

# 'Maybe it is prejudice ... but it is NOT racism': Negotiating racism in discussion forums about Gypsies

Goodman, S. and Rowe, L.

**Author post-print (accepted) deposited in CURVE March 2014**

**Original citation & hyperlink:**

Goodman, S. and Rowe, L. (2014) 'Maybe it is prejudice ... but it is NOT racism': Negotiating racism in discussion forums about Gypsies. *Discourse and Society*, volume 25 (1): 32-46.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0957926513508856>

**Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.**

**This document is the author's post-print version of the journal article, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.**

**CURVE is the Institutional Repository for Coventry University**  
<http://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open>

# **“Maybe it is prejudice... But it is NOT racism”: Negotiating racism in discussion forums about Gypsies**

## **Abstract**

This paper addresses the ways in which opposition towards Gypsies is debated with regard to whether or not such opposition constitutes racism or prejudice. First it is demonstrated that Gypsies are a vulnerable group who are subject to large amounts of prejudice and discrimination. A discursive analysis of a corpus of internet discussion forums about Gypsies in the UK is analysed. The analysis demonstrates that opposition towards Gypsies can be presented as racist; however such accusations are met with criticism so that writers become accountable for making them. Finally, it is shown that while writers go to rhetorical lengths to dissociate themselves from being presented as racist, there is nevertheless an acceptance that opposition to Gypsies may constitute prejudice. This prejudice is presented as an inevitable result of Gypsies' behaviour and appears to be deemed an acceptable prejudice, to the detriment of this group. The implications of this finding for the discursive literature on taboos against, and denials of, racism are discussed.

**Keywords:** Gypsies; Romani; Prejudice; Racism; Discursive Psychology; Discourse Analysis

## **Introduction**

### ***The harsh treatment of Gypsies***

The term Gypsy refers to Travellers and Romany people, a group that is recognised as an ethnic group in the UK under the Race Relations Act 1976 (amended 2000). There is a wealth of literature that shows that Gypsies are a vulnerable group that suffers discrimination throughout Europe (e.g. Marcu 2005) and in the UK, where research suggests that hostility towards them is relatively acceptable compared to hostility towards other ethnic groups (Tileaga 2006), something that would generally be considered unacceptable (Edwards 2003). In the UK this discrimination manifests itself in terms of Gypsies being one of the most deprived groups (Ellis & McWhirter 2008) where they have the lowest life expectancy and highest child mortality of any ethnic group in the country (Van Cleemput 2010).

In education Gypsy children under achieve (Ellis & McWhirter 2008) and although they commit no more crimes than other groups (O’Nions 1995) if prosecuted they are more likely than other groups members to be denied bail, imprisoned and to die in custody (Meek 2007). It is difficult for Gypsies to gain permission to settle on land to live, meaning that many live on unauthorised sites (Ellis & McWhirter 2008) which has shown to be damaging to their mental health and social integration (Cemlyn & Clark 2005). When unauthorised sites are cleared, as was the case with the ‘Dale Farm’ camp<sup>1</sup>, it has been shown that extreme force is used to remove the residents (Kabachnik 2010)

While this research shows that Gypsies are a marginalised and vulnerable group, they are nevertheless presented negatively in media and political spheres. Scheeweis (2010) shows how Gypsies are presented as thieves and beggars and Bowers (2010) highlighted how headlines about Gypsies, that would be deemed unacceptable about other ethnic minorities, are present in UK, with a particularly prejudicial examples being ‘winning the war against Travellers’ (2010: 6). Turner (2002) showed that the same negative presentation of Gypsies is also present in British parliamentary debates, where again Gypsies are presented as dirty and as criminals. Gypsies, therefore, have been shown to be a vulnerable group that is presented negatively in the media and by politicians.

### ***Discursive Psychology and Race and Prejudice Talk***

Throughout its history, discursive psychology has focussed on the ways in which prejudice and racism is managed in talk, with Billig (1988: 95) describing the ‘norm against prejudice’ in which it was demonstrated that speakers will do rhetorical work to avoid being labelled as being prejudicial; being labelled as such can bring about connotations of being irrational (Edwards 2003). It is for this reason that disclaimers (Hewitt & Stokes 1975) are used to dissociate speakers from appearing to violate this cultural norm.

