

THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS TO RESEARCH ON THE SLOVENE MINORITY SITUATION IN CARINTHIA¹

A REVIEW ESSAY

Tom Priestly

1. INTRODUCTION

“Discourse analysis” is a vast “interdisciplinary movement” (Jaworski and Coupland 1). The term “... has become common currency in a variety of disciplines: critical social theory, sociology, linguistics, philosophy, social psychology and many other fields, so much so that it is frequently left undefined” (Mills 1). In strictly (“mainstream”) linguistic usage, it refers to the fact that both the structure and the meaning of units such as sentences normally depend on what has occurred in foregoing texts, i.e., that one can appreciate syntax and semantics only with reference to the wider context; this context may be more or less limited—a single short conversation, for example, or something as extremely wide as “the discourse of advertizing.” Some scholars even analyze non-linguistic as well as linguistic data (see Jaworski and Coupland 3). In a loose sense much textual analysis of literature is discourse analysis in a strictly linguistic sense, and many historians, sociologists and political scientists who use primary sources as evidence for their accounts and their conclusions may—probably to the great surprise of most of them—be labeled critical linguists and/or cultural theorists who use discourse analysis.

The kinds of discourse analysis discussed here have developed specialized techniques, especially as used in various “applied” fields: juridical studies, health sciences, gender studies, and—given the focus of this essay—the politics of interethnic relations. This is a vast field of research: for instance, a recent bibliography limited to the discourse analysis of news media (van Dijk 1999) lists over 365 items. It also has

¹ A book received for review, Reisigl and Wodak 2001, has no direct connection with *Slovene Studies*. Its indirect links, which indeed are of interest, prompted this review essay. I wish to express my gratitude for assistance to Ruth Wodak, Élisabeth Le, and Carole Greene.

its own sub-varieties: Ruth Wodak—a scholar highlighted here—has worked with what is known as “Critical Discourse Analysis [CDA]” (see Wodak, de Cillia, et al. 1999²), and has developed the broader “Discourse-Historical Analysis” (see Reisigl and Wodak 2001) which integrates wider social and political contexts and social psychological factors into the analysis. Methodologically different analyses of discourse have other names, thus especially “Conversation Analysis [CA],³ which is more rigorous than, and normally has more overtly heuristic techniques than, CDA. The latter is more explicitly concerned with “power” relationships: “CDA may be defined as fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language” (Wodak 2001, 2).

Often (as may be assumed from these words) this approach has an explicit political agenda: see further in 4. below. The kinds of discourse analysis other than CDA will not be discussed here, since Wodak’s methods, and variations thereon, are what have been utilized in Carinthia.

All these studies involve (1) a linguistic analysis of some kind of text, and (2) a wider-than-linguistic analysis of the context in which that text was spoken or written. Because (1) the analysis may be performed with lesser or greater precision and thoroughness by people with more or less training in linguistics, and because (2) the context may be narrowly or widely defined, and may require all kinds of non-linguistic training (in psychology, sociology, political science, and/or, cf. the “applied fields” mentioned above, law, medicine, and so on) —for these reasons, applications vary enormously. Further, some are concerned with spoken, some with published texts; and some are analyses of monologues (speeches, political pamphlets, most newspaper materials) while others are of dialogues or “interactions” among participants. These last represent the most basic and normal use of

² The pioneer in this field is Teun van Dijk, see van Dijk 1985. Another leading specialist is Norman Fairclough, see Fairclough 1995. Wodak and Meyer (2001), with contributions from seven knowledgeable specialists, may be strongly recommended as a many-sided overview of the field.

³ See, for example, Pomerantz and Fehr (1997). CA derives from both clinical studies, especially those of Harvey Sachs (see Drew and Heritage 1992), and anthropological research, like the now classic Gumperz (1982).

language and are at the same time least easy to analyze: CA necessarily deals with dialogues, CDA often deals with them. For more comments on methodology, see 3.11.

The examples discussed below are the applications known to me of discourse analysis to the political situation of the Slovene minority in Austrian Carinthia. Most of them can be characterized as CDA; this label cannot be properly applied to all of them, however, and they will be all broadly labeled DA (“Discourse Analysis”).

2. RUTH WODAK AND HER WORK

DA has been applied to several kinds of texts published in Austria by Ruth Wodak, and her work has served as a model for applications in Carinthia; it is therefore a suitable starting-off point for this essay. She is the author of seven single-authored and over twenty co-authored books (and numerous articles), all of them concerned with the analysis of “discourse” in various settings—especially, law courts, doctors’ and psychiatrists’ offices, and the media—and treating several vital contemporary problems which involve communication in various forms, both private and public. In 1996 she received the Wittgenstein Award, one of Austria’s most prestigious, and now heads her own Discourse, Politics and Identity Institute in the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

