

(Anti)Racist Discourse

Teun A. van Dijk

Final (4.0) Version. June 17, 2022

Introduction and Aims

Racism and ethnicism are major forms of social domination and inequality, studied in thousands of books and papers in many disciplines (Solomos, 2020). One of their crucial manifestations is racist and antisemitic discourse, one of the main topics of Critical Discourse Studies and other disciplines since the 1980s. Antiracism is a historical global social movement engaged in the resistance against racism, and antiracist discourse one of its prominent activities. Within a multidisciplinary framework, this chapter summarizes this research on racist and antiracist discourse.

The system of racist domination consists of two major dimensions: racist cognition, such as prejudices and ideologies, and racist action, such as discrimination, exclusion and oppression, among many other violations of human rights. In this system of racist power abuse and inequality, discourse plays a crucial role: On the one hand it is a form of racist practice among others, and on the other hand racist cognitions are largely acquired and reproduced through discourse. Hence discourse plays a key role in the (re) production of the system of racist domination, and discourse studies a central role in its critical analysis among other disciplines of the humanities and social sciences. The same is true for the study of antiracist discourse as a major form of antiracist resistance (Van Dijk, 2021)

Despite growing antiracist resistance, especially by black and brown people and by such movements as Black Lives Matter in the USA and S.O.S. Racisme in France and Spain, racist discourse and other forms of racist practice remain pervasive today in societies where the ‘white(r)’ population is dominant (Goldberg, 2015). Also for discourse, this is the case in all domains of society, including politics, the media and

education, controlled by white symbolic elites (Van Dijk, 1993). These elites and their organizations and institutions are primarily responsible for the reproduction of racism, because they control (access to) public discourse, and hence the formation of racist prejudices and ideologies that are the basis of racist practices. This is even the case today for the social media, whose widespread racist “hate speech” is influenced by populist elites in politics and traditional media such as tabloid newspapers, radio and television programs (Schauer, 2019).

This succinct summary of the theory of racism and the fundamental role of discourse in its reproduction and resistance is the reason why this chapter is needed in a handbook of discourse analysis. Since research on antiracist discourse is still in an early stage, this chapter will mainly focus on the study of racist discourse, where ‘racist’ is understood in a broad sense as including ethnicist, antisemitic, (neo) colonialist or anti-immigrant text and talk of ‘white(r)’ people about or directed against ethnic minorities and (other) ‘non-white’ peoples.

Since the field of discourse, and hence also the field of racist discourse is vast, we’ll focus on the discourses controlled by the symbolic elites: media discourse (especially of the press), political discourse and educational discourse, as well as on everyday conversation.

We do not discuss (nor deny the existence of) racist or ethnicist discourse engaged in by ‘non-white’ people, for instance in Africa, Asia or the Americas. Crucial in its general definition is that racist discourse is practiced by dominant peoples, groups, organizations and their members, and hence as a form of power abuse.

Given its perspective, the chapter at the same time contributes to the paradigm of Critical Discourse Studies. In this sense it is also a form of academic antiracist discourse. Presupposed and hence not elaborated in this chapter is general knowledge about racism, on the one hand, and knowledge about discourse and discourse studies as studied in the other chapters of this Handbook, on the other hand.

Racism in the Media

Racist Media Contexts

Since the 1970s, most critical studies of racist discourse have focused on the ‘traditional’ mass media, such as newspapers, radio and television (among many references, see Campbell, 2017; Downing & Husband, 2005; Hartman & Husband, 1974; Richardson, 2004; Van Dijk, 1987, 1991).

As is (and should be) the case for discourse studies in general, such analyses are not limited to the structures of racist media discourse, but also examine their *communication context*, such as media access, processes of production, news gathering and gate keeping, the routines of media organizations, journalist and their policies, practices, knowledge, attitudes and ideologies.

Among one of the most important causes of racist news and other media genres, is the routine *discrimination of black and brown journalists* (Carroll, 2017; Lewis, 2015). Much empirical research has shown that newsrooms in Europe and the Americas remain largely white. Owners and Editors of media are nearly exclusively white, and so are their aims, policies and control of the production and publication of news and other programs. If present at all, non-white journalists are also a minority in the organization and the newsroom, and virtually absent if they are committed or radical anti-racists (which is also true for white journalists). Journalists are required to be professionals with a professional ideology, and explicit antiracist ideologies, attitudes and media discourses are generally not tolerated.

The second major cause of racist media are *production routines such as news gathering*. Sociological research since the 1970s has shown that journalists engage in daily practices that guarantee a steady flow of news discourse, e.g., by selecting the institutional, organizational and personal sources that provide regular and reliable news, as is the case for governments, ministries, the police, the courts, business corporations or universities (Gans, 1979; Machin & Niblock, 2006; Tuchman, 1978). Since in white-

dominated societies most elite sources are white, also their discourses have a predominantly white perspective at all levels of text or talk: general issues, specific topics, opinion, news actors, lexicon or even metaphors. It is hence not surprising that also for this reason, most news is ‘white’ news, as we’ll see in more detail below (Heider, 2000).

The third major cause of biased news is closely related to the previous ones: For various reasons non-white persons and institutions have much less *access* as sources to white media (Owens, 2008). Non-white sources may be discriminated, excluded, ignored by many media and journalists as part of their general routines, policies or ideologies. Such discrimination may have ‘professional’ reasons: news or other information of non-white sources may be found to be less reliable or biased, especially on ‘ethnic’ or ‘racial’ topics – thus presupposing that ‘white’ sources or information is (more) ‘objective’. Moreover, non-white sources may have less organizational resources, such as special departments or specialists for relations with the media.

Another cause of the prevalence of ‘white’ news are *gatekeeping* and the *routines of the selection of news discourse*. Especially today through the internet, thousands of e-mails, letters, press releases and many other types of discourse reach newspapers each day. Only a tiny amount of these texts can be used as information for news or other media genres. Also in this sense, news production is largely a form of manual text processing, in which journalists must decide, within a strict time frame, which discourses, on what issues or topics, and from what source are selected for attention, and then read and only then possibly used as material for news articles. As is the case for the other causes of bias mentioned above, also this process will generally not only be controlled by white journalists but also favour preference of issues, topics, perspectives, opinion that are consistent with the attitudes and ideologies of white media and their audience (Hall, 1981; Knobloch-Westerwick, Appiah & Alter, 2008; Kumah-Abiwu, 2020; Shah & Thornton, 1994).