In their review of (critical) discursive literature on talk about prejudice, Augoustinos and Every (2007) identify five major strategies that are used by speakers to avoid being seen to violate these norms, which are the ‘denial of prejudice’ (2007: 125); ‘grounding one’s views as reflecting the external world’ (2007: 127); ‘positive self and negative other

presentation' (2007: 129); discursive deracialisation (2007: 133), and; 'liberal arguments for "illiberal" ends' (2007: 134). The denial of prejudice is exemplified by the use of disclaimers, where speakers deny that what follows is racist. The grounding of views as reflecting the external world is a strategy used to present any views that could potentially be viewed as prejudicial as grounded in reason and therefore as rationale. Positive self and negative other presentation refers to the ways in which an 'us and them' distinction is made where the in-group is presented as good, in contrast to the out-group. Discursive deracialisation is the way in which references to 'race' can be removed from talk that may appear to be about race. Finally, liberal arguments for liberal ends refers to the strategy in which supposedly liberal ideals, such as treating everyone the same, are used to argue for illiberal actions; an example of this is the use of the notions of fairness and equality to argue against affirmative action schemes that are designed to overcome existing inequalities in New Zealand (Wetherall and Potter 1992).

In addition to these features of race and prejudice talk, it has also been demonstrated that there is increasingly a norm against making accusations of prejudice (Goodman 2010; van Dijk 1992) as the norm against prejudice is presented as victimising majority groups because it curtails their freedom of speech and as shuts down legitimate debates (Goodman & Burke 2010); indeed, those who do make accusations of racism are open to criticism for what Lewis (2004) describes as 'playing the race card' and for being unfair. It has also been shown (Burke & Goodman, 2012) that public online discussions (in this case, those on the popular website 'facebook' can contain examples of talk that displays no regard or orientation to the norm against prejudice and instead can be seen as examples of 'old', unguarded prejudice where very few of the strategies outlines by Augoustinos and Every (2007) are used.

Tilega (2005; 2006) showed how talk about Gypsies can be extremely prejudicial, with Gypsies being blamed for the occurrence of this prejudice towards them, which was accounted for by presenting them as not just different from 'us' but also as a morally inferior group that does not belong in the host nation (in this case Romania). Leudar and Nekvapil (2000) addressed the representation of Gypsies in televised debates held in the Czech Republic. As in Tilega's work, they found Gypsies to be presented as different from the majority group because they are not normal. Again, they were presented as a problem and as

likely to be criminals. More recently *anonymous author(s)* (under submission) addressed discussion forum posts in the UK and found, in line with previous discursive findings in other countries, that Gypsies were presented as different, immoral and likely to be criminal and were described in dehumanising ways that legitimised their harsh treatment and further exclusion from society. What these findings show is that of the strategies identified in Augoustinos and Every's (2007) review, the most common on these used in talk about Gypsies contains examples of positive self and negative other presentation where Gypsies (the other) are presented in extremely negative and dehumanising (Billig 2002) ways. The purpose of this paper is therefore to build upon the discursive literature on both the presentation of Gypsies and specifically the ways in which talk about prejudice and race are managed.

## **Procedure**

The data in this report comes from a larger project, which is the first discursive research addressing the ways in which Gypsies are presented in the United Kingdom (see *anonymous author(s)* under submission). Initial analysis of the data identified dehumanising talk about Gypsies, however it was also noted that there was some interesting talk about what is meant by prejudice and racism in the data, which is analysed in detail here. The data itself consisted of three internet discussion forums. The first of these followed an article on the Independent newspaper's website, entitled 'No Blacks, no dogs, no Gypsies'<sup>ii</sup> which highlights the prejudicial treatment of Gypsies in the UK. The second forum followed an article on the website 'foreigners in the UK' entitled 'Gypsy child thieves: controversy over BBC documentary'<sup>iii</sup>, which responded to a documentary on the BBC called 'Gypsy child thieves'<sup>iv</sup>, and argued that the documentary unfairly, and prejudicially, represented Gypsies. The third forum followed an article on the Sun newspaper's website entitled 'Paradise lost to JCB gypsies'<sup>v</sup> which described the local response to Gypsies laying the foundations for a permanent caravan site; this article appears to be anti-Gypsy in a similar vein to those articles identified by Bowers (2010). The data represents 'naturalistic data' (Potter 1997) which means that it occurred in the public sphere free from any researcher intervention. Data was collected in the summer of 2010 and the comments themselves were left between May 2009 and June 2010.

The posts are presented here as they appeared in the original posts so any spelling or grammatical errors remain. The only alteration is that line numbers have been added to aid the analysis. Links are given to the original forum sites (although the Independent forum is no longer available to view). As this is a (critical) discursive analysis (e.g. Augoustinos & Every 2007) attention is paid to what is accomplished by the comments in the discussion forums, rather than using them as ways of trying to assess what the contributors may or may not think, following the discursive psychological ideal of addressing 'action, not cognition' (Edwards & Potter 1992: 154). In this analysis specific attention is given to the ways in which 'race', 'racism' and 'prejudice' are talked about as this report focuses on the ways that notions of race and prejudice are managed in the, unusually overtly prejudicial (anonymous author(s) under submission), area of talk about Gypsies. The extracts featured in this analysis are all of those that contain explicit references to 'race', 'racism', or 'prejudice'.