Each sub-variety of DA, including CDA, appears to have its own terminology, although they overlap greatly. For example, the theoretical portions of Reisigl and Wodak 2001 (most of the first forty pages), where what they call “discourse-historical analysis” is set out, rely on a large number of terms from political philosophy and psychosociology, and must surely be very difficult reading for non-specialists like myself (cf. Mills 1: “[the term] is often employed to signal a certain theoretical sophistication in ways which are vague and often obfuscatory”). This is a pity, if only because, as I see it, any analysis of political language must not only be objective, but (since it will probably be used, and is often meant to be used, in the political arena) must be overtly seen to be so, and the theoretical approach is especially important; see further in 4. The authors recognize this, and maintain that their own multidisciplinary and multimethodological approach will “minimize the risk of critical biasing” (35). Their exposition of methodology (the second forty pages) is, fortunately, more

accessible to the general reader, and repays careful study: for here the strategies utilized by people who devise and compose political discourse are itemized and described. After a brief example of how their analysis is applied—described in 3.9. below—chapters 3–5 present, in turn, examples of various kinds of DA (using as texts: laws, media items, speeches, interviews, official notifications, etc.) dealing with three topics: the “Waldheim Affair” of 1986; the “Austria First” petition of Jörg Haider, 1992–93; and official refusals of Austrian residence permits for aliens, 1996–97. This book is of interest to commentators on the Austrian political scene, but, apart from the examples discussed below, only of indirect interest to specialists in Slovene studies.

3. APPLICATIONS RELEVANT TO THE SLOVENE MINORITY IN CARINTHIA

I now review and briefly characterize the applications known to me of DA to various texts from Austrian Carinthia which, directly or indirectly, concern the Slovene minority in that province. After a pioneering study by Holzer, which presents the political but not the linguistic groundwork for DA, there was a flurry of activity in 1989 and 1990, and apparently very little since then.⁴

3.1. A precursor. Willibald Holzer's study of “*Ruf der Heimat*” (1982)

This long chapter (87 pages, 200 notes) is not DA *sensu stricto* but a less systematic critical commentary of the periodical *Ruf der Heimat*⁵ between its first issue in 1968 and its fifty-sixth in 1980; it

⁴ There are many other writings relevant to the Slovene minority in Carinthia which utilize textual materials but which can not be characterized as DA, since there are no explicit analyses of the kind exemplified in 3.2. below. One among many excellent examples is Boeckmann (1988) who uses extensive quotations from interviews with Carinthian Slovenes to exemplify his categorizations of them (from “[ethnically] conscious politically active Slovene” to “radical assimilee”) but does not analyze the actual quotations.

⁵ In 1987 the title was changed to *Der Kärntner*. This quarterly newspaper, delivered free to every household in Carinthia, is the organ of the *Kärntner Heimatdienst (KHD)*, an umbrella organization for a number of self-styled *heimattreu* (patriotic) groups. On the correct label for this organization (extreme right wing, or not?) see note 8 below. Since it was founded in 1957 the KHD has sponsored several initiatives, including: the discontinuance of

approaches DA because some textual analyses are involved. Holzer deliberately includes the complete thirteen-year run of this periodical in his survey, to avoid suspicion of bias in his choice; but, given fifty-six issues each with from four to twelve pages, he is obviously unable to present an analysis of every sentence. Rather, he limits his analysis to a search for specific features, admitting (77) that there may be some lack of representativity, a matter which (see 4.) I consider extremely important. He starts by listing the general attributes of right-wing publications—universalism, *Volksgemeinschaft*,⁶ antiliberalism, anti-pluralism, authoritarianism—and then proceeds to exemplify these with extensive direct quotations and very interesting comments. Thus, he writes (88) that the specific term *Volksgemeinschaft* is avoided in *Ruf der Heimat* but that the same concept is conveyed by references to the *Kärntner Volk* [Carinthian nation/ethnic group] and its pursuit of traditional values in the Carinthian homeland, e.g., “*ohne eine gesicherte Heimat gibt es kein Leben* [without a safeguarded homeland there is no life]” (*Ruf der Heimat* 50, 1979, p. 8). In this way he pays considerable, if unsystematic, attention to the linguistic means of expression of the attributes listed above—for example, the repeated use of clichés such as

bilingual (German/ Slovene) education in Carinthian schools (1958); the so-called *Ortstafelsturm* when many bilingual topographical signs were forcibly removed (1972); campaigns for Carinthians to report their first language as “German” in various censuses; a campaign against the expansion of combined Yugoslav /Austrian business ventures (1976); and a movement to change the educational system so that Slovene-language and German-language schooling would be separate (1986). It is clear from nearly every page of *Der Kärntner* that the KHD maintains what can only be called, in general, a disdainful and discouraging attitude to the minority. Further details in Holzer’s chapter here reviewed and in Fritzl (1990), Bailer and Neugebauer (1993).

⁶ The ideology of *Volksgemeinschaft* (‘national/ethnic community’) reflects the concept of a natural harmonious order set in a patriarchal mold and offered as an alternative to modern industrial society, involving the rejection of ideologies and policies which may disturb this harmony—namely liberalism, the labor movement, equal rights for women and gays, rights for minorities, immigration to one’s country of anybody not in one’s own ethnic group, and so on. See also Holzer 1993, 34–38, a section which begins “*Im Zentrum Natur mythologisierenden rechtsextremen Denkens steht die Idee des Volkes* [At the center of the extreme right-wing thought, which mythologizes nature, stands the idea of the nation/ ethnic group].”