Finally, the selection processes of journalists in these routines of news production result in proposals for ‘stories’ that need to be discussed in daily meetings, and approved by superiors, section editors or the Editor in Chief, who exercise the ultimate control of the production and publication of ‘white’ news. And the Editor in Chief needs

to coordinate its policies with those of the (usually white) owners of newspapers, television or radio stations (Archer & Clinton, 2018; Craig, 2014).

Racist Media Discourse

It is not surprising that in the contexts as summarized above, most news and other media discourse at least has a ‘white’ perspective or slant. Today, for many media this does not mean such discourse is always explicitly racist, but in more subtle, implicit and indirect ways may contribute to the (re) production of biased knowledge, stereotypes, prejudices or ideologies among the media public. Let us briefly examine the results of research on these ‘biased’ properties of news and other media discourse.

Topics

One of the main structures of discourse are its topics, theoretically explained in terms of semantic macrostructures that represent the overall meaning of discourses and control its local meanings of words and sentences. Whereas the selection or construction of such topics that arise from the routines of news gathering and production mentioned above in general depend on the definition of news, the general policies of the newspaper, as well as socio-economic aspects such as the interest of the readers, and hence sales, the selection of news on ‘ethnic/racial’ affairs is constrained by further limitations, which not only depend on biased news gathering as explained above.

Within a general racist ideology, we may expect – and do find in empirical research – that news about (white) US vs. (non-white) THEM is polarized between a predominantly positive representation of US, and a negative one about THEM (Van Dijk, 1991, 1998). This negative bias in the selection or construction of topics is shown in the prevalence of associating minorities, migrants or non-European peoples with problems, deviance, threats, crime, violence, backwardness, and so on. Thus, migrants may be associated with burdening or abusing social or medical services or the job market (among many studies, see Al-Hejin, 2015; Campbell, 2010; Carroll, 2017;

Cohen & Young, 1981; Dell'Orto & Wetzstein, 2019; Gordon & Rosenberg, 1989; Lewis, 2015; Philo, Briant & Donald, 2013; Richardson, 2004; Van Dijk, 1991).

Local meanings

What is true at the overall level of topics of news is specified at the local levels of word and sentence meanings. Minority actors may be represented as agents of criminal or other negative actions, and associated with negative personality properties, for instance as being violent, irresponsible, ignorant, etc. (Entman, 1994; Don & Lee, 2014). Or else, they may not be associated with an active role at all, as is the case for the 'passive' representation of refugees as 'victims' (Agustín, 2003); Chouliaraki & Zaborowski, 2017). Actor descriptions may be limited to references to groups instead of information about individual persons (Van Leeuwen, 1996).

Metaphors

Important part of the local meanings of news discourse are its metaphors, used to emphasize local meanings. If many migrants or refugees are arriving at the same time, that event is routine described as a WAVE, and sometimes even more negatively as an INVASION. (Abid, Manan, & Rahman, 2017). These metaphors have specific cognitive consequences for the comprehension of the readers. They construct subjective embodied mental models of the events metaphorically described by the news, so that these models may be experienced as drowning in these waves of migrants, or being threatened by an invasion- both associated with the emotion fear in the mental models that represent their interpretation of the news (Van Dijk, 1991; Wodak, 2020).

Organization and structures

The (negative) meanings thus globally and locally construed in the news may then also be expressed and emphasized by global and local structures. Position and salience in the media are relevant, such as frontpage news, and again, negative news about minorities or migrants may appear on (top of) frontpages, with large(r) headlines, and larger

articles. Negative topics may be made explicit and stressed by headlines, leads or the order of a news report (Bleich, Stonebraker, Nisar, & Abdelhamid, (2015).

The same is true for the syntactic structures of sentences, in which negative actors may be preferred as agents of negative actions in first, topical position of the sentence, whereas the opposite may be the case for OUR actors, such as the government, the police or our institutions. The same is true for active vs. passive sentences and nominalizations (Fowler, Hodge, Kress & Trew; 1979; Hart, 2014; Van Dijk, 1991).

Voice and Quotations

Of the many other structures of news are also the representations of those who speak, that is the voices of news actors or sources. Given the biased news gathering discussed above, we may expect – and do find – that minority actors in general speak less and are cited less, and hence have less control over how the ethnic events in the media are presented and commented on (Chouliaraki & Zaborowski, 2017; Horsti, 2016; Thorbjørnsrud & Figenschou, 2016).

Social Media

Most studies referred to above are based on data from the ‘traditional’ media: newspapers, radio and television. Obviously in the 21st century, internet and especially the social media play a prominent role in the reproduction (and challenge) of racism and its (now mostly multimodal) discourses (Tittley, 2019; see the review of Matamoros-Fernández & Farkas, 2021).

This also changes the theoretical framework mentioned above according to which the symbolic elites, also of the media, play a prominent role in the reproduction of racism. The logic of that theory is simple: Since people are not born racists, and the basis of racism are racist beliefs (opinions, attitudes, ideologies), and such beliefs are largely acquired by public discourse, and the symbolic elites by definition control such discourse, they are largely responsible for the reproduction of racism.

With the prevalence of social media, not just the elites have access to ‘public’ discourse, but also many other organizations, groups and especially also individual

people. This means that popular or populist forms of racism can spread fastly through society, as has been observed with the prevalence of many types “hate speech” (among a vast number of books, see, e.g. Heinze, 2016).

Although the term “hate speech” is theoretically not very useful, because it suggests that racism or sexism is rather a question of emotion and not of power and power abuse, much research has also been carried out on racist discourse on social media. It should be stressed though that such racism is not dominantly or exclusively ‘popular’ and bottom-up. First of all, also the classical media have websites and Facebook and Twitter accounts read and viewed by millions, and in that sense, these media remain very influential. The same is true for right-wing political parties and organizations, whose presence on the internet is no less controlled by various kinds of political or other elites. Thus, many personal posts on Facebook or Twitter presuppose and comment (like, agree) with racist elite discourse, even when (traditional) media may be influenced (bottom-up) by the reactions of their users online. Detailed empirical research and case studies would be needed to assess whether racist (social) media influence is rather top-down (as our theory of the role of symbolic elites holds) or bottom-up. This question is part of a theory of populism defined as a popular reaction to elite power abuse (for discussion, see e.g., Mudde, 2017).

Whatever the direction of origins and influence, studies of racist discourse of the social media are very relevant for the theory of the discursive (re) production of racism in society, if only because they also provide insight in the acceptance of, or resistance against, elite racism among the population at large (see also Feagin & Hohle, 2018; Noiriel & Richard, 2007). Of many studies, we mention just some relevant for this chapter.

Since antisemitism is a form ethnicism and part of a broadly defined racism, the denial of antisemitism on Facebook is one of the typical forms of racism of the social media (Allington, 2018; see also Hunt, 2019). For “gas chamber talk” on Facebook, see Burke & Goodman, 2012). The same is true for anti-Roma ‘humour’ on Facebook (Breazu & Machin, 2019). Besides the social media, also the message boards of racist organizations play a role on the web, as is the case for Islamophobic discourse the English Defence League (Cleland, Anderson, & Aldridge-Deacon, 2018) or the cyber-

racism of the Alt-Right (Jakubowicz, 2017). Social media also played a role in racist opinion formation against refugees and other migrants (Ekman, 2019).

Relevant are not just the studies of racist social media messages, but especially also their uses and influence, whether by their acceptance and reproduction online, as well as among the users in their everyday lives, if which unfortunately only the messages themselves are methodologically accessible for empirical research (Rauch & Schanz, 2013).

Another crucial aspect of social media racism is that it is not limited to text but also features images, memes and other visual ways of discriminating against ethnic or racist minorities, and in ways that is harder to challenge (Van Leeuwen, 2011). See for instance the multimodal analysis of the social media message of Trump and Salvini (Lorenzetti, 2020).

We'll see below that social media also are crucial in the (re) production of antiracist discourse. The crucial, but difficult to investigate question however is whether it is racist or antiracist discourse which is most relevant on social media and the internet in general.

Political Discourse

Though usually filtered and reconstrued by the media, also political discourse plays a fundamental role in the reproduction of racism by the symbolic elites. Whether or not known to the public at large, such discourse, for instance in laws, parliamentary debates, policies, party programs and speeches of politicians, has fundamental influence on the position, rights, etc of minorities or migrants. It is this political discourse that is often the main topic of media representation, which may further emphasize negative topics and representations of political discourse.

Much research on racist discourse is carried out about all aspects of politics, such as government policies, party programs, parliamentary debates, or speeches of politicians. This has been especially the case for the analysis of populist policies and politicians, who may be the politicians responsible for the current reproduction of racist discourse, racist cognition and racist practices in society. The notion of 'populist' here

does not mean that these are ideas or discourses originating with the public at large, or poor people. On the contrary, many if not most populist ideas, discourse and policies are developed and propagated by political and media elites, and only indirectly (re) produced by people manipulated by them in specific contexts of poverty and dependence.

Parliamentary Debates

The social and political situation of minorities and migrants depends first of all of governments and state agencies. But in democratic societies these depend on parliaments and their discourses (debates, laws, etc). Therefore, considerable research has been done on parliamentary debates on many topics related to minorities and migrants, especially also on race relations, civil rights, racism, migration and so on. Relevant for this chapter are the studies on the discursive aspects of these debates.

Within the paradigm of Critical Discourse Studies, a team organized by Wodak & Van Dijk (2000) investigated the parliamentary debates of Austria, the Netherlands, the UK, France, Germany, Italy and Spain in order to assess forms of discursive racism “at the top”, as one of the forms of elite racism. The authors examine, over a 2-year period, the language of parliamentary debates and the discourse strategies, *topoi* (standard arguments) and lexical choices that are characteristic of the talk of politicians from a broad range of different political persuasions. Against the background of a description of racism throughout Europe the authors analyze samples of political discourse on such topics as xenophobia, immigration, foreign labour, unemployment, legal control, and social and cultural issues. The data from the six different countries are all processed according to a common approach: the Discourse-Historical method of the Vienna School.

Also several other studies of racism in parliament are carried out within a CDS perspective. Cheng (2015), in a study of parliamentary debates on minarets in Switzerland found that the minaret ban initiative relied heavily on the ‘slippery slope’ fallacy to make both Islamophobic and Muslimophobic arguments, that is, accusing Muslims and Islam of transgressions against Swiss society that have not even occurred.

Also Hafez (2015) in a study of topoi in parliamentary debates in Austria examined the populist Islamophobic discourses of the extreme right in parliament.

Martín Rojo & Van Dijk (1997) examine the discursive structures of the legitimation strategies of the Spanish Minister of the Interior, Mayor Oreja, during a parliamentary debate on the expulsion of “illegal” African migrants in Melilla.

Van der Valk (2003) analyzed topoi, topics, actor descriptions and argumentation fallacies of mainstream parties in immigration debate in French parliament. She concludes that right-wing political discourse is organized by a global strategy of negative other-presentation, not only of the ‘others’, who are almost systematically derogated, accused of abuse and thus criminalized, but also of their supposed allies, the political Left, object of systematic delegitimation.

Party Programs and Manifestos

Political parties produce many public discourses, also on their views and policies on civil rights, minorities, migrants and refugees. During the last decades, the emergence of influential right-wing parties has stimulated increasingly xenophobic and racist discourse, and not only at the extreme right.

Using Corpus Analysis as a base and drawing upon aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Edwards (2012) study compares the 2005 and 2010 manifestos of the British National Party. He shows how ‘in-group’ categories such as nationhood are invoked to imply inclusivity, yet on closer inspection are racially defined. The project of disguising BNP racism in seemingly moderate discourse is continuing apace.

Unfortunately, there are many studies of minority or migration topics in party (election) programs and manifestos in the political sciences (see e.g. Lehmann, & Zobel, 2018; Odmalm, 2014), but seldom with discourse analytical methods.

Example of an Antiracist Manifesto

By way of example, let us briefly look at an **antiracist** manifesto of a famous social movement; Black Lives Matter (BLM). Space limitations do not allow a full analysis, nor a theoretical framework for the study of manifestos in general. For the general

theoretical and historical contexts of antiracist discourse, including of Black Lives Matter, see Van Dijk (2021). The example is also part of my new project on social movement discourse, which also needs a much larger theoretical framework.

Manifestos in general, and also the manifesto of BLM, are a type of foundational texts of social movements, often issued when a new movement is created, or after important social or political events or changes of the ideas of a movement. Most of the literature on manifestos is on political manifestos of political parties, for instance as part of an election campaign. Much less literature exists on manifestos of social movements.

The following manifesto of BLM was published on its website:

1 **What We Believe**
2 Four years ago, what is now known as the Black Lives Matter Global Network began to organize. It
3 started out as a chapter-based, member-led organization whose mission was to build local power and
4 to intervene when violence was inflicted on Black communities by the state and vigilantes. In the
5 years since, we've committed to struggling together and to imagining and creating a world free of
6 anti-Blackness, where every Black person has the social, economic, and political power to thrive.
7 Black Lives Matter began as a call to action in response to state-sanctioned violence and anti-Black
8 racism. Our intention from the very beginning was to connect Black people from all over the world
9 who have a shared desire for justice to act together in their communities. The impetus for that
10 commitment was, and still is, the rampant and deliberate violence inflicted on us by the state.

Our brief analysis will be limited to the typical structure of antiracist manifestos, which we also have observed for the manifestos of the Movimento Negro in Brazil (Van Dijk, 2020). This structure is very similar to the organization of ideologies we proposed in Van Dijk (1998), consisting of following general categories: *Identity* (Who are we?), *Action* (What do we do?), *Goals* (What do we want?), *Norms and Values* (What is good and bad for us?), *Who are our reference groups* (Allies, Beneficiaries, Enemies), and *Resources* (What are our strengths?). These polarized structures control the socially shared attitudes (e.g., on police violence), personal mental models (experiences, plans, etc) and discourse of the movement, including its manifestos. In this and many other antiracist manifestos, we find the following schematic categories (which form some kind of superstructure), followed by fragments of the manifesto:

History (*Four Years Ago; it started out; in the years since; began as a call to action; from the very beginning etc*)

Identity (*We; what is now known as BLM, etc*)

Action (*began to organize; intervene; call to action, struggling against; connect black people etc*)

Goals (*mission; construe local power; a world free of anti-blackness etc*)

Norms and Values (*chapter-based, member-led; justice; where every black person...: implicitly: democracy*)

Reference groups (US: *Black community*; THEM: *police, vigilantes, State*)

Resource (*local power*).

We see that most of the text expresses some of the information of the underlying antiracist ideology of BLM. More specific of antiracist manifestos, as is the case for many social movement manifestos, is the more detailed information of the **bad situation** against which they are acting: *response to state-sanctioned violence*, and which represents the very motivation of a social movement in the first place. Interestingly, this relation between manifesto structure and the structure of ideology is also indexed in the very cognitive title of the manifesto, referring to the *beliefs* of BLM.

Moreover, the structures of the (antiracist) manifesto also are relevant for the structures of the very movement. This means that our analysis is *relevant*, in the sense that the categories of analysis not only correspond to the ideology of the movement but also to its sociopolitical structure, such as its identity, actions, goals, etc. – which are also categories of social movement analysis. This means that the analysis is an illustration of our general theoretical framework relating discourse structures with sociopolitical structures via a *cognitive interface*, in this case not only a basic antiracist ideology, but also socially shared attitudes (e.g., about police and vigilante violence) and *knowledge* about “*the rampant and deliberate violence inflicted on us by the state*”.

Speeches of Politicians

Even more than governments, parliaments or political parties, popular as well as elite interest is focused on the views and discourses of right-wing politicians on minorities and migration, as is the case of Le Pen (father and daughter; Hotier, 1997) in France, Farage in the UK (Kelsey, 2016), Trump in the USA (Demata, 2017; Lucks, 2020),

Orbán in Hungary (Bolonyai & Campolong, 2017) or Salvini in Italy (Colaci, 2020). These populist politicians have occasioned a vast number of studies in several disciplines, also in the field of discourse studies, only some of which can be mentioned here.

For example, Colaci (2020) studies the conceptual metaphors used by Salvini of the Lega Nord and Meuthen of the German Afd when describing the “immigration crisis” on their Facebook pages with negative conceptual potential through images transmitting anxiety, despair, threats to life.

Populist discourse is often associated with triggering emotions. In an experimental study Wirz (2018) shows that this is indeed the case, and that emotion is one of the conditions of persuasion. Also Breeze (2019) focuses on the role of emotion in UKIP discourse in the UK. In an early article on populist discourse, Kienpointner (2005) analyzes racist manipulation of right-wing discourse in Austria, Germany, the Netherlands, France and Italy. Krizsan (2013) analyzes transitivity processes as pragmatic markers of political strategy in the 'state of the nation' speeches of the first Orbán government in Hungary. More fundamental and wide-ranging have been the many studies of populist, racist discourse of the Extreme Right by Ruth Wodak, and especially her last book (Wodak, 2020).

Educational Discourse

What people know about society and the world is acquired through many forms of public discourse, first of all in educational contexts, and later expanded by other media and contexts. Hence, classroom discourse, and especially textbooks and other learning materials are a crucial source of this knowledge, especially if teachers have little time to develop their own lessons or learning materials.

There is a vast literature on the way especially textbooks and other learning materials are biased against minorities, migrants and non-white peoples and countries.

On the other hand, more than in politics and the media, education may also be the privileged context for the (re)production of antiracist ideas, discourses and practices.

Curricula

Both textbooks and interaction in the classroom depend on many discursive, educational, social and political conditions. One of them are the curricula, usually issued by the ministry of education. They generally prescribe the general principles and topics of subjects or disciplines. Racist bias in textbooks and teaching may have its obligatory source here, especially if teachers have little autonomy or independence. Critical curriculum studies have a long history (see, e.g., Apple, 1979), and pleas for a multicultural, antiracist curriculum have been pervasive in many countries (see below), presupposing that many standard curricula are not inclusive or antiracist. Many studies also attribute racial bias to curricula (e.g., Castenell & Pinar, 1993), but systematic discourse analysis of racism in curricula is rare. As we'll see for antiracist education below, critical curriculum studies usually focus on the many things that are lacking in curricula, or focus on textbooks and not on official curricula. Fylkesnes (2019) analyzed the discourse of teacher education policies in Norway, and found that despite these educational documents being explicitly positioned as promoters of social justice, they are nonetheless both a product and producers of racialised discourses of Othering and exclusion.

Textbooks

As may be expected, most antiracist critical studies of educational discourse focus on textbooks and other learning materials, implicitly also criticizing the curricula on which they are based. Again, most critical studies do not find explicit racism in contemporary textbooks, but rather important information that is missing, or the misrepresentation of minorities or immigrants, or lacking or biased information on racism.

In our own study of Dutch social science textbooks in the Netherlands in the mid-1980, we found that half of the textbooks did not yet acknowledge the ethnic diversity of the country despite more than 10 years of significant immigration, whereas minorities were often stereotyped (like “Chinese work mostly in Chinese restaurants”), and Dutch racism and colonialism was not dealt with at all (Van Dijk, 1993).

Montgomery (2005) studied the topic of racism in Canadian history textbooks and the idea of racism continues to be understood largely within a prejudice/discrimination framework that reduces racism to irrational and individualized problems of thought, behaviour, and assumption. Moreover, through multiple techniques of containment, racism is imagined to exist within temporal and spatial locations, events, or incidents that are represented as either foreign to Canada or aberrations within Canada. The combined effect is to depict the space of Canada as one largely antithetical to racism. Rezai-Rashti & McCarthy (2008) had similar criticism of social science textbooks in Canada.

Classroom Interaction

Perhaps even more important for the (re) production of racism and antiracism is what happens in the classroom. Biased curricula and textbooks can be challenged or tacitly accepted in teacher talk and interaction with students. Empirical studies of racist teacher discourse in the classroom are obviously rare, given methodological problems of recording such talk or interaction, although it is likely that racist teachers will teach following their attitudes and ideologies. As is the case for curricula and textbooks, relevant here is not only what they say, or even how they do so, but also what they are *not* talking about, typically racism or discrimination in the country or as experiences by minority students (Fox, 2001). Interestingly, a Google Scholar search for “racist teacher(s)” only produced many reference to “anti-racist” teachers or teaching.

Bryan, Wilson, Lewis & Wills (2012) examined teacher education and recommended “race talk” in PhD classes in order to produce racially literate professionals capable of problematizing the constructions of race and racist practices in educational settings.

One of the ways to assess racism in the classroom is by analyzing the stories of minority students. Rojas-Sosa (2016) found however that in stories of Latinx students in the USA these students were hesitant to recognize that they were the subjects of discrimination or to qualify the story as an occurrence of racism. Different strategies were used to avoid this recognition, including assigning others the role of recognizing

the situation as discriminatory and also using narrative evaluations or introductions to justify or mitigate the reasons that motivated these incidents.

Implicit racism or ethnic prejudice of teachers is usually measured through the study results of minority students. Specifically, students benefited most academically when their teachers' implicit biases favoured the ethnic group to which the student belonged (Peterson, Rubie-Davies, Osborne, & Sibley, (2016).

Everyday Conversation

It is not unlikely that most racist discourse occurs in everyday conversation. For the same reasons of access and methodology in the study of classroom interaction, however, empirical studies of racism in daily talk are rare, or merely indirect, as reported by participants (Dasli, 2014). Thus, we usually only have access to such talk in institutional settings, media talk, online discussion forums, schools, focus groups or interviews (Berg, Wetherell, & Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2003; Van Dijk, 1984, 1987). More generally studies find that for white people talking about race is 'difficult' (at least when they are observed) (DiAngelo, 2018; Myers, 2005).

Alegria (2014) found that focus group members legitimized racial profiling and did so using language that was largely 'colour-blind' and socially acceptable by attributing the disproportionately high rate of stops for black drivers to ostensibly non-racial factors. The groups used mostly colour-blind language, but the result was racializing discourse. In a study of focus group talk in UK secondary schools, Andreouli, Greenland & Howarth (2016) found that that racism was, on the whole, 'othered': It was located in other times, places, and people or was denied altogether. In a study of online interaction in South Africa, Durrheim, Greener & Whitehead (2015) found that participants avoided explicit racism, denied racism, and denied racism on behalf of others when discussing whether black protesters could be called 'savages'. Many studies find that the denial of racism by white speakers is routine (Van Dijk, 1992), as also found by Goodman & Rowe (2014) in their analysis of talk in a discussion forum. The same is true for a focus group discussion on what constitutes 'discrimination', when only clear proof is accepted of its occurrence (Greenland, Andreouli, Augoustinos & Taulke-Johnson, 2018). There are many studies of 'race talk'

in many contexts, but except from some mentioned above, few engage in explicit discourse or conversation analysis. In our own fieldwork in Amsterdam and La Jolla (California) we interviewed local people on the arrival of migrants and found many similar structures and strategies of racist talk, despite the different contexts, such as racist topics, stories, argumentation, metaphors and racism denial (Van Dijk, 1984, 1987).

Antiracist Discourse

Most research, also in discourse studies, has been carried out on racism and not on antiracism (Bonnett, 2000). Yet, from the start the victims of racism have always also resisted racist oppression, racism, discrimination or prejudice, beginning with resistance against slavery and colonialism. The same is true for solidarity discourse of white persons and organizations. However, in the past such discourse was often marginal and excluded by dominant forces such as those of the media, politics or the economy.

As was earlier the case for abolition discourse, and the resistance and solidarity discourses of the Civil Rights Movement, or the anticolonial movements of the 1960s, today antiracist discourse not only occurs in politics, the media and education, but also in social movements and civil society in general (for the few book-length studies, see, e.g., Cheng, 2017; Lentin, 2004; Lloyd, 1998). Most studies of antiracism and hence of antiracist discourse are published in the field of education (among many books, see Casey, 2016; Dei, 1996).

Obviously, throughout history and until today, these antiracist discourses may have many relevant structures and strategies, but research shows that there are some very general properties of such discourse. In the same way racist discourse is controlled by racist ideologies and contexts, antiracist discourse is controlled by antiracist ideologies and contexts. Hence, again we may expect polarization between US good people, and especially THEM bad people. So, of course, the main topic of antiracist discourse will be the negative past and current situation of racism as a system of oppression, and its main actors (racist white people) and their actions described as main topics, as well as in the details of local meanings, metaphors as well as local discourse structures.

In our study of the history of antiracist discourse in Europe and the USA we found that many antislavery, abolition and Civil Rights discourses feature the following topics (Van Dijk, 2021): descriptions of the **History** of oppression and resistance, and the celebration of the heroes and heroines of the antiracist struggle. Secondly, as we have seen above for manifestos and their underlying ideologies, **Our Identity**, as black or racialized people is (positively) described. Central in antiracist discourse is the detailed description of the **acts and practices** of Our Resistance (or Solidarity). Fundamental is such discourse is also the attention to **norms and values** that have been violated by racist actors and actions, and the norms and values that are prominent for US. Another interesting aspect of antiracist discourse, already since abolition, is the references to **international solidarity**, cooperation, organizations or famous people. And finally, as is the case for the underlying ideology, antiracist discourse will emphasize **Our resources** for struggle and resistance against racism, such as Our unity, cooperation, organization, etc. Interestingly, these topics correspond with the main categories of the structure of ideologies, that is basic ingroup representations.

Although there is very broad interest in antiracism in education, the systematic analysis of antiracist discourse in the other context studied above (media and politics) is still rare and will not be reviewed in this chapter (for detail, see Van Dijk, 2021).

Conclusions

Discourse plays a prominent role in the (re) production of racism. It may be a form of racist practice such as discrimination, and it is the main source of the acquisition of racist attitudes and ideologies that are the basis of racist practice in the first place. In this chapter we have reviewed some of the literature on racist discourse of the white symbolic elites in the media, politics and education, that is, those who are responsible for the influence of racist discourse, and hence of racism, in society. Such is the case in the complex contexts of news gathering and production, and in the topics, actor descriptions, metaphors and quotations in news reports, generally ideologically polarized between emphasizing **OUR** good things and especially **THEIR** bad things. Similar tendencies may be observed in the political discourse in parliaments, party programs, websites and speeches of politicians – as well as their influence on the media,

and hence on the general public. Although education obviously also features racism in curricula, textbooks and classroom talk, this social domain has most antiracist discourses. Studies of “race talk” in many contexts often show various forms of denial or mitigation of racism and discrimination, and that such talk is generally experienced as ‘difficult’ by white speakers.

Future Developments

There are many studies of racism in many disciplines. Since the 1980s also the study of racist discourse has become widespread, also in (Critical) Discourse Studies. Antiracist discourse is less common as a topic, but increasing especially since the activities of Black Lives Matter in the USA and its international influence. However, there are still many areas of (anti) racist discourse studies that need further development, especially from a multidisciplinary perspective.

Although prejudice as a dimension of racism has been studied extensively, especially in social psychology, the cognitive dimension of racism, such as the relation between racist ideology and discourse structures need more detailed analysis also in discourse analytical studies. Although racist discourse of the symbolic elites in the media, politics and education has received extensive interest in several disciplines, there are social and political domains that require more attention also from discourse studies, as is the case for the social media, everyday conversation or corporate contexts. Other fields are hardly studied because of their lack of access for critical scholarly research, as is the case for meetings of governments, business corporations or media editorial meetings, or of course talk in personal everyday settings.

Methods of (anti) racist discourse analysis have also developed widely since the 1980s, and focus on overall topics, the lexicon (key words, etc), metaphor, storytelling and argumentation, generally showing polarized ideological influence in positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. Earlier qualitative research is now also complemented by the quantitative methods of corpus linguistics. Multimodal analysis of racist images, whether in the traditional and social media or other discourses is still in its first stages. The same is true for experimental studies and ethnography. More generally, the study of (anti) racist discourse requires multidisciplinary projects that

integrate social, political, cultural, historical studies with detailed and systematic discourse analysis.

Further reading

- Campbell, Christopher. (Ed.). (2017). *The Routledge companion to media and race*. New York: Routledge.
- Myers, Kristen A. (2005). *Racetalk. Racism hiding in plain sight*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Richardson, John. E. (2004). *(Mis)representing Islam. The racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers*. Amsterdam Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Pub.
- Van Dijk, Teun. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, Ruth. (2020). *The politics of fear: The shameless normalization of far-right discourse*. 2nd edn. London: Sage.

References

- Bonnett, Alastair (2000). *Anti-racism*. London New York: Routledge.
- Burke, Shani, & Goodman, Simon. (2012). 'Bring back Hitler's gas chambers': Asylum seeking, Nazis and Facebook - a discursive analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 23(1), 19-33.
- Campbell, Christopher P. (Ed.). (2017). *The Routledge companion to media and race*. New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, Christopher. P. (Ed.). (2010). *Race and news. Critical perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Carroll, Fred. (2017). *Race news. Black journalists and the fight for racial justice in the twentieth century*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Casey, Zachary A. (2016). *A pedagogy of anticapitalist antiracism. Whiteness, neoliberalism, and resistance in education*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Castenell, Louis A., & Pinar, William. (Eds.). (1993). *Understanding curriculum as racial text. Representations of identity and difference in education*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Cheng, Jennifer E. (2015). Islamophobia, Muslimophobia or racism? Parliamentary discourses on Islam and Muslims in debates on the minaret ban in Switzerland. *Discourse & Society*, 26(5), 562-586.
- Cheng, Jennifer. E. (2017). *Anti-racist discourse on Muslims in the Australian Parliament*. Amsterdam Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chouliaraki, Lillie., & Zaborowski, Rafal. (2017). Voice and community in the 2015 refugee crisis: A content analysis of news coverage in eight European countries. *International Communication Gazette*, 79(6-7), 613-635.
- Cleland, Jamie., Anderson, Chris., & Aldridge-Deacon, Jack. (2018). Islamophobia, war and non-Muslims as victims: an analysis of online discourse on an English Defence League message board. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 41(9), 1541-1557.
- Cohen, Stanley, & Young, Jock. (Eds.). (1981). *The manufacture of news. Deviance, social problems and the mass media*. London: Constable & Beverly Hills: Sage. 2nd. edition.
- Colaci, Laura A. (2020). L'uso delle metafore concettuali come propaganda contro l'immigrazione. Analisi delle Pagine Facebook di Matteo Salvini e Jörg Meuthen. *Lingue e Linguaggi*, 35, 101-128.
- Craig, Richard. T. (2014). *African Americans and mass media: A case for diversity in media ownership*. Lexington Books.
- Dasli, Maria. (2014). The discursive deployment of race talk. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 14(4), 460-474.
- Dei, George J. S. (1996). *Anti-racism education: Theory and practice*. Halifax, N.S.: Fernwood.
- Dell'Orto, Giovanna, & Wetzstein, Irmgard. (Eds.). (2019). *Refugee news, refugee politics. Journalism, public opinion and policymaking in Europe*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Demata, Massimiliano. (2017). "A great and beautiful wall" Donald Trump's populist discourse on immigration. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 5(2), 274-294.
- DiAngelo, Robin. (2018). *White fragility: Why it's so hard for white people to talk about racism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Don, Zuraidah., & Lee, Charity. (2014). Representing immigrants as illegals, threats and victims in Malaysia: Elite voices in the media. *Discourse & Society*, 25(6), 687-705.
- Downing, John. D. H., & Husband, Charles. (2005). *Representing race. Racisms, ethnicities and media*. London: SAGE.
- Durrheim, Kevin, Greener, Ross., & Whitehead, Kevin A. (2015). Race trouble: Attending to race and racism in online interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 54(1), 84-99.
- Edwards, Geraint O. (2012). A comparative discourse analysis of the construction of 'in-groups' in the 2005 and 2010 manifestos of the British National Party. *Discourse & Society*, 23(3), 245-258.
- Ekman, Mattias. (2019). Anti-immigration and racist discourse in social media. *European Journal of Communication*, 34(6), 606-618.
- Entman, Robert. M. (1994). Representation and reality in the portrayal of blacks on network television news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 71(3), 509-520.
- Every, Danielle, & Augoustinos, Martha. (2007). Constructions of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates on asylum seekers. *Discourse & Society*, 18(4), 411-436.
- Fegain, Joe E., & Hohle, Randolph. (2018). *Racism in the neoliberal era. A meta history of elite white power*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Fowler, Roger., Hodge, Bob, Kress, Gunther, & Trew, Tony. (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fox, Helen. (2001). *When race breaks out: Conversations about race and racism in college classrooms*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Fylkesnes, Sandra. (2019). Patterns of racialised discourses in Norwegian teacher education policy: Whiteness as a pedagogy of amnesia in the national curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy*, 34(3), 394-422.
- Gans, Herbert. J. (1979). *Deciding what's news. A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek, and Time*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Goldberg, David T. (2015). *Are we all postracial yet?* Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Goodman, Simon, & Rowe, Lottie (2014). 'Maybe it is prejudice... but it is not racism': Negotiating racism in discussion forums about Gypsies. *Discourse & Society*, 25(1), 32-46.
- Gordon, Paul, & Rosenberg, David. (1989). *Daily racism: The press and Black people in Britain*. London: Runnymede Trust.
- Greenland, Kat., Andreouli, Eleni, Augoustinos, Martha, & Taulke-Johnson, Richard. (2018). What Constitutes "Discrimination" in Everyday Talk? Argumentative Lines and the Social Representations of Discrimination. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 37(5), 541-56.
- Hafez, Farid. (2017). Debating the 2015 Islam law in Austrian Parliament: Between legal recognition and Islamophobic populism. *Discourse & Society*, 28(4), 392-412.
- Hall, Stuart. (1981). The whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies and the media. In G. Bridges (Ed.), *Silver linings. Some strategies for the eighties*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hart, Christopher. (2014). Event-construal in press reports of violence in political protests: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach to CDA. *Journal of Language and Politics* 12 (3).
- Hartmann, Paul G, & Husband, Charles. (1974). *Racism and the mass media: A study of the role of the mass media in the formation of white beliefs and attitudes in Britain*. Totowa, N.J.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Heider, Don. (2000). *White News. Why local news programs don't cover people of color*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Heinze, Eric. (2016). *Hate speech and democratic citizenship*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Hotier, Hugues. (1998). Le Pen—Les mots Analyse d'un discours d'extrême droite de Maryse Souchart, Stéphane Wahnich, Isabelle Cuminal de Virginie Wathier, Le Monde Éditions 1997, 275 pages, *Communication et organisation* 14 (1998).
- Horsti, Karina. (2016). Visibility Without Voice: Media Witnessing Irregular Migrants in bbc Online News Journalism. *African Journalism Studies*, 37(1), 1-20.
- Hunt, Whitney. (2019). Negotiating new racism: 'It's not racist or sexist. It's just the way it is'. *Media Culture & Society*, 41(1), 86-103.

- Jakubowicz, Andrew. (2017). Alt_Right White Lite: trolling, hate speech and cyber racism on social media. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies-an Interdisciplinary Journal*, 9(3), 41-60.
- Kelsey, Darren. (2016). Hero Mythology and Right-Wing Populism: a discourse-mythological case study of Nigel Farage in the Mail Online. *Journalism Studies*, 17(8), 971-988.
- Kienpointner, Manfred. (2005). Racist manipulation within Austrian, German, Dutch, French and Italian right-wing populism. In: L. de Saussure, & P. Schulz (Eds.), *Manipulation and ideologies in the twentieth century: Discourse approaches to politics, society and culture*. (pp. 215-235). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, Silvia, Appiah, Osei, & Alter, Scott. (2008). News selection patterns as a function of race: The discerning minority and the indiscriminating majority. *Media Psychology*, 11(3), 400-417.
- Krizsan, Attila. (2013). Ideologically speaking. Transitivity processes as pragmatic markers of political strategy in the 'state of the nation' speeches of the first Orban government in Hungary. *Pragmatics and Society*, 4(2), 177-199.
- Kumah-Abiwu, Felix. (2020). Media gatekeeping and portrayal of Black men in America. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 28(1), 64-81.
- Lehmann, Pola, & Zobel, Malisa. (2018). Positions and saliency of immigration in party manifestos: a novel dataset using crowd coding. *European Journal of Political Research*, 57(4), 1056-1083.
- Lentin, Alana. (2004). *Racism and anti-racism in Europe*. London Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto Press.
- Lewis, Libby. (2015). *The myth of post-racialism in television news*. New York: Routledge.
- Lloyd, Catherine. (1998). *Discourses of antiracism in France*. Aldershot Brookfield, USA: Ashgate.
- Lorenzetti, Maria. I. (2020). Right-Wing Populism and the Representation of Immigrants on Social Media. A Critical Multimodal Analysis. *Iperstoria*, (15). 59-94.
- Lucks, Daniel S. (2020). *Reconsidering Reagan. Racism, Republicans, and the Road to Trump*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Machin, David., & Niblock, Sarah. (2006). *News production. Theory and practice*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Martín Rojo, Luisa, & Van Dijk, Teun A. (1997). "There was a problem, and it was solved!" Legitimizing the Expulsion of 'Illegal' Immigrants in Spanish Parliamentary Discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 8(4), 523-567.
- Matamoros-Fernández, Ariadna, & Farkas, Johan. (2021). Racism, Hate Speech, and Social Media: A Systematic Review and Critique. *Television & New Media*, 22(2), 205-224.
- Montgomery, Ken. (2005). Imagining the antiracist state: Representations of racism in Canadian history textbooks. *Discourse*, 26(4), 427-442.
- Mudde, Cas. (2017). *The populist radical right. A reader*. London New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Myers, Kristen A. (2005). *Racetalk. Racism hiding in plain sight*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Noiriel, Gérard, & Richard, Bertrand. (2007). *Racisme, la responsabilité des élites*. Paris: Éditions Textuel.
- Odmalm, Pontus. (2014). *The party politics of the EU and immigration*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Owens, Lynn C. (2008). Network news: The role of race in source selection and story topic. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 19(4), 355-370.
- Peterson, Elisabeth R., Rubie-Davies, Christine, Osborne, Daniel, & Sibley, Christopher. (2016). Teachers' explicit expectations and implicit prejudiced attitudes to educational achievement: Relations with student achievement and the ethnic achievement gap. *Learning and Instruction*, 42, 123-140.
- Philo, Greg, Briant, Emma, & Donald, Pauline. (2013). *Bad news for refugees*. London: Pluto Press.
- Rauch, Shannon M., & Schanz, Kimberley. (2013). Advancing racism with Facebook: Frequency and purpose of Facebook use and the acceptance of prejudiced and egalitarian messages. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(3), 610-615.
- Rezai-Rashti, Goli M, & McCarthy, Cameron. (2008). Race, text, and the politics of official knowledge: A critical investigation of a social science textbook in Ontario. *Discourse*, 29(4), 527-540.
- Richardson, John. E. (2004). *(Mis)representing Islam. The racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers*. Amsterdam Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Pub.
- Rojas-Sosa, Deyanira. (2016). The denial of racism in Latina/o students' narratives about discrimination in the classroom. *Discourse & Society*, 27(1), 69-94.

- Schauer, Pete. (Ed.). (2019). *Politicians on social media*. New York, NY: Greenhaven Publishing.
- Shah, Hemant, & Thornton, Michael. C. (1994). Racial Ideology in United-States Mainstream News Magazine Coverage of Black-Latino Interaction, 1980-1992. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 11(2), 141-161.
- Solomos, John. (Ed.). (2020). *Routledge international handbook of contemporary racisms*. Abingdon, Oxon New York, NY: Routledge.
- Thorbjornsrud, Kjersti., & Figenschou, Tine U. (2016). A comparative analysis of irregular migrant voice in Western media. *Journalism Studies*, 17(3), 337-355.
- Titley, Gavan. (2019). *Racism and Media*, London: Sage.
- Tuchman, Gaye. (1978). *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Van der Valk, Ineke. (2003). Right-wing parliamentary discourse on immigration in France. *Discourse and Society*, 14(3), 309-348.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse. An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1987). *Communicating racism. Ethnic prejudice in thought and talk*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1991). *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1992). Discourse and the Denial of Racism. *Discourse & Society*, 3(1), 87-118.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2020). *Antiracist Discourse in Brazil. From Abolition to Affirmative Action*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2021). *Antiracist Discourse. Theory and History of a Macromovement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo J. (2011). Multimodality. In *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 688-702). London: Routledge.
- Van Leeuwen, Theo. J. (1996). The Representation of Social Actors. In Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen Rosa, & Coulthard, Malcolm (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. (pp. 32-70). London, England: Routledge.
- Wirz, Dominique. (2018). Persuasion Through Emotion? an Experimental Test of the Emotion-Eliciting Nature of Populist Communication. *International Journal of Communication*, 12, 1114-1138.
- Wodak, Ruth. (2020). *The politics of fear: The shameless normalization of far-right discourse*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, Ruth, & Van Dijk, Teun A. (Eds.). (2000). *Racism at the Top. Parliamentary Discourses on Ethnic Issues in Six European States*. Klagenfurt, Austria: Drava Verlag.