## **Analysis**

Three distinct ways of talking about racism and prejudice were identified. These are (1) making direct accusations of racism, (2) responding to accusations of racism and (3) attempts to reposition racism. Each of these will be addressed in turn.

### *1. Direct accusations of racism*

This first section of the analysis addresses the ways in which direct accusations of racism were made in the discussion forums. The first of these extracts contains a suggestion that the article that the forum is about was designed to increase racism towards Gypsies.

*Extract One: Foreigners in the UK, #43 Liloro 2011-04-01 15:46*

1. I'm not exactly sure what the purpose of this article? To stop crime? or to create
2. racism? In my opinion this article only serves to create hatred and racism, which will
3. create further isolation and joblessness... isn't that the reason for crime in the first
4. place? Racism, joblessness and isolation? Jobs are not available for Gypsies and it
5. will not be available in the future either because articles like this one.. so what's left?
6. Instead of concentrating on creating hatred, why not help these people? Anyway these
7. type of stories are made up by Liviu Tipurita, a Jewish man who is well known for his
8. hatred against Gypsies as he is from Romania and he will do anything to cut a movie

9. together to make the Gypsies look bad.. Liviu Tipurita should be in jail.. why isn't he?
10. or is he making his leaving from racism? You should list all the crimes that is done by
11. different nationalities and races, including Jewish people.. let's see if it will be
12. available for debate or just be removed.. There are many Jewish criminals and it will
13. not be written "Jewish Crime" because it would only create hatred.. right?

This post contains accusations that the 'Independent' newspaper article the forum is about is racist and that it will serve to increase racial hatred. The extract begins with rhetorical questions that are designed to present the purpose of the article as to increase racial hatred. The first rhetorical question challenges the purpose of the article (1) and then two alternative answers are given for this, the first is that it is to reduce crime, which would have positive connotations. However, the second possible answer, which is favoured both by presenting it last (Atkinson 1984) and by elaborating on the ways in which this is deemed to be true, is that it is designed to create racism. The elaboration that follows takes the form of being in the writer's 'opinion'. The writer then goes on to account for why Gypsies may commit more crime (which means that the association with Gypsies and crime is accepted here, although here crime is blamed on deprivation, isolation, and importantly, racism (2). Rather than aligning with the position that it is acceptable to brand Gypsies as criminals, it is racism that is used to account for this behaviour. The remainder of the post is concerned with a person who the stories being discussed in the article are attributed to, a figure who is presented as racist through the claim that he hates (8) Gypsies and so is motivated to present them in a negative light. Finally, the writer finishes the post with a comment which uses the strategy of swapping the talk about Gypsies for another minority group (in this case Jews, who can be identified as receiving the most extreme outcome of racial prejudice) and attempting to demonstrate how this would be deemed unacceptable for any other group (as Bowers 2010 did), a strategy that serves to highlight that the representations of Gypsies is unfair. In the following extract, taken from the same discussion forum the writer 'UK Gypsy' explicitly labels other posts to the forum as racist.

*Extract Two: Foreigners in the UK, [#8 uk gypsy](#) 2010-03-02 16:28*

1. Well just read the comment's below and find them highly racist im a uk born roma run a
2. company pay my tax's and dont steal from nobody, i no hundreds of gypsy's in the uk

3. who are the same. There are romany people all over the world and in some country's are
4. oppressed into a life they cannot climb out of there for having and im meen having to do
5. anything to servive after all that's human nature...The comment's that have just been left
6. if any other race read them aimed at them they would be getting prosecuted for racism
7. :shock:

The extract begins with a direct reference to previous comments, and so can be viewed as a direct interaction with them, and clearly labels them as 'racist' (1). This accusation is upgraded by being preceded with the term 'highly' which serves to show that there is no room for discussion about whether or not this is the case. The writer then draws on her/his own identity as being a British Roma. The writer, however, presents a non-stereotypical account of what it is to be a Roma by referring to her/his status as someone who runs a company and contributes a fair share to the country (signalled through the use of paying taxes). The direct rejection of being a thief (2) serves to suggest that this association has become common knowledge to the extent that Romanies have an interactional requirement to deny such as identity.

The writer then goes on to explain the difficulties that Romany people have to deal with (which supports the literature addressed before this analysis, e.g. Ellis & McWhirter 2008). Next, the writer uses the same strategy as identified in the previous post; suggesting that prejudicial talk about Gypsies is more acceptable than prejudice towards other groups; indeed suggesting that had these comments been aimed at any other groups then they would be in breach of anti-racism laws. As with the previous extract, this helps to position Gypsies as the victims of more extreme prejudice than other groups. The post is completed with the single word 'shock' (7) surrounded by colons for emphasis. This final statement serves to highlight the unacceptable nature of the comments made within the forum. The next extract, the last one in this section, is taken from the forum on the Sun's website and also contains a direct accusation of racism.