heimattreu [faithful to one's homeland] and *Gesetze der Natur* [laws of nature]). He also pays close attention to the way in which political positions and arguments are presented, e.g., appeals to specific *demokratische Grundsätze* [democratic principles] as justification for political beliefs, and the demonization of holders of opposing views. In this way he combines analysis of individual words and phrases with the analysis of the structure of the discourse in general. All of his examples are citations from *Der Kärntner* with indirect or, more usually, direct reference to the Slovene-speaking minority; given that the periodical's basic *raison d'être*, was during the period reviewed, political engagement with the minority, this is to be expected;⁷ the examples are rather repetitive, but then the periodical itself can be characterized as tending to re-cycle well-known arguments. Holzer's long essay is offered in response to the *Ruf der Heimat's* editors' self-identification as "*weder Extremisten noch Faschisten* [neither extremists nor fascists],"⁸ and as a potential contribution to an objective assessment as to whether such a description of the periodical may be justified; and, although his analysis can only be called preliminary, he can be credited with laying the groundwork for such an assessment and indeed showing that at least the first of the two epithets appears to be, to a considerable extent, applicable.

3.2. A brief example from the "Bilingualism and Identity" Working Group (1988)

This "working group" published a brief article (Boeckmann et al. 1988) which includes a section about an interview with a young Slovene minority male, identified as "A." and with the subtitle "*Der*

⁷ More recently the periodical has taken up broader issues, in particular the membership of Austria in the European Community.

⁸ We read in *Der Kärntner*, #33, April 1995, p. 10, that the latest edition of the *Handbuch des österreichischen Rechtsextremismus* lists the KHD as "*nicht rechtsextrem* [not extreme-right-wing]." This is literally correct, although what the *Handbuch* actually states is that the KHD does not qualify for this label because of its limited aim, namely (in their words) "*die Auseinandersetzung* [altercation]" with the Slovene minority in Carinthia; since other defining features of "*rechtsextrem*" (such as xenophobia and racism) are (for whatever reason) not typical of the KHD, it is therefore labeled as "*eine rechstextreme Vorfeldorganisation* [an organization on the periphery of right-wing extremism]" (Bailer and Neugebauer 1993b, 244).

Kampf des A. gegen das Verschlungenwerden [A.'s struggle against being devoured]." This three-page section, most of which comprises the text of the interview, can hardly be considered a full DA, but it does include one example of careful linguistic analysis: the use by the interviewee of plural rather than singular first person pronouns precisely in those passages where, the authors assume, he wishes to distance himself from his own actions.

3.3. The first thorough DA of Carinthian data: Menz, Lalouschek, and Dressier (1989)

The aim of this study is to determine, through an analysis of selected Carinthian publications, whether their reports about and comments on the Slovene minority are prejudiced and discriminatory, to trace the extent of historical continuity in these attitudes, and specifically to find out whether they comprise any [neo-]Nazi elements. In particular, they aim to concentrate on the topic of minority education (hence the title, "*Der Kampf geht weiter* [The struggle continues]," a quotation from a Carinthian newspaper from 1958, when the system of obligatory bilingual education which had been instituted by the occupying British authorities after World War Two was done away with.) Methodologically, the approach is based mainly on Wodak's work (viz., Wodak 1981 and some of her other publications from the 1980s) and on research into anti-semitism (see Wodak, Nowak et al. 1990). This involves a combination of social, psychological and historical analyses of two "dimensions" of the selected texts — first, their linguistic levels, especially those of vocabulary and syntax; second, what may be called the stylistic levels of methodology of argumentation and presentation of (prejudiced) attitudes.

Space precludes a detailed exposition of analysis at the lexical level; as examples, words may be categorized as "miranda" and "anti-miranda" (viz., those with, respectively, constant positive and constant negative connotations, e.g., on the one hand *Freiheit* [freedom], *Heimat* [home] and on the other *balkanisch*, *Panslawismus*), as "euphemisms," "slogans," "metaphors," and so on. Every category of word is also classified as occurring in contexts that are clearly either "*Wir-gruppe*" or "*andere*" (probably best rendered in English as "in-group" and "out-group"). This last distinction is one which also figures among the frequently-occurring argumentation strategies: references to each of

these groups act as collocations for appropriate positive and negative phrases, whose contrasting accumulation thus emphasizes the distinction between “Us” and “Them.” In addition to this “portrayal in black and white” strategy, others which are known to characterize prejudiced discourse include—again, I give examples only—“victim-perpetrator inversion” and “trivialization,”⁹ e.g., respectively, labeling members of the Slovene-speaking minority as authors of their own misfortunes, and (more specifically) referring to the destruction of bilingual place names signs in 1972 as *die gewaltlose Demonstration der Heimatliebe* [the non-violent demonstration of love for one’s homeland] (89). As for presentation strategies, these include explicit expressions of antipathy to the minority; direct citations from so-called “authorities,” a strategy which thus renounces responsibility for any discriminatory remarks involved; and allusions to well-known events or phenomena which in this way avoid explicit prejudiced commentary.

