retention of ethnic prejudices (recognition, categorization, and storage of experience) can be divided into three memory structures: the semantic, the episodic, and the control system, where semantic memory is a social memory storing collectively shared beliefs. Our perception of individual experiences is thus influenced by these cognitive representations that are always adapted to preexisting models acquired during socialization (van Dijk 1984 cited by Wodak, Reisigl 1999: 184). The discourse-historical approach extends the socio-cognitive model, trying to incorporate the historical-political level. The historical-political context would also be

valuable in analyzing the Eastern European space after the abolition of the borders for non-European immigrants and other foreigners. It is especially useful in analyzing the transformations of the racist discourses evolving in the mass media, because the scientifically elaborated historical-political approach gives us a basis to assume that various racist discourses are syncretic in nature in their linguistic realizations, but also could be transformative in their contents and stereotypes, as discourses about nations and national identities rely on different types of discursive macro-strategies: constructive strategies (construct the national identities), preservatory or justificationary strategies (conserve and reproduce the national identities or narratives of identity), transformative strategies (take place at the social field of the domain where the discursive events related to the topic – one or another of the aspects connected with these strategies – are brought into prominence) (Wodak, Reisigl 1999: 188). Jager and the Duisburg⁶ group are German researchers dealing with issues of racism in discourse, and they represent the approach of discourse strands and collective symbols and focus on discourse semantics by uncovering the collective symbols that could immediately be understood by members of the same language community. They also applied this approach to media analysis (launching big campaigns against foreigners). They found that the group in power employs collective symbols to stigmatize, marginalize, and exclude minority groups (Wodak, Reisigl 1999: 192).

In presenting the different approaches to investigating manifestations of racism in public discourse, not only various methodologies for analyzing the public discourse but also the spectrum of the conditions of racism could be seen. Thus, there are two positions about discourse constituting reality and the individual's social perception of the reality. Therefore, the dilemma could not be solved adequately, because racism could be seen to be interlaced as constitutive of both social and psychological factors and by racist prejudices. But let us try to examine this with the illumination of examples from the media of Lithuania.

INFLUENCE OF PUBLIC DISCOURSE (MASS MEDIA) ON “NEO”-RACISM MANIFESTATIONS: THE CASE OF LITHUANIA

Bearing in mind the above considerations and arguments about the concept of “classic” and “neo”-racism, we can discuss the appearance of “neo”-racism in the Lithuanian society which historically has faced a relatively low immigration and in which distinction between Islam and Christianity is not apparent. Historians (Truska 2005) say that anti-Semitism was rooted in Lithuanian society (and in public discourse), especially in the period between

the two World Wars. Also, it is known that there were constant anti-Roma attitudes⁷, but what about the new identity categories such as “immigrants”? In Lithuania, the category of “immigrant”, according to media monitoring,⁸ was not yet become a connective for all foreigners. The “war immigrants” from Chechnya who are Muslims are excluded from the category as a special group and are considered more favorable than other non-European immigrants. Russian, Belorussian, and Ukrainian labor immigrants, who constitute the majority⁹ of all immigrants in Lithuania, are also not included in the category of “immigrants” as “culturally different others”. Most actual “others” in public discourse (mass media) traditionally are such ethnic minorities as Jews, Roma, Russians¹⁰, Poles, but not such religious minorities as Lithuanian Islamic Tatar community. Having in mind the aforementioned facts, the negative attitudes towards such ethnic minorities as Poles, Belorussians, Ukrainians or other ethnic groups which are Europeans

⁷ According to the data of public opinion polls, the negative attitudes towards the Roma have been intensifying since 1990 (59% in 1990, 62% in 1999, 77% in 2005 and 75% respondents in 2006 answered that they would not like to live in a neighborhood with Roma people). (See more in: Leončikas, T. 2005 „Tolerancija Lietuvos visuomenėje: tyrimų duomenys“, *Tautinių mažumų teisės*. Vilnius: Lietuvos žmogaus teisių centras, 7–22; Rybakova, K. 2005. “Etninio nepakantumo ir ksenofobijos apraiškos Lietuvoje: visuomenės nuomonė“, *Lietuva Europos Sąjungoje: pirmieji metai*. Vilnius: Socialinių tyrimų institutas: 82–89; Public opinion polls on tolerance in 2005 and 2006 are available at: <http://www.ces.lt/>).

⁸ The Centre of Ethnic Studies of Institute for Social Research media monitoring (2004–2006) was performed according to a media analysis model and the data were used to prepare reports on racism, xenophobia, and discrimination in the spheres of employment, education, legislation, racist violence, and crime. There was collected and systematized the information published in the Lithuanian media (items, opinion articles, etc.) about the ethnic, religious minority groups, migrants and asylum seekers in Lithuania. The collected data were analyzed applying the quantitative and qualitative media analysis methods.

⁹ According to data on international migration, compiled by the Lithuanian Department of Statistics, in 2004, a total of 5,553 persons immigrated; in terms of citizenship, Russians (441), Belorussians (203), and Ukrainians (246) constituted the major part of immigrants. (The data available at: Statistics Lithuania, Statistical Yearbook of Lithuania 2005, Table 4.24. International migration; Table 4.26. Immigration and emigration by citizenship, http://www.stat.gov.lt/uploads/metr_2005/en/start/index.html (07.09.2006)).

¹⁰ Political themes about the relationship of Lithuania and the Russian Federation prevail in the mass media. Teun A. van Dijk said that such negative attitudes towards Russians could be caused by sociopolitical reasons, not ethnic discrimination, since Russians represent the former occupiers of the country (E-mail Interview...).

⁶ See more in Wodak, R.; Reisigl, M. 1999. “Discourse and racism: European perspectives”, *Annual Review Anthropology* 28: 175.

should not be called manifestations of racism but ethnic hatred. Thus, the concept of “neo”-racism is not capable to cover all cases of xenophobia in different countries, and especially in the Eastern European countries, and dealing with the manifestations of racism and a deeper analysis of the various racial categories in different countries historical context becomes of great importance.

Although, some changes related with the mass media influence in Lithuanian public opinion are noticed. For example, with the increasing number of articles covering issues of different ethnic groups (mostly Jewish), social and religious groups (new immigrants, Muslims) in the Lithuanian media, negative attitudes towards ethnic groups were strengthened. This can also be seen in the public opinion polls – European values survey in 1990 and 1999, and surveys in 2005 and 2006 about the tolerance of Lithuanian people¹¹. The most definitive example here would be the cases of Muslims and Jews. The opinion about Muslims has changed the most radically. In 1990 and 1999, a third of the respondents did not desire them as neighbors (34–31% of respondents) and in 2005 and 2006 almost half of the respondents (51–58%) felt this way. The respondents who stated this opinion about the Muslims again increased from 49% in 2005 to 67% in 2006. It could be said that the reason for this is the increased attention of the media in associating Islam with threats by reporting such consequential incidents as the bombing in London in July 2005, the riots in the suburbs of France in the fall of 2005, the scandal of the cartoons about Mohammad at the beginning of 2006. The increased negative public opinion about the Jews (from 18% in 1990 and 21% in 1999 to 31% in 2005 and 25% in 2006) in Lithuania could also be directly related to the anti-Semitic campaign conducted in 2005 by the editor of *Respublika*, one of the leading daily newspapers in Lithuania, against the Jewish intention to recover the property formerly belonging to their religious community.

A particular case is the respectively small (about three thousand people) Roma community. Public opinion towards them (they are one of the most hated ethnic communities in Lithuania) is stable and this negative opinion cannot be explained only by the influence of the mass media. Noticeable attention to the Roma in the mass media increased after the Vilnius municipality demolished some buildings in the settlement of the Roma community in Vilnius in 2004. Information that appeared in the mass media at that time stated that the Roma were criminals and antisocial (the Roma people were connected with the illegal drug business and depicted as sluggards).

¹¹ See more in: Leončikas, T. 2005 „Tolerancija Lietuvos visuomenėje: tyrimų duomenys“, *Tautinių mažumų teisės*. Vilnius: Lietuvos žmogaus teisių centras; „Kovo 21-oji – tarptautinė rasinės diskriminacijos panaikinimo diena“. 2006. Vilnius: Socialinių tyrimų institutas, Etninių tyrimų centras, available at: www.ces.lt, (11.09.2006).

The increasing hatred towards immigrants and refugees, significant in the media texts, could be explained by the fear of terrorism, which is widely connected with the Islamic practices in the public discourse, especially after September 11th, because Lithuanian media described the immigrants and refugees as Muslims. The hatred could also have been increased by an escalation of the dominant group discourse in the media (politicians, officers of detention centres for foreigners, policemen’s speeches about the plans to keep the immigrants beyond the EU borders and discipline them by inculcating them with the attitude that they should not consider their rights to be more important than their responsibility, duty and respect to the state in which they arrived). Thus, spread of such culturally predetermined statements about “clash of civilizations” and the manifestations of Islamophobia in Lithuanian media (especially when the functioning statements could not be based on the real experiences and social interactions in the society) show the influential role of public discourse (mass media) in forming and strengthening the opinion of society. Manipulation theory (van Dijk 2006: 361) could explain the mechanism of the realization of public discourse when manipulative discourse occurs in public communication controlled by dominant political, bureaucratic, media, academic or corporate elites. Comparing contemporary communicative manipulation and persuasion, manipulation is a more influential form because of the role of interlocutors (interlocutor in persuasion depends on decisive arguments while in manipulation s/he has a passive role) (van Dijk 1993: 361).

Thus, evidences of the functioning of not only the forms of “neo”-racism but also the contemporary variant of the “classic” form of indigenous European racism are obvious (in a sense that roots of Roma discrimination and also Anti-Semitism in Europe (including Lithuania) have a long history). At the same time, manifestations of the forms of “neo”-racism in Lithuania, directed toward non-European immigrants or people in general could be observed (e.g., in a public opinion and analysis of mass media). The fair tale of “threatening” Arabs, combined with Islamophobia, is being spread and multiplied by the mass media, appealing to the social experiences of “old” democracies in the immigration and presenting examples of the Western media concerning the problems of immigration and immigrants’ integration / assimilation.

The last important problem that should be mentioned here is the questioning of indirect racial discrimination (which Miles sees as intentions, but not racist actions). It should be stressed that such “intentions” are not constant and there is a “process of determinacy” (Law 1996: 48–49) between racist discourse and its embodiment in practice, thus, the practice may have resulted from the institutionalization of racist discourse.

Manifestations of ethnic or racial stereotypes in the public discourse without the real social experiences could tell us about the functioning of the above described

racist “intentions” in society; without systematic politics from the government against such racist manifestations in public discourse, from the theoretical level they could transform into real racist actions.

Received 25 October 2006

Accepted 20 November 2006

References

- Anderson, B. 1999. *Įsivaizduojamos bendruomenės. Apmąstymai apie nacionalizmo kilmę ir plitimą*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Barker, C. 1989. *Television, Globalization and Cultural Identities*. Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- E-mail Interview by Merit Karise for *SIRP* (Estonia) on the occasion of the Estonian translation of Van Dijk's book ideology (Estonia). November 2005. Available at: <http://www.discourses.org/Teun.html> (29.08.2006).
- Goldberg, T. D. 1999. “The Semantic of Race”, in *Racism*. Blumer, M.; Solomos, J. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press: 362–377.
- Hall, S. 1996. “New ethnicities”, in *Stuart Hall. Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. Morley, D., Chen, D.-K. (eds.). London: Routledge.
- Harre, R.; Moghaddam, F. M. 2003. *The Self and Others: Positioning Individuals and Groups in Personal, Political and Cultural Context*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Harre, R.; Slocum, N. 2003. “Disputes as Complex Social Events. On the uses of Positioning Theory”. *Common Knowledge* 9.1: 101–118.
- „Kovo 21-oji – tarptautinė rasinės diskriminacijos panaikinimo diena“. 2006. Vilnius: Socialinių tyrimų institutas, Etninių tyrimų centras. Available at: www.ces.lt (11.09.2006).
- Law, I. 1996. *Racism, Ethnicity and Social Policy*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Leončikas, T. 2005. „Tolerancija Lietuvos visuomenėje: tyrimų duomenys“, in *Tautinių mažumų teisės*. Vilnius: Lietuvos žmogaus teisių centras: 7–22.
- Miles, R. 1999. “Racism as a concept”, in *Racism*. Blumer, M., Solomos, J. (eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press: 344–355.
- Rybakova, K. 2005. „Etninio nepakantumo ir ksenofobijos apraiškos Lietuvoje: visuomenės nuomonė“, in *Lietuva Europos Sąjungoje: pirmieji metai*. Vilnius: Socialinių tyrimų institutas: 82–89.
- Statistics Lithuania, Statistical Yearbook of Lithuania 2005. Available at: http://www.stat.gov.lt/uploads/metr_2005/en/start/index.html (05.09.2006).
- Telešienė, A. 2005. „Kritiškosios diskurso analizės metodologinių principų taikymas sociologiniuose tyrimuose“, *Filosofija. Sociologija* 5: 1–6.
- Truska, L. 2005. *Lietuviai ir žydai. Nuo XIX a. pabaigos iki 1941 m. birželio*. Vilnius: VDU leidykla.
- van Dijk, T. Second draft, March 29, 2005. “Elite discourse and institutional racism”, Universidad Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona. Available at: <http://www.discourses.org/Teun.html> (12.08.2006).
- van Dijk, T. A. 1999. “Discourse and racism. Editorial”, *Discourse & Society* 10(2): 147–148.
- van Dijk, T. A. 2006. “Discourse and manipulation”, *Discourse & Society* 17(3): 359–383.
- Winant, H. 2000. “The Theoretical status of the concept of race”, in *Theories of Race and Racism. A Reader*. Back, L.; Solomos, J. (eds.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Wodak, R.; Reisigl, M. 1999. “Discourse and racism: European perspectives”, *Annual Review Anthropology* 28: 175.
- Yinger, J. M. 1976. “Ethnicity in complex society: Structural, cultural, and characterological factors” in *The Uses of Controversy in Sociology*. Coser, L. A.; Larsen, O. N. (eds.). New York: Free Press.
- Балибар, Э.; Валлерстайн, И. 2004. *Раса, нация, класс*. Москва: Логос.
- Балибар, Э. 2004. “Расизм и кризис”, в кн. Балибар, Э.; Валлерстайн, И. *Раса, нация, класс*. Москва: Логос: 251–263.
- Балибар, Э. 2004а. “Существует ли “неорасизм”?”, в кн. Балибар, Э.; Валлерстайн, И. *Раса, нация, класс*. Москва: Логос: 27–39.

Monika Frėjutė-Rakauskienė

ŠIUOLAIKINIO RASIZMO FENOMENAS IR JO APRAIŠKOS VIEŠAJAME DISKURSE

Santrauka

Analizuojama šiuolaikinio rasizmo fenomenas ir jo apraiškos viešajame diskurse. Pristatoma plačiausiai socialinių mokslininkų vartojama skirtis tarp „klasikinio“ ir „neorasizmo“ sąvokų. Rasė suprantama kaip nykstantis arba išnykęs fenomenas, tačiau rasizmas įvardijamas, kaip besitęsiantis reiškinys, keičiantis formas ir nepakantumo objektus. Pabrėžiama, kad rasizmas nuo kitų ksenofobinių praktikų gali skirtis istoriškai susiformavusia tradicija, išplėtojusia dominavimo ir socialinės nelygybės sistemą, viena vertus, pasireiškiančia per kasdienės marginalizacijos, diskriminacijos, išskyrimo praktikas, o kita vertus – kuriant bei vartojant nuostatas ir prietarus, antra – jis padeda apibendrinti ir tokiu būdu įvairioms identiteto grupėms taikyti rasistines praktikas.

Nors ir pripažįstama, kad rasizmas, kaip socialinis fenomenas, gali pasireikšti skirtingais būdais – institucionalizuotose praktikose, diskurse ir individo vaizduotėje, tačiau akcentuojama rasizmo viešajame diskurse svarba, kadangi rasės ir etnikumo kategorijos gali būti konstruojamos ir keičiamos viešajame diskurse, per vyraujančias diskurso praktikas etninėms, religinėms ir kitoms identiteto grupėms taikant rasistinius apibendrinimus ir stereotipus.

Pateikiami du metodologiniai požūriai analizuojant viešąjį diskursą – diskursą suvokiant kaip socialinę tikrovę ir sociokognityvinį požūrį, kai diskursas, kaip ir socialinė tikrovė, yra suprantamas individualiai.

Vietoj išvadų pateikiamas svarstymas apie viešojo diskurso, ypač žiniasklaidos įtaką rasistinėms apraiškoms. Pateikiant pa-

vyzdžius iš Lietuvos viešosios nuomonės apklausų ir Lietuvos žiniasklaidos kvestionuojamas „neorasizmo“ sąvokos universalumas ir pritaikomumas Rytų Europos kontekste. Prieinama prie išvados, kad „neorasizmo“ sąvoka negali būti vartojama universaliai, o analizuojant etninio ir rasinio nepakantumo atvejus būtina atsižvelgti į šalies istorinį kontekstą. Vis dėlto matomiems pokyčiams viešojoje nuomonėje įtakos turėjo žiniasklaida. Be „klasikinio“ rasizmo apraiškų, įgavusių šiuolaikinio, uždaresnio, institucionalizuoto rasizmo formą (turima omenyje antisemitizmą ir romų diskriminaciją), pastebimą Lietuvos žiniasklaidoje,

įžvelgiamos ir „neorasizmo“ apraiškos – nepakantumas imigrantams bei islamofobija. „Neorasizmo“ apraiškos Lietuvos žiniasklaidoje gali būti siejamos su viešojo diskurso įtaka, kadangi nėra suformuluotos dėl kasdienės socialinės praktikos bei komunikacijos. Šios apraiškos žiniasklaidoje įvardijamos kaip rasistiniai „ketinimai“, kurie nesiimant prevencinių priemonių gali virsti rasistiniais veiksmais.

Raktažodžiai: rasė, rasizmas, etniškumas, viešasis diskursas, žiniasklaida