*Extract Three, The Sun, bessie83*

1. What a racist bunch of idiots. Gypsies are recognised as a distinct ethnic minority! GOD



2. FORBID they build on land they own! Is this not what people do with land they own.
3. God forbid they would want basic sanitation for their children and washing facilities. Of
4. course they pay road tax and insurance on cars, im sure gypsies have to abide by laws
5. like anyone else. The ignorant attitudes on this forum are appalling and enrage me!!

This post begins with an explicit and insulting (Burke & Goodman 2012) accusation directed towards all those who have posted before on this discussion forum. Here the racism is presented as self evident and as unacceptable, to the extent that it is worthy of insulting people who have made such comments because it so strongly violates the norm against prejudice (Billig 1988). After the initial comment, the writer goes on to account for why these comments are deemed to be so offensive by presenting Gypsies as an ethnic minority. It therefore follows that members of ethnic minorities are constructed as people who should be protected from racism, a point that is emphasised through the use of the exclamation mark (1). The writer then goes on to suggest that Gypsies should be free to build on their own land, a point that is made with the sarcastic use of the phrase ‘god forbid’ which is emphasised through the use of capital (which tends to denote shouting in an online setting). A rhetorical question is used to suggest that Gypsies building on their own land is completely reasonable. The phrase god forbid (3) is then repeated (this time without capitals) which again sarcastically presents the Gypsy’s intentions as completely reasonable. The appeal to the interests of Gypsy children presents a moral argument for right of Gypsies, similar to that identified in the support of asylum seekers though the use of appeals to supporting families (Goodman 2007). As with the previous extract, Gypsies are presented as being law abiding citizens (4) who make a positive contribution to their country through the paying of their taxes. The post ends by accusing those who are deemed to be making the ‘racist’ comments as being ignorant, which is a common feature of more direct accusations of racism in an online setting (Burke & Goodman 2012). These posts are presented in a very negative light (‘appalling’ 5) and are deemed worthy of a negative emotional response.

This section of analysis has therefore shown that in these forums there are examples of direct accusations of racism directed towards those opposing Gypsies. The next section, however, demonstrates the ways in which other participants in the forums respond to such accusations.

## **Responding to accusations of racism**

This next section begins with a direct response to the previous extract, in which making accusations of racism is strongly criticised.

*Extract Four: The Sun, Thicko*

1. Bessie83 - You are clearly the ignorant one here. Branding people racist is so pathetic
2. and old.

This extract begins by directly addressing ‘bessie83’, the poster responsible for the previous extract. The writer here takes issue with the reference to ignorance (extract three, line five) and turns it round so that ‘bessie83’ is presented as ignorant instead. The reason for this counter claim comes next, in the charge that making accusations of racism is problematic (here ‘pathetic’ and ‘old’). This post therefore clearly demonstrates an example of the orientation to accusations of racism as problematic (e.g. Goodman 2010). It is noteworthy that the writer here doesn’t engage with any of bessie83’s other arguments that are based around a more positive and sympathetic portrayal of Gypsies; it is only the explicit accusation that is singled out for criticism. This adds further weight to the existence of a taboo on making accusations of racism, something that the previous speaker’s lack of awareness of this new (as opposed to the ‘old’ use of making accusations referred to here) is presented as grounds for making an accusation of ignorance. The next extract, from the Independent, contains a more detailed criticism of accusations of racism.

*Extract Five: The Independent. kuma2000 - 26 February 2010 01.40pm*

### **Racism**

1. I always find this politically correct bollocks to be annoying. The “Travellers” who have
2. made my life hell in the past have been white like me and I have no idea where their
3. origin is. People hate them because they are a bunch of thieves who have a disregard to
4. other people and the law. Their visits around my previous homes and workplaces have

5. left children's playing fields and areas of natural beauty strewn with debris and waste
6. and local homes hit by a mini crimewave. Their colour or where they are from is
7. completely beside the point, there is no racism here.

This post begins with the writer 'kuma2000', criticising the Independent article that the discussion forum is about. The article, entitled 'No Blacks, no dogs, no Gypsies' begins with the line "Gypsies and Travellers in the UK are uniting to form a nationwide coalition to fight what they describe as rapidly escalating levels of racism and discrimination<sup>vi</sup>" which can be seen as a general accusation of racism, and it is 'racism' that has become the title of this part ('thread') of the discussion forum. The writer refers to the article as being 'politically correct bollocks' (1) which demonstrates that the notion of political correctness is tied up with accusations of racism, so that the two can be criticised together (Scott 1992). The use of 'bollocks<sup>vii</sup>' to insinuate nonsense dramatises the remark, making it seem more striking and vivid. After making this initial claim, the writer goes on to give a personal account of the difficulties s/he has purportedly suffered because of Travellers. It is noteworthy that the category 'Travellers' (1) is placed in quotation marks in a way that questions this description (Van Dijk 1993) and potentially serves to present these people as illegitimate. Once again Travellers are presented as problematic through an association with crime (3, 4 and 6).