The actual analyses are presented in two ways. The first, “longitudinal” section analyzes publications from three periods: (a) 1919–38:¹⁰ leaflets with pan-German and anti-minority tendencies; (b) 1938–45: exemplars of the Nazi-era press; and (c) 1945–88: more extensive samples from newspapers and leaflets of all political persuasions. The selected items from each period are analyzed *en masse*, with citations exemplifying the features previously mentioned. It is implicit that these are representative—again, see below. This is followed by “cross-sectional” case studies, i.e., detailed analyses of more restricted selections of discourse: (a) selections from the *Neue Zeit*, later the *Kärntner Tageszeitung*, between 1945 and 1984; (b) readers’ letters in the *Kleine Zeitung* between September and December 1972, the time of the *Ortstafelsturm*; (c) a comparative-in-depth analysis of two articles from *Unterkärntner Nachrichten*, namely “*Keine Ruhe*,” 3 February 1984 and “*Unerhörte jüdische Anmassung*,” 8 November 1930; and finally (d) two paragraph-length extracts from *Der Kärntner*, 1986–87. These four case studies show, in increasingly microscopic detail, how DA can clarify the resources and methods of prejudiced and discriminatory

⁹ The English-language versions of this terminology are taken directly from the valuable tables of types of strategy in Wodak, de Cillia et al. 1999, 36–42.

¹⁰ One interesting excursus (51–58) in a section dealing with this period analyzes Martin Wutte’s well known article (1927) in which he sets out the quasi-academic basis for the so-called “Windischentheorie/vindišarska teorija”; see also Priestly (1997).

writing. The comparison between the discourse-structurally very similar 1984 anti-Slovene and 1930 anti-Jewish articles in (c) are exceptionally useful in this regard. The authors conclude by stating, with justification, that they have demonstrated the construction and maintenance in the Carinthian printed media of a “*geschlossene minderheitenfeindliche Diskurswelt*,” i.e., a closed world of discourse which is inimical towards the [Slovene] minority; although no specific [neo-] Nazi features were found, sufficient German-nationalist, racist and anti-democratic linguistic structures and discourse strategies were uncovered, showing an “astounding continuity” from the interwar years to the 1980s. In sum: this short book shows how useful DA can be for laying bare the political misuse of language, from its more blatant practitioners (e.g., *Der Kärntner*) to those where it is less obvious, including the daily newspapers of all Carinthian political parties.

3.4. A detailed study of a “Calendar”: Amann, Botz et al. (1990)

The FPÖ’s¹¹ *Kärntner Grenzland-Jahrbuch* is published every winter, like “The Farmer’s Almanach” and “Koledar Mohorjeve Družbe v Celovcu,” and like them has a varied selection of contents, but pays more attention than most other calendars to political matters. The one studied here, for 1989, evoked very negative reactions when it first appeared. I presume that each of the nine authors of this twenty-page chapter selected some portion(s) of the text—e.g., an article or two—for scrutiny; no subsections are identified with any one author. Similar in approach to the Menz-Lalouschek-Dressler book, this study is more superficial, because each linguistic marker of discourse is exemplified with citations from or references to a selection of relevant individual items (chapters, etc.), but no one item is analyzed on its own, and no one linguistic strategy is analyzed in full. Nevertheless, the authors do succeed in exemplifying—to take a few examples—(a) *negative Verzerrungstechnik* (the technique of negative distortion); (b) the strategy by which citations of others’ views are implicitly shown to justify one’s own; and (c) devaluative strategies (e.g., allusions using cryptic labels: “*die Geldverleiher* [the money-lenders]” for “the Jews”). The authors briefly point out (121–23) that the Slovenes either have their existence as a minority in Carinthia ignored (thus, in Haider’s

¹¹ Abbreviation for *Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs* (Austrian Freedom Party), the party in which Jörg Haider rose to power.

comments on the school system) or are generally characterized in negative terms: specifically, they are mentioned as “the enemy” fifty times in the actual calendar section which has many references to the 1918–19 “resistance struggle”—for December 3rd the comment is “The Slavs occupy St. Paul,” for December 11th “The Southern Slavs occupy the Karavanke tunnel.”¹² Descriptions, elsewhere in the calendar, of this 1918–19 miniwar are characterized by the “black and white portrayal” strategy: Germanophones are provided with positive adjectives, their opponents with negative ones. When it comes to Josef Feldner’s article¹³ “*Warum sprechen die Slowenen lieber Deutsch* [Why the Slovenes prefer to speak German],” it is made clear that his argument—namely, that many Slovenophones prefer to speak German because they speak Slovene so badly—is not only an obvious reversal of cause-and-effect but an example of the frequently-used discourse strategy of branding an “out-group” (here, a minority) as agents of their own downfall. The article ends with some examples of the way in which several authors relate events and policies from the Nazi period not just uncritically but in some instances in favorable and even adulatory tones. In sum: they cite enough examples to make their conclusions credible, but in no way do they (or could they, in twenty pages) offer a complete analysis.

3.5. Another “Calendar” study: Fischer (1990)¹⁴

Gero Fischer, one of the authors of the 1989 *Grenzland-Jahrbuch* study, here takes up the 1990 issue of the same calendar and subjects it to a similar description. This time—and the year is significant: the seventieth anniversary of the Carinthian plebiscite—, several items are treated: articles by leading lights in “heimattreu”

¹² Note that in this calendar the months are designated, so to speak, bilingually: in both Standard German and the archaic German *Eismond*, *Hornung*, ... *Christmond*, which are printed in Gothic script.

¹³ Feldner has been *Obmann* [leader] of the KHD since 1972 (Fritzl 1990, 119).

¹⁴ The title of the book in which this chapter appeared requires explanation. *Am Kärntner Wesen könnte diese Republik genesen* [literally ‘Carinthia’s heart and soul could restore the health [or, wellbeing] of this Republic’; in rhyme, “Carinthia’s soul, Carinthia’s heart/ Could to our land new health impart”; my thanks to Manfred Prokop for this version] is a verbatim citation from a speech by Jörg Haider which in turn—some assume, deliberately—echoes a Nazi-era catchphrase.

organizations—Kriemhild Trattnig, Fritz Schretter, Josef Feldner, and Andreas Mölzer¹⁵—and the text of an interview with Jörg Haider. In nine pages he can do no more than sketch a description and some conclusions, and indeed seldom performs any DA *sensu stricto*, being content to provide political comments; several discourse strategies are mentioned in passing.

3.6. *An addendum to the “first discourse study”: Lalouschek and Menz (1990)*

Johanna Lalouschek and Florian Menz (two of the authors of the “first DA”, 3.3. above) reprise and extend part of the longitudinal analysis performed in that work, showing how the publications analyzed there constructed, and maintained virtually unchanged for seventy years, an ideological framework for writing about the Slovene minority. They briefly list a number of argumentation and presentation strategies, and then concentrate on two. The *Strategie der Verharmlosung* [strategy of making harmless], or *Harmonisierungsstrategie* [strategy of harmonizing], aims to idealize the conditions of ethnic togetherness in Carinthia, a utopia which any activism on the part of the minority can only harm, whether this comes from minority politicians or from south of the border. Linked thereto is the *Strategie der Aufrechterhaltung der Bedrohung von Einheit und Freiheit des Landes* [the strategy of maintaining the threat to the unity and freedom of the province]: for the threat of encroachment from the south can only solidify desires to maintain the Carinthian utopia, and what has been referred to as the Carinthian *Urangst* (primeval fear) is thus nurtured. Both of these strategies, and especially the second, are very neatly exemplified with quotations from the print media. This is a very useful addendum to the earlier study, and makes a good short introduction to the contribution that DA can make to understanding politically-slanted texts.

¹⁵ Trattnig and Schretter are high-ranking members of the FPÖ and, with Feldner (see note 13), very active in the KHD (Fritzl 1990: 126–32). Mölzer, formerly personal assistant to Jörg Haider, is on record with anti-Semitic comments in the extreme right-wing magazine *Aula*, of which he was editor (Bailer-Galanda and Neugebauer 1996, 38; Gärtner 1993.).

3.7. *An analysis of Jörg Haider's discourse: Gruber (1990)*

This short chapter by Gruber only mentions “*Slowenen*” in passing but it deserves mention as an excellent example of how one specific strategy—the “Portrayal in black and white”—is used by one politician, Jörg Haider. The author sets out to ascertain what it is that characterizes a *rechstopulistischer* [right-wing populist] politician; his answer—that Haider knows how to present himself to the media as an “ordinary” person, and takes advantage of this facility to publicize the “Us against Them” dichotomy which appeals to irrational fears in oversimplified terms: the positive “Us” collocates with “here,” “ordinary worker,” “housewife,” “German-Carinthian,” and so on, and ranked against them are “Them,” “there,” “officials,” “partisans,” “Slovenes,”... Gruber has unfortunately insufficient space for textual examples.

3.8. “*Burenwurst*” (1998)

De Cillia (1998)¹⁶ is a collection of four rather disparate chapters about aspects of linguistic politics and ethnolinguistic identity occasioned by Austria’s entry into the EU. Pertinent to my theme here is the third chapter, “Weil I ein Österreicher bin. I bin ja ka Tschusch, ka Jugoslawener. Autochtone sprachliche Minderheiten und zweisprachige Identität” [Because I’m an Austrian. I’m no Tschusch, no Yugoslav. Autochthonous linguistic minorities and bilingual identity]¹⁷ (115–99). De Cillia has collaborated with Wodak in several publications (in addition to Wodak, de Cillia et al. 1999), and it is natural for him to cite DA analyses in this context. He summarizes Menz, Lalouschek and Dressler 1989 with approval and goes on to add (only) two (unanalyzed) examples of *minderheitenfeindlich* (inimical-to-the-minority) discourse: one from *Der Kärntner* and, more interestingly, one from the mainstream, popular daily newspaper *Neue Kronenzeitung*. The main part of this chapter however is a DA of interviews with

¹⁶ The title of the book literally translates as “Farmer’s sausage will always be farmer’s sausage [i.e., you can’t change the old traditional ways]. Language politics and societal multilingualism in Austria.”

¹⁷ The first part of the title is a comment by a Burgenland Croat, in the local Austrian German dialect, on her reasons for not wanting bilingual topographical signs. On the meaning and origin of the slur “Tschusch,” see Priestly 1996.

minority Slovenes and Croats in Carinthia and the Burgenland; this is cited from a research project that is the subject of another section in the present essay, see 3.9.

3.9. The “discursive construction of national identity” (1998, 1999)

The book Wodak, de Cillia et al. (1998) is the original text forming the basis for the English-language Wodak, de Cillia et al. (1999) referred to in section 1. above; the 1998 original has many more details and textual examples and will be described here. Its main thrust is to determine how Austrians conceptualize their “Austrian-ness,” through five analyses of a selection of kinds of discourse. These vary greatly (and the inclusion of dialogic and monologic, and of written and oral texts, is noteworthy and laudable): (a) twenty-three speeches by well-known Austrian politicians (165–257), in which there are a few passing references to Carinthian Slovenes; (b) party and non-governmental organization publicity material from 1994 expressing views for and against joining the EU; (c) selections from newspaper articles, also from 1994, dealing with “neutrality” and security concerns in the EU debate; (d) group discussions concerning “Austrian identity,” which include interesting materials from Carinthia (315–400); and (e) twenty-four individual interviews on the same theme (401–80), two of them with Carinthian Slovenes. The last two analyses (d–e) are relevant here.

One of the group discussions ((d) above) took place in December 1995 in Beljak/Villach, Carinthia; there were three Slovenophone participants. This is the only group, out of six, in which language is cited in discussions of “identity”; four interesting (but brief) citations are provided (361). Of greater interest is a short section (392–96) comprising two pages of text and an analysis; the latter consists of an interpretation of what the speakers said and/or intended to say; but there is no lexical analysis and no systematic presentation of “strategies.”

The interviews ((e) above) are analyzed *en masse* rather than one by one, and again there is no systematic analysis of strategies—which would, if performed thoroughly, have taken up several thousands of pages. Instead, we are presented with the general views of the twenty-four interviewees, under several headings (self-ascription as Austrians, shared historical Austrian heritage, and so on)

with citations to exemplify how their statements reflect these views. Two Carinthian Slovenophones were interviewed: the male is cited a few times, the female extremely frequently and sometimes at length.

3.10. A short but thorough example: Reisigl and Wodak (2001)

Finally, in the book received for review, a section entitled “‘Even black Africans’: a short discourse-historical analysis” (2001 85–88), Reisigl and Wodak provide a brief but very illuminating analysis of a single paragraph from a 1997 interview with Jörg Haider, in which he comments on the tendering of public works projects to firms who hire foreign workers rather than Austrians. In an original German paragraph of just seventy-nine words, Haider is shown to employ three strategies. He uses, instead of “I,” an ambiguous “we” (is he expressing solidarity with another politician, or using a kind of “royal plural”?). He has recourse to *par pro toto* — he pillories all of his critics by selecting two for denunciation. And third, he employs an exaggerated “Us versus Them” strategy and suggests that “*Auslander bis hin zu Schwarzafrikaner* [foreigners even including black Africans]” may be employed instead of Austrians, thus justifying “negative emotions” towards foreigners (here identified as Croatians and Slovenes). —The Reisigl-Wodak analysis is exemplary; but it should be noted that a full analysis of one short paragraph requires three full pages—see further my comments below.

3.11. Summary

Methodologically, these kinds of analyses may vary enormously: at the one extreme there are what may be called the “impressionistic,” in which selected characteristics of the chosen texts are described, with no explanation of how they were identified, and more or less extensively exemplified with citations; at the other, what I would call the “painstaking,” in which all the linguistic features of the whole text are explicitly analyzed with an aim to identifying whatever textual features are important. Ten different works are briefly described above (3.1.-3.10.); most approach the “impressionistic” end of the spectrum—thus Holzer 1982 (3.1.), which does not claim to be “DA,” but also to some extent Wodak et al. 1998 (3.9.), which does so claim. The other, “painstaking” extreme is best represented by Menz, Lalouschek, and Dressler 1989 (3.3.) and by the one section in Reisigl and Wodak 2001 (3.10.). Most of the ten analyses discussed here are

more rather than less “impressionistic,” or if they do analyze strategies only choose a few for analysis.

Only the one full-length “painstaking” study of political and politically-relevant discourse in Carinthia has appeared (Menz, Lalouschek, and Dressler 1989), and I may therefore conclude as follows. Given (a) that everything which affects attitudes to the life and prospects of Slovenophone Carinthians is verbalized in the kinds of discourse available (written and oral, monologic and dialogic), and (b) that these discourses have real (if not yet properly assessed!) political impact, then it is fair to say that not all that much has been achieved. Moreover, the most interesting treatments were published in 1989–90. It is true that in one way or another what has been done presents sufficient, and extremely useful, commentary on discriminatory texts and their linguistic structures, and shows how these structures can be fruitfully analyzed. Given the continued appearance in Carinthia of, as a particular instance, *Der Kärntner* and other tendentious *heimattreu* publications, however, it is a shame that so little appears to have been done since 1990. This is especially important because my preliminary analysis suggests that some far-reaching changes have occurred in the discourse strategies employed in *Der Kärntner* during this period: to the extent that my analysis is correct, reasons for the changes may be sought among factors such as Austria’s entry into the European Union, Slovenia’s achieving independence, and other fundamental modifications of the status quo; and in any case the changes may reflect on significant developments in either the policies or/and the practices of the far-right in Carinthia.

4. A RESERVATION

As quoted in 1. above, Wodak defines CDA as being concerned with power relationships that are manifested in language. Practitioners do not conceal their agendas: the aim of these theories is “to produce enlightenment and emancipation” (Wodak 2001, 10); CDA is an analysis “with an attitude” (van Dijk 96). Meyer’s statement, “the line between social scientific research and political argumentation is sometimes crossed” (15) is thus probably an understatement: rather, CDA explicitly defines and defends a sociopolitical position: “[it] is biased—and proud of it” (van Dijk 96). Critics have indeed rejected

CDA as not deserving the name “analysis” precisely because of this lack of objectivity (Widdowson, quoted in Meyer 17).

As seen in the individual paragraphs in 3. above, CDA can indeed be used as an instrument for showing how language is used and misused for political purposes; in the Austrian Carinthian context, any purposes that involve denigration of, denial of rights to, and/or assimilatory pressure on the Slovenophone minority will no doubt evoke disapproval, or something stronger, on the part of readers of *Slovene Studies*, as they do in the writer of this essay. It will be natural for those readers, as it is for myself, to sympathize with CDA’s motives and to excuse any potential or actual shortcomings in the methodology.

However, I would suggest that we should resist any tendency to excuse methodological shortcomings, for one practical reason at least. The audience for any exposition of the political misuse of language (in this case, in Austrian Carinthia) can be divided into three groups: (1) those who do not need to be convinced that this is indeed a misuse of language; (2) those who may be so convinced. There is in my opinion little point in preaching to the converted, and little point in preaching to the inconvertible; it is those in between the two extremes who may benefit from a persuasive exposition; and (3) those who could never be so convinced. These are more likely to be persuaded if the exposition is methodologically faultless and especially if it can be seen to be so. To the extent that there is an agenda, it should not interfere with the presentation of analyses, descriptions, and arguments: the more objective these are, the more acceptable. So, an explicit methodology and in particular explicit discovery procedures are essential. In the ten books and articles reviewed here, one approaches this ideal, namely Reisigl and Wodak (2001); but even this work is not always easy to follow.

In addition, and much more important, it must be clear that the materials have not been selected in any arbitrary way. For example, cf. 3.1., Holzer (1982) is to be commended for analyzing every single issue of *Ruf der Heimat* between 1968 and 1980; but he only searches for specific negative features of the language of these issues, and does not provide any data as to whether these are balanced by any positive features. The very brief section in Reisigl and Wodak (2001) mentioned in 3.10. is exemplary, for the language of the whole of this piece of discourse is analyzed; and here the major problem inherent in my call

for non-arbitrary text-selection becomes obvious: for the analysis of this one short paragraph, no fewer than three pages are required. How many pages, therefore, would Holzer have needed to analyze fifty-six issues of *Ruf der Heimat*? The answer is probably to be found in the approach adopted, cf. 3.3., by Menz, Lalouschek, and Dressler, who combine longitudinal with cross-sectional analyses of different degrees of detail. Still, the problem remains, and those who believe that CDA deserves the attention of the “convertible” general public will presumably, with me, hope that it can be solved.

University of Alberta

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amann, Klaus, Gerhard Botz, Wolfgang Dressler, Gero Fischer, Kurt Fischer, Herta Nagel, Anton Pelinka, Karl Stuhlpfarrer and Ruth Wodak. 1990. “Struktur, Sprache und Ideologie im ‘Kärntner Grenzland-Jahrbuch 1989.’” Ed. Fischer and Gstettner 1990. 108–27.
- Bailer, Brigitte and Wolfgang Neugebauer, eds. 1993a. *Handbuch des österreichischen Rechtsextremismus*. Wien: Stiftung Dokumentationsarchiv des Österreichischen Widerstandes.
- Bailer, Brigitte and Wolfgang Neugebauer, eds. 1993b. “Vorfeld- und Umfeld-organisationen.” Ed. Bailer and Neugebauer 1993a. 239–52.
- Bailer-Galanda, Brigitte and Wolfgang Neugebauer. 1996. *Incorrigibly Right. Right-Wing Extremists, “Revisionists” and Anti-Semites in Austrian Politics Today*. Trans. Barry McLoughlin. Vienna-New York: Stiftung Dokumentationsarchiv des Österreichischen Widerstandes.
- Boeckmann, Klaus-Börge. 1988. “Stereotype und Typen.” Ed. Klaus-Börge Boeckmann, Karl Michael Brunner, Mariola Egger, Georg Gombos, Marija Jurič, and Dietmar Larcher. *Zweisprachigkeit und Identität*. Series Disertacije in razprave. Dissertationen und Abhandlungen 16. Celovec: Drava. 81–104.
- Boeckmann, Klaus-Börge, Karl-Michael Brunner, Mariola Egger, Georg Gombos, Marija Jurič, and Dietmar Larcher. 1988. “Identität und Assimilation.” Ed. Bauböck, Rainer, Gerhard Baumgartner, Bernhard Perchinig and Karin Pintér. *Und raus*

- bist du! Ethnische Minderheiten in der Politik.* Vienna: Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik. 209–23.
- De Cillia, Rudolf. 1998. *Burenwurscht bleibt Burenwurscht. Sprachenpolitik und gesellschaftliche Mehrsprachigkeit in Österreich.* Series Disertacije in razprave. Dissertationen und Abhandlungen 42. Celovec: Drava.
- Drew, Paul and John Heritage. 1992. "Analyzing talk at work: An introduction." Ed. Drew, Paul & John Heritage. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 3–65.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language.* London: Longman.
- Fischer, Gero. 1990. "Das Grenzland-Jahrbuch 1990." Ed. Wodak and Menz 1990. 118–27.
- Fischer, Gero and Peter Gstettner, eds. 1990. "Am Kärntner Wesen könnte diese Republik genesen." *An den rechten Rand Europas: Jörg Haiders "Erneuerungs-politik."* Celovec: Drava.
- Fritzl, Martin. 1990. *Der Kärntner Heimatdienst. Ideologie, Ziele und Strategien einer nationalistischen Organisation.* Celovec: Drava.
- Gärtner, Reinhold. "Die 'Aula'," 253–70 in Bailer and Neugebauer 1993a.
- Gruber, Helmut. 1990. "Ein Gespenst geht um in Österreich. Textlinguistische Untersuchungen zum populistischen Diskurs Jörg Haiders," Ed. Wodak and Menz 1990. 191–207.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Holzer, Willibald L. 1982. "Wir wollen sein ein einig Volk von Brüdern!' Völkische Ordnungspräferenzen und antiliberale Zielvorstellungen im 'Ruf der Heimat'." Ed. Dotter, Franz, et al. *Kein einig Volk von Brüdern. Studien zum Mehrheiten-/Minderheitenproblem am Beispiel Kärntens.* Wien: Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik. 73–159.
- Januscek, Franz. 1994. "J. Haider und der rechtspopulistische Diskurs in Österreich." Ed. Tributsch 1994. 284–335.
- Jaworski, Adam, and Nikolas Coupland, eds., 1999. *The Discourse Reader.* London: Routledge.
- Lalouschek, Johanna and Florian Menz. "'Nationaler Hass war uns immer völlig fremd.' Kontinuitäten in der Berichterstattung der Kärntner Printmedien über die slowenische Volksgruppe seit 1918." Ed. Wodak and Menz 1990. 98–117.

- Menz, Florian, Johanna Lalouschek and Wolfgang U. Dressler, 1989. *“Der Kampf geht weiter”*: der publizistische Abwehrkampf in Kärntner Zeitungen seit 1918. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Analyse vor Vorurteilen und Feindbildern. Series Disertacije in razprave. Dissertationen und Abhandlungen 20. Celovec: Drava.
- Meyer, Michael. 2001. “Between theory, method and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA.” Ed. Wodak and Meyer 2001. 14–31.
- Mills, Sara. 1997. *Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Pomerantz, Anita and B.J. Fehr. 1997. “Conversation analysis: An approach to the study of social action as sense making practices.” Ed. Teun A. van Dijk. *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction. II. Discourse as Social Interaction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage. 64–91.
- Priestly, Tom. 1996. “On the etymology of the ethnic slur *Tschusch*.” *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*. 4.1: 109–32.
- Priestly, Tom. 1997. “On the development of the ‘Windischentheorie.’” *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 124. (Special Issue: Sociolinguistics of Slovene): 75–98.
- Reisigl, Martin and Ruth Wodak, 2001. *Discourse and Discrimination. Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Tributsch, Gudmund, ed. 1994. *Schlagwort Haider. Ein politisches Lexikon seiner Aussprüche von 1986 bis heute*. Wien: Falter Verlag.
- van Dijk, Teun A., ed. 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 3 vols. London: Academic Press.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1999. “Bibliography. Discourse analysis of news in the media.” www.hum.uva.nl/teun/news-dis.htm.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2001. “Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity.” Ed. Wodak and Meyer 2001. 95–120.
- Wodak, Ruth. 1981. *Das Wort in der Gruppe*. Vienna: Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Wodak, Ruth. 1995. “The development and forms of racist discourse in Austria since 1989.” Ed. D. Graddol and Stephen Thomas. *Language in a Changing Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 1–5.
- Wodak, Ruth. 1997. “Austria and its new East Central European Minorities: The discourses of racism.” Ed. L. Kürti and J.

- Langman. *Beyond Borders. Remaking Cultural Identities in the New east and Central Europe*. Boulder: Westview. 132–45.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2001. "What CDA is about - A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments." Ed. Wodak and Meyer 2001. 1–13.
- Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl, Karin Liebhart, Klaus Hofstätter and Maria Kargl. 1998. *Zur diskursiven Konstruktion nationaler Identität*. Frankfurt/ Main: Suhrkamp.
- Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl and Karin Liebhart, 1999. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Wodak, Ruth and Florian Menz, eds.. 1990. *Sprache in der Politik - Politik in der Sprache: Analysen zum öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch*. Series Disertacije in razprave. Dissertationen und Abhandlungen 24. Celovec: Drava.
- Wodak, Ruth and Michael Meyer. 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Wodak, Ruth, Peter Nowak, Johanna Pelikan, Helmut Gruber, Rudolf de Cillia and Richard Mitten. 1990. "Wir sind unschuldige Täter". *Diskurshistorische Studien zum Nachkriegsantisemitismus*. Frankfurt/ Main: Suhrkamp.
- Wutte, Martin. 1927. "Deutsch - Windisch - Slowenisch," supplement to *Koroška domovina*, 7 October 1927. Reprinted as *Deutsch - Windisch - Slowenisch. Zum 7. Jahrestage der Kärntner Volksabstimmung*. Celovec: Kärntner Heimatbund, 1927.