

Università degli Studi di Torino

Euro-American Relations in the Age of Globalization: Risks and Opportunities

Guest Editors

Massimiliano Demata, University of Turin

Marco Mariano, University of Turin



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI TORINO

Special Issue - 2020

De Europa



UNIVERSITÀ
DEGLI STUDI
DI TORINO

Collane@unito.it
Università di Torino

ISBN: 9788875901653



Quest'opera è distribuita con
Licenza Creative Commons Attribuzione.
Condividi allo stesso modo 4.0 Internazionale.

Special Issue - 2020

De Europa
European and Global Studies Journal
www.deeuropa.unito.it

With the support of the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



Jean Monnet Chair
*The EU in a Challenging
World*



In cooperation with:



Euro-American Relations in the Age of Globalization: Risks and Opportunities

Guest Editors

Massimiliano Demata, *University of Turin*

Marco Mariano, *University of Turin*



Special Issue - 2020

INTRODUCTION

Euro-American Relations in the Age of Globalization: Risks and Opportunities <i>Massimiliano Demata, Marco Mariano</i>	5
--	---

ESSAYS

La Turchia nella NATO, un ruolo in evoluzione per un antico alleato <i>Alessia Chiriatti, Davide Borsani</i>	11
George H.W. Bush's "Pause" and Mikhail Gorbachev's "Common European Home" <i>Stefano Luconi</i>	29
Fears of oneself: perceptions of the role of the American élites in the political literature during the 1989 crisis <i>Patricia Chiantera</i>	49
Trump vs. the EU: framing the enemy <i>Paolo Donadio</i>	63
The polarity of collective identity in diplomatic discourse: legitimacy by metaphor <i>Liudmila Arcimavičienė</i>	73
Anti-Immigration Rhetoric in Italy and in the USA: A Comparative Perspective <i>Maria Ivana Lorenzetti</i>	97

Essays

Anti-Immigration Rhetoric in Italy and in the USA: A Comparative Perspective

Maria Ivana Lorenzetti

“We few have drifted here to your shores.
What race of men is this? What land is so barbaric as to allow
this custom, that we’re denied the hospitality of the sands?
They stir up war, and prevent us setting foot on dry land.
If you despise humans and mortal weapons,
still trust that the gods remember right and wrong”
(Virgil, *Aeneid*, Book I, 538-543)

1. Introduction

Liquidity as ease of movement of people, objects, and information is a fitting metaphor for the present time, associated with the complex transplanetary sets of processes characterising globalisation (Bauman 2000; Ritzer and Dean 2010). Thanks to the increased porosity of barriers and boundaries, movement often occurs in terms of flows, but this does not always happen without frictions.

A case in point are the many frictions caused in several parts of the world by international migration and the backlash against it. Based on the UN estimates, in 2019, there are nearly 272 million international migrants, around 3,5% of the world’s population. More than half of them live in Europe (82 million) and North America (59 million), while the United States of America is the country attracting the highest number of migrants (51 million), equal to 19% of the world’s total (UN DESA 2019).

In the last few years, and particularly since 2012 onward, migration has become a hot topic in both the media and the political agenda of many European countries as a result of several conflicts, in Syria, in the Middle East, in parts of sub-Saharan Africa, and more recently on account of the massive flow of Rohingya people to Bangladesh in 2017, and of the Kurdish people at the border between Turkey and Syria. Across the ocean, the Venezuelan political crisis in Latin America, which led many citizens to flee their country seeking asylum elsewhere, fueled the already heated immigration debate in the US, where the US-Mexico corridor is one of the world’s most critical routes for international migration. Based on the UN 2017 data, the number of forcibly displaced people between 2010 and 2017 increased by about 13 million, and in 2017 the number of refugees¹ and asylum seekers² worldwide reached 29 million people (UNHCR 2019).

Maria Ivana Lorenzetti, University of Verona, mariaivana.lorenzetti@univr.it

¹ A refugee is defined as a person who has fled their country of origin and is unable or unwilling to return due to a well-founded fear of being persecuted because of their race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group or political opinion. An exhaustive definition of “refugee” can be found in the 1951 *Convention related to the Status of Refugees*.

² An asylum seeker is an individual seeking international protection. In countries with individualised procedures, an asylum seeker is someone whose claim has not yet been finally decided on by the country in which he or she has submitted it. Not every asylum seeker will ultimately be recognised as a refugee, but every refugee is initially an asylum seeker.

However exceptional these data might seem, migration is by no means a new phenomenon, as people have always migrated in great numbers from a territory to another searching for better living conditions since ancient times. America has constantly witnessed waves of newcomers since the end of the 19th century and through the entire 20th century primarily from Europe. During the great Atlantic migration, and prior to 1880, entry to the US was largely unregulated, while additional and drastic restrictions on immigration were imposed soon afterwards.

In Europe, the free movement of people is one of the pillars of the European Union, where the Maastricht Treaty had originally aimed at making Europe an increasingly borderless society. However, not only has the arrival of immigrants from the less developed East progressively led to calls for a reassertion of border controls, but the concern about unauthorised immigration is growing. The mass migrations of people entering Europe from Africa and the Middle East often with very precarious means, fleeing war, religious persecutions, and famine led the media to speak of a “refugee crisis” due to the difficulties of some Southern European countries (most notably Italy, Greece, and Spain) facing the influx. Such a critical situation emphasised the lack of stable coordination among EU institutions and its member-states for resettling people. Furthermore, the global concern over terrorism, following a series of dramatic terrorist attacks in Europe, caused a reinforcement of immigration restrictions in both Europe and the US amidst general fear of Islamic terrorism.

The election of Donald Trump as American President in 2016 contributed to the rise and spread of anti-immigration sentiment. During his entire presidential campaign, he pledged to erect a border wall between US and Mexico³ to prevent “criminal illegal aliens” from entering the country. Moreover, one of his first acts after taking office in 2017 was the so-called Muslim ban, an executive order that lowered the number of refugees to be admitted into the US for that year, suspended the entry of Syrian refugees and created a blacklist of countries that did not meet adjudication standards under US law, and from where immigration and visas were temporarily suspended. Despite its limited duration, this ban, which raised serious protests throughout the country, certainly fostered a climate of persecution and hate.

In Europe, the Visegrád countries⁴ articulated a very pronounced anti-immigration policy exemplified by the Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán erecting an anti-migrant wall along the Hungary-Serbia border. At the same time, the Brexit referendum outcome in the United Kingdom in June 2016, after an anti-immigration-fueled Leave campaign, fomented the instrumentalisation of some ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities as scapegoats and “dangerous others” all over the continent.

³ The building of what is generally referred to as “Trump’s wall” started in 1990 under the Presidency of George H.W. Bush, while additional barriers were erected under Bill Clinton’s administration. Trump advocated for the expansion of such border barrier to the entire US-Mexico border.

⁴ The Visegrád Group is an alliance of four East European countries, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia, that are members of the EU and NATO for the purpose of promoting cooperation with one another and furthering their integration in the EU.

In a moment of great political turmoil, with countries still coming to terms with the effects of the 2008 economic crisis, and the growing disaffection of citizens towards politics (Mair 2003), this critical juncture resulted in the growing consensus of right-wing Euro-sceptic and anti-immigration populist parties promoting nationalistic policies. Claiming to represent “the true people” in contrast with usurpers alleged to threaten the identity and integrity of each nation (Wodak 2015; Lorenzetti 2018), these parties (*League* in Italy, *Rassemblement National* in France, *UKIP* and *Brexit Party* in the United Kingdom, the Dutch *Freedom Party*, *FPÖ* in Austria among others) and their leaders promote the creation of ever new linguistic, political, and physical “borders”. They put the core principles of democratic systems and fundamental human rights at stake with harshly divisive and dehumanising rhetoric, they showing that solidity and barriers are far from dead in the liquid world (Bauman 2000).

Discourse lies at the heart of exclusion and discrimination. Dominant group members, such as politicians, mass-media, or members of the educational, research or bureaucratic élites, with their privileged access to, and control over the most influential forms of public discourse play a crucial role in the discursive reproduction of discrimination and racism. What they say about outgroups or ethnic minorities, and how they say it, may have an impact on people’s minds, thus shaping attitudes towards them (Van Dijk 2002a; Bonilla-Silva 2003). Describing immigration as a “crisis” that requires “restrictions” is not neutral but evokes an issue-defining frame (Lakoff 2014). Framing immigration as a problem is not merely an oversimplification, but the more a frame is activated, the stronger it gets in people’s minds, pre-empting considerations of the multiple facets of such a complex phenomenon, most notably that of civil rights. Besides, politicians endorsing a highly stigmatising language towards ethnic minorities, framing them as dangerous, using racial slurs or animal personifications to refer to them, normalise the use of such a language and are ultimately responsible for the spread of hostility and racism in society (Van Dijk 2013).

Critical discourse analysis as a type of discourse analytical framework is interested in the study of the ways social power abuse, dominance, manipulation and inequality are enacted by text and talk (Van Leeuwen and Wodak 1999; Van Dijk 2001, 2013; Wodak 2015). Drawing on Van Dijk’s (2013) socio-cognitive framework and Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and framing (Lakoff 2014), this paper addresses the rhetorical representation of migrant people in the oratory of American President Donald Trump and Italian *League* leader Matteo Salvini, two politicians who reflect the globalised return of populism to the political scene, in two corpora of collected speeches and tweets.

Primarily focusing on the lexical level of analysis, the argumentative frame, and the rhetorical strategies employed, Trump’s rhetoric of the forgotten man, foregrounding the plight of working-class whites at the expense of other ethnic minorities is compared with Matteo Salvini’s anti-immigration discourse (Kazin 2016). Not only do the two leaders share a consistent position on immigration, but they rely on similar communication tactics, including a straightforward language and a massive usage of social networks to

spread their messages according to the logic of virality, thus bypassing media channels, that they both portray as part of the corrupt establishment (Gerbaudo 2018; Mazzoleni and Bracciale 2018). These communicative strategies enable them to build a consensus community, legitimising and normalising the use of discriminating and racist language towards outsiders, by playing upon people's deeply rooted fears (Wodak 2015).

Despite the contextual and historical differences between right-wing populism in Europe and the US (Pelinka 2013), the data analysed highlight similar discursive strategies, pointing to a likely cross-fertilisation of ideas and strategies among right-wing populists across the globe, and the emergence of a "script" that can be flexibly adapted to multiple national settings. Moreover, Trump's coarse language and politically incorrect rhetoric might have had an impact and an additional legitimising effect on Salvini's anti-immigration language, but also on the rhetoric of other European right-wing populist politicians.

2. Right-Wing Populism

The pervasiveness and transversality of populist parties cross-nationally gaining ground on both the left and the right of the political spectrum has led scholars to argue that we are currently experiencing a "populist zeitgeist" (Mudde 2004). However, it is the right-wing parties' upsurge, conjuring *bêtes noires* of liberal democracy, such as xenophobia, racism, fascism, homophobia, and misogyny that drove the media to talk about a "populist epidemic" or a "populist contagion".

Bearing on the work of Freedman (1996), Mudde defined populism as a

thin-centered ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups: the "pure people" and the "corrupt elite", and which argues that politics should be the expression of the *volonté générale*, or general will, of the people. (Mudde 2004: 543)

All politicians, populists of different orientation, or even non-populists, appeal to the people as the primary addressee of political argumentation. In the last few years, however, we saw "the people" back in the foreground in political communication like never before. Let us consider an excerpt from Trump's Inaugural Address:

Today we are not merely transferring power from one Administration to another, or from one party to another – but we are transferring power from Washington, DC and *giving it back to you, the American People*⁵.

For too long, a small group in our nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of government while *the people have borne the cost*.

Washington flourished – but *the people did not share in its wealth*.

[...] What truly matters is not which party controls our government, but whether *our government is controlled by the people*.

20 January 2017, will be remembered as *the day the people became the rulers of this nation again*.

The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer.

(President Donald Trump's Inaugural Address, Washington DC, 20 January 2017)

⁵Emphasis by the author.

Aside from the symbolic occasion and *captatio benevolentiae* strategy, several senses of the expression “the people” appear in this speech. They are mostly references to the American people, as the primary addressees of this speech, thus defined by their nationality. They are sovereign and back in control of their government. However, they are also portrayed as those who “have borne the cost” (while the nation’s capital has reaped the government rewards), and as “the forgotten men and women” of the country. Therefore, the people are in charge, but at the same time, they have been betrayed and robbed of their wealth. In some occurrences, multiple senses seem to be intertwined.

Populism is based on Abraham Lincoln’s definition of democracy as “government of the people, for the people, and by the people”, but the identity of the people is never made explicit. This leads to one of the paradoxes of populism: who is included or excluded from the people is treated as a self-evident dogma, without taking cultural developments or societal cleavages into account. One of Laclau’s (2005) most influential observations is that populists do not speak for some pre-existing people, but rather bring the entity “the people” into being through a performative act of naming and their rhetorical representation (Smith 2001), since society is highly heterogeneous, and the construction of a popular subjectivity is possible only by reducing to the minimum its particularistic content (Laclau 2005).

The concept “the people” and its denotatum are fundamentally ambiguous in extension, as Latin *populus* and Greek *dēmos* (see Lorenzetti 2016 for a brief overview of these senses). Canovan (1984; 1999) isolates several senses of “the people”:

- The political community as a whole, *i.e.* “the united people” in a very inclusive sense.
- The people as a nation. An ethnic group in an exclusionary/nativist way, *i.e.* “our people” *versus* those who were not born here.
- The people as underdogs in contrast with a power class, thus referring to the less privileged majority inside the entire community.
- Ordinary people, a sense highlighting the egalitarian ideal in the appeal to the people, which in this case refers to “people in general”.

Populism may have different contents depending on the enemy it is mobilising against and is overall founded on a Manichean dichotomy between an underdog (the people) and some usurpers exploiting or threatening them. It is a narrative structure through which the crisis of a people can be popularised, and a group can be mobilised for something and often against someone. In whatever manner the people and its values are defined, there must always be an enemy as a *conditio sine qua non*, acting as a people’s definer, but also functioning as a scapegoat (Lee 2006) with whom to engage in perpetual confrontation (Wodak 2017).

The specific sense of “the people” put in the foreground, together with the identification of a specific type of usurper is ultimately crucial, among other characteristics, to differentiate between left-wing and right-wing populists. Both of them are (or claim to be) essentially anti-elitist. However, left-wing populists, who

have a strong ethical idea of how society should be ruled, and aim at empowering citizens and involving them in the direct decision-making process, put forward a pyramidal view of society, where corrupt élites or the economic establishment stand at the top (UP), while the exploited people are at the bottom of the social scale, as the underdogs (DOWN). On the other hand, right-wing populists, despite being anti-establishment, strongly emphasise a nuclear view of society, not just based on the UP/DOWN dichotomy “the people” *versus* “the élite”, but centred on the IN/OUT one “the people” *versus* “outsiders”, namely foreigners due to birth, citizenship, culture, religion, or race. The people here are conceived in a nativist sense, while outsiders are at the same time construed as out of the realm of legitimate people, but also less worthy, as the untouchables in the Indian caste system.

The construction of the people and its enemies, be they the establishment or foreigners, migrants, or Muslims, varies in their inclusionary or exclusionary specifics, sometimes implying a sort of conspiracy between these two outgroups to the detriment of “the people”.

Parties pursuing discrimination against societies or given social groups follow a narrow ethno-nationalist and potentially racist agenda. They claim to speak for the people, but the identity of this people is defined in a nativist sense by the exclusion of non-natives as outsiders. They are against multiculturalism, hence against globalisation, combine different political imaginaries and traditions, and evoke or rhetorically construct an idyllic past, or “heartland” in Taggart’s (2000) terms in the form of *ad hoc* identity narratives to create common ground with their “imagined community” (Anderson 1983), and the values they campaign for depend on local concerns (Wodak 2015). Ambiguity is their ID card, as they may flirt with fascism and nazism, proposing a revised interpretation of historical events, emphasise a perceived Islamic threat, or endorse a Christian conservative and reactionary agenda highlighting a particular vision of the American Dream (Pelinka 2013).

The use of divisive and aggressive rhetoric, characterised by scapegoating and covert or overt xenophobic messages sit at the core of nearly all contemporary right-wing populist parties, while in the most extreme cases migrants are portrayed as the vanguard of apocalyptic racial, religious and civilisational struggles (Taguieff 2001; Hogan and Haltinner 2015).

Right-wing populists simplify complex matters by looking for a culprit, a scapegoat to be blamed and construed as dangerous for the alleged cohesion of the nation, emphasising a nativist ideology.

Furthermore, they use anti-intellectualism, or the rhetoric of