While the purpose of this post is to deny racism, the writer does suggest that there is hatred towards Travellers. The point about hatred is made by speaking on behalf of other, unspecified people (3); which is an interesting footing (Goffman 1981) as it means that the writer doesn't have to align with feeling hatred her/himself. The final sentence of the post begins with a claim that the colour (6) of Travellers is irrelevant; this is therefore a clear case of 'discursive deracialisation' (Augoustinos & Every 2007) as there is a direct attempt to suggest that the strong opposition displayed in this post has nothing to do with race. This point is supported with the claim that, like colour, the group's place of origin is also not the motivation for the opposition towards them. The post is then completed with an explicit denial that this opposition is not about racism and the use of 'here' may refer to the wider discussion forum, in which case this is also an example of denying racism on behalf of others (Condor et al 2006) and shows a clear orientation to the norm against prejudice (Billig 1988).

This section has shown that participants go to rhetorical lengths to both deny racism and to suggest that making accusations of racism is problematic and unacceptable, while there is no attempt to deny that there is prejudice directed towards Gypsies.

### *3. Repositioning racism as prejudice*

In this final section of analysis it can be seen how attempts are made to reposition racism as something different. These final two extracts follow directly on from the previous extract with the first responding to it and the second being a reply from the writer of the previous extract. In the first extract the writer takes issues with ‘kuma2000’'s attempt to remove the label of racism from talk about Gypsies as well as other posts on the forum.

*Extract Six: The Independent. Rabbitlug - 26 February 2010 06.03pm*

Re: Racism

1. Not racism. Just simple extreme prejudice.
2. I look at the above comments and substitute “Gypsy” for “unemployed person” or
3. “druggie”, or (more typically) “bankers” pick a sector and despise it, makes you feel
4. superior.

In this extract the writer ‘Rabbitlug’ responds to the previous attempt to deny racism. This begins with an agreement that opposition to Gypsies isn’t racist (1). Directly after this very brief agreement the writer states that it is ‘extreme prejudice’ (1). The preceding terms ‘just simple’ (see Goodman & Burke 2010) suggests that what is to follow – in this case prejudice – is basic and problematic, something that supports the suggestion that any prejudice is irrational (Edwards 2003). While there is a concession that the opposition to Gypsies isn’t racist, which allows the writer to appear reasonable, the suggestion that this opposition is extremely prejudicial is nevertheless a serious criticism that aligns with the norm against prejudice. What this means is that while the writer is willing to acknowledge that opposition to Gypsies does not signify racism, it is still presented as unreasonable and unwarranted. Following from this complaint, the writer then uses the same strategy as that seen earlier in this analysis – that of changing the term ‘Gypsy’ for another minority group to highlight how unacceptable similar comments about other groups would be, although in this

case examples of other socially criticised groups (2 and 3) rather than ethnic minorities are used. The post is completed with the writer's attempt at accounting for this prejudice, which is that finding a scapegoat may make people feel better.

What this strategy shows is that there may be an acceptance that opposition to Gypsies isn't racist, but that this opposition is still presented as wrong, which shows that there is an orientation to the norm against prejudice despite criticisms of accusations of racism. The next, extract contains the response to this extract, in which racism is once again denied, while prejudice towards Gypsies is not denied; instead it is accepted.

*Extract Seven: The Independent. kuma2000 - 26 February 2010 07.03pm*

Re: Racism

1. Maybe it is prejudice. But its prejudice derived from experience not hearsay. But it is
2. NOT racism. That is throwing in a buzzword that is designed to provoke a reaction of
3. denial, you could do the same thing by saying "all people who hate Travellers are
4. paedophiles" and get a similar immediate reaction. My multiple experiences of different
5. Traveller groups found them to be people who have a complete disregard for the people
6. around them. They expect us to provide free campsites for them and to pay to clean
7. up the filth and mess they leave around our houses and workplaces when they decide
8. to leave and to turn a blind eye to the things that go coincidentally go missing when
9. they are around

This extract begins with a partial acceptance of the suggest that opposition to Gypsies is prejudicial. This is signalled through the term 'maybe' which is a hedging term that neither fully denies or confirms that this is the case. However, the next sentence does concede that this opposition is caused by prejudice (signalled through the 'but') which changes the meaning of the previous 'maybe' to an acceptance. This prejudice is accounted for in a way that is designed to present the speaker as rationale rather than bigoted, on the grounds of 'experience' (1), which is a difficult thing for others to argue against. What this means is that prejudice based on 'hearsay' (1) is irrational and wrong, whereas prejudice based on experience is understandable and acceptable. Interestingly, this statement is followed with an

explicit denial that this opposition is racist (2) which is emphasised through the capitalisation of 'NOT' (2).

As in the previous section of this analysis, accusations of racism ('that') are presented as unreasonable (Goodman 2010; Van der Valk 2001); indeed more so than experience-informed prejudice. Accusations of racism are presented as a simplistic way of making a point and gaining a 'reaction' (2) that requires a denial (3); as is demonstrated in this extract and throughout the analysis it is the case that *accusations* of racism require a denial (Augoustinos & Every 2007; Billig 1988). The reference to 'buzzword' (2) suggests that these accusations are simplistic and easy to make, but that they are also unwarranted. After this criticism, the writer goes on to liken accusations of racism to accusations of being a sex offender (4); something which is claimed would also require a denial. While it is the case that there is a norm against paedophilia as there is against prejudice, by drawing a comparison with the two it is suggested that racism is a baseless and unfair accusation to make, that will be damaging to those it is directed to; the implication here is that accusations of racism are made in situations (such as those where groups like Gypsies are criticised) where there are no grounds for making such claims. Here the 'racism' is removed from opposition to minority groups.

As in kuma2000's previous post (extract five) a number of reasons, based in personal experience, for taking issue with Gypsies are given. Gypsies (here 'Travellers') are presented as the unreasonable group because they have no regard for others. They are presented as freeloading (6) and dirty (7) and as thieves (8-9). Throughout this post an 'us and them' distinction is used to position Gypsies as very different to, and worse than, settled communities. It is of note, however, that no reference to 'hate' is made, as in this writer's second post. Throughout this post, although racism is denied, it is conceded that opposition is due to prejudice (albeit prejudice grounded in personal experience) and Gypsies are nevertheless presented in a particularly negative way.

## **Discussion**

This analysis has identified three different ways of talking about racism in relation to opposition to Gypsies. The first is that opposition to Gypsies is presented as racist; the second is that these accusations are responded to through denials and criticisms of making

accusations; in the third there is debate over whether or not opposition to Gypsies is due to racism or prejudice.

In the first section it was shown that the norm against prejudice (Billig 1988) was operating so that the harsh treatment and criticism of Gypsies can be labelled as problematic and racist. This norm was invoked by contributors to the forum who were arguing for a more positive stance towards Gypsies. Here racism, hatred and discrimination are presented as extremely negative and as the grounds on which to justify anger, shock and resistance. A common feature of these accusations is to draw parallels with talk about other minority groups and to argue that the ways in which Gypsies are spoken about would be considered unacceptable if it were about any other minority groups (and particular ethnic minority groups). In this way, the norm against prejudice to other groups is invoked to bolster the strength of a norm against prejudice towards Gypsies.

In the second section of analysis it was shown how contributors to the forums deal directly with such accusations of racism in a way that presents such accusations as unwarranted and unfair. In these cases accusations are presented as problematic because they are baseless insults that prevent proper engagement with an issue. These posts contain counter insults (such as ignorance, being pathetic and annoying) but they contain no rhetorical efforts to suggest that there isn't prejudice or hatred directed towards Gypsies, with one example suggesting that there is hatred towards them. This means that it is only 'racism' that is rejected, not hatred or other extreme opposition. So while the label 'racism' is strongly rejected, there is a relative lack of orientation to the norm against prejudice as hatred towards Gypsies remains unchallenged; indeed there are examples of common features of prejudicial representations of Gypsies, such as suggestions that they are different, dirty and criminal (e.g. anonymous author(s) under submission; Tilega 2006).

It is the final section that contains the most striking finding which is that there is acceptance that opposition to Gypsies may indeed be due to prejudice, albeit not racism. This suggests a hierarchy of opposition to out-groups whereby racism is the most extreme form. This is signalled by all posts containing orientations to racism as problematic, either

something worthy of making an accusation about, or where an accusation is made the accusations is dealt with as unwarranted and unfair. No posts contain an acceptance that the writer is racist, or any suggestion that racism is acceptable; there is therefore clear evidence in this data of a norm against racism. However, next in this hierarchy comes prejudice, something oriented to as less severe than racism and something that may not be denied. Within the final extract in this analysis there is a distinction made between prejudice based on 'hearsay' and that based on experience, so in this data the hierarchy seems to be racism, hearsay prejudice and experience informed prejudice. It is this experience informed prejudice that is presented as acceptable and something that doesn't require a denial. This means that the norm against prejudice in this data appears to be flexible so that it doesn't apply to all forms of prejudice against Gypsies. While criticising accusations of racism has been shown to be a common feature of talk where such accusations may be anticipated (Goodman & Burke 2010), acknowledging prejudice in this way is novel finding. The lack of rhetorical work to deny prejudice towards Gypsies could demonstrate that prejudice against Gypsies is socially acceptable.

Despite this (limited) acceptance of prejudice against Gypsies, there is nevertheless evidence of strategies previously identified to present speakers and writers as not prejudiced. Of the strategies Augoustinos and Every (2007) identified (denials of prejudice, presenting views as reflecting reality, positive self and negative other presentation, discursive deracialisation and liberal arguments for illiberal ends) there is evidence of these being used here. There is clear evidence of denials, although significantly these denials are of racism, but not prejudice, so this differs from the common understanding of the ways in which denials are made. Views are presented as reflecting reality rather than any prejudices as can be seen in the ways that personal experience is used to present Gypsies as problematic. In line with existing literature (e.g. Tileaga 2005) there is an 'us and them' distinction where Gypsies are presented as different and as problematic when compared to settled non-Gypsy groups 'us'. Discursive deracialisation is a key feature of the data in this analysis as the focus is on the way in which 'race' and 'racism' is systematically argued against and removed from the debates, albeit with an acceptance that prejudice is present in the data. It is only the use of liberal arguments for illiberal ends that is not a major feature of this data.



### *Concluding remarks*

These findings have major implications for the discursive literature on prejudice and racism. While the taboo against prejudice (Billig 1988) has remained a consistent and robust finding throughout discursive psychology this research has shown that in the specific context of discussion forums about Gypsies in the UK, the taboo against prejudice does not seem to operate. Instead there is a hierarchy of prejudices where only racism is deemed too extreme to acknowledge (van Dijk 1993) whereas prejudice towards Gypsies is not denied, but rather is presented as an inevitable outcome blamed on the actions of the Gypsies themselves. This means that while there is still a taboo in place, the taboo is against only racism, which is presented as the most extreme opposition (van Dijk 1993) rather than prejudice and hatred, which are deemed acceptable here. While there is evidence of criticism of posts that are deemed to be racist and/or prejudiced, which suggests that displays of hatred towards Gypsies are not universally accepted, accusations of racism are criticised and deemed to be problematic (as demonstrated elsewhere e.g. Goodman 2010), which allows extremely prejudicial comments are directed Gypsies.

This in turn has worrying implications for the treatment of Gypsies, who have been shown to be a particularly vulnerable group of people. This finding therefore supports the suggestion that a level of prejudice that would not normally be accepted towards minority groups is commonplace when discussing Gypsies. It appears that when it comes to Gypsies the norm against prejudice is suspended so that this talk is an example of ‘discourse that denies, rationalizes and excuses the dehumanization and marginalization of, and discrimination against,’ (Every & Augoustinos 2007: 412) Gypsies, much to the detriment of this group and those who campaign for their rights. In order to attempt to counter their harsh treatment, further research is needed to determine the extent to which prejudice against Gypsies has become acceptable.

## Notes on contributors

**Simon Goodman** (S.Goodman@coventry.ac.uk) is a senior lecturer in psychology at Coventry University. His research explores the discursive construction of asylum seekers and refugees, and his interests include discourse analysis, the social construction of categories, boundaries and prejudice, particularly in relation to asylum seeking, social inequality, and the far right.

**Lottie Rowe** is a student at the department of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences, Coventry University, Priory Street, Coventry, CV15FB [lottie.rowe@hotmail.co.uk](mailto:lottie.rowe@hotmail.co.uk)

## References

Atkinson, J. 1984. Public speaking and audience responses: some techniques for inviting applause. structures of social action: In *Studies in conversation analysis*. J. M. Atkinson and J. Heritage, 370-409. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Augoustinos, M. & Every, D. 2007. The language of “race” and prejudice: a discourse of denial, reason, and liberal-practical politics. *Journal of language and social psychology* 26 (2): 123-141

Billig, M. 1988. The notion of ‘prejudice’: some rhetorical and ideological aspects. *Text* 8: 91-110

Billig, M. 2002. Henri Tajfel's 'cognitive aspects of prejudice' and the psychology of bigotry. *British journal of social psychology*, 41: 171-188

Bowers, J. 2010. Traveller Times online FAQ pack- *Gypsies and Travellers: their lifestyle, history and culture*.  
[http://www.travellerstimes.org.uk/downloads/lifestyle\\_history\\_and\\_culture\\_24052010\\_111520.pdf](http://www.travellerstimes.org.uk/downloads/lifestyle_history_and_culture_24052010_111520.pdf)

Burke, S & Goodman, S. 2012. “Bring back Hitler’s gas chambers”: asylum seeking, Nazis and facebook: a discursive analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 23(1): 19-33

Cemlyn, S., & Clark, C. 2005. The social exclusion of Gypsy and Traveller children, in: G. Preston (Ed.) *At Greatest Risk: The Children Most Likely to be Poor*, pp. London: CPAG 150–165

- Condor, S., Figgou, L., Abell, J., Gibson, S., & Stevenson, C. 2006. "They're not racist": prejudice mitigation and suppression in dialogue. *British journal of social psychology*, 45: 441–462.
- Edwards, D. 2003. Analyzing racial discourse: the discursive psychology of mind-world relationships. In *Analyzing race talk: multidisciplinary approaches to the interview*. H. Van den Berg, Wetherell, M., and Houtkoop-Steenstra, H., 31-48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Edwards, Derek. & Jonathan Potter. 1992 *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage Publications
- Ellis, G. & McWhirter, C. 2008. Land-use planning and Traveller-Gypsies: towards non-prejudicial practice. *Planning and practice research* 23 (1): 77-99
- Every, D & Augoustinos, M. 2007. Constructions of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates on asylum seekers. *Discourse and society*, 18(4): 411–436
- Hewitt, J. & Stokes, R. 1975. Disclaimers. *American sociological review* 40: 1-11
- Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodman, S .2010. "It's not Racist to Impose Limits on Immigration": Constructing the boundaries of racism in the asylum and immigration debate. *Critical approaches to discourse analysis across disciplines* 4(1): 1-17
- Goodman, S & Burke, S. 2010. "Oh you don't want asylum seekers, oh you're just racist": A discursive analysis of discussions about whether it's racist to oppose asylum seeking. *Discourse and Society* 21(3): 325–340
- Kabachnik, P. 2010. Place invaders: constructing the nomadic threat in England. *The geographical review* 100 (1): 90-108
- Leudar, I. & Nekvapil, J. 2000. Presentations of Romanies in the Czech Media: on Category Work in television Debates. *Discourse and society* 11 (4): 587-513
- Lewis, A. 2004. "What group?" studying whiteness in the era of "colour blindness". *Sociological Theory* 22(4): 623–46.

- Marcu, A. 2005. Exclusion of ethnic groups from the realm of humanity: prejudice against the Gypsies in Britain and Romania. *Psicología Política* 30: 41-56
- Meek, R. 2007. The experience of a young gypsy-traveller in the transition from custody to community: an interpretive phenomenological analysis. *Legal and criminological psychology* 12: 133-147
- O’Nions, H. 1995. ‘The Marginalisation of Gypsies’. *Web Journal of Current Legal Issues* 3, <http://webjcli.ncl.ac.uk/articles3/onions3.html#criminal>
- Potter, J. 1997. Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In: Silverman D (ed.) *Qualitative research: theory, method and practice*, 144–160. London: Sage.
- Schneeweis, A. 2010. Talking differences: discourse about the Gypsy/Roma in Europe since 1989. *Humanities and Social Sciences* 70 (9): 3252
- Scott, J. W. 1992. The campaign against political correctness: what's really at stake. *Radical History Review* 54: 59-79
- Tileaga, C. 2005. Accounting for extreme prejudice and legitimating blame in talk about the Romanies. *Discourse and society* 16 (5): 603-624
- Tileaga, C. 2006. Representing the ‘Other’: A Discourse Analysis of Prejudice and Moral Exclusion in talk about Romanies’. *Journal of community and applied social Psychology* 16: 19-41
- Turner, R. 2002. Gypsies and British parliamentary language: an analysis’. *Romani Studies* 12: 1-34
- Van Cleemput, P. 2010. Social exclusion of Gypsies and Travellers: health impact. *Journal of research in nursing* 15 (4): 315-327
- Van Dijk, T. A. 1992. Discourse and the denial of racism. *Discourse and society* 3: 87-118
- van Dijk, T A. 1993. Denying Racism: Elite Discourse and Racism In: J. Solomos & J. Wrench (Eds.). *Racism and migration in western Europe.*, pp. 179-193. Oxford: Berg

Wetherell, Margaret & Jonathan Potter. 1992. *Mapping the language of racism*.  
London, Harvest Wheatsheaf.

---

<sup>i</sup> For more about this case, see <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-essex-15738149>

<sup>ii</sup> <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/no-blacks-no-dogsno-gypsies-860873.html> [at the time of writing the comments accompanying the article are no longer accessible]

<sup>iii</sup> <http://www.foreignersinuk.co.uk/blog-videoblog-gypsy-child-thieves-controversy-over-bbc-documentary-1383.html>

<sup>iv</sup> <http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b00mkjyd>

<sup>v</sup> <http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/article2446669.ece>

<sup>vi</sup> <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/no-blacks-no-dogsno-gypsies-860873.html>

<sup>vii</sup> This term is used in British slang/swearing to denote that something is bad, stupid and/or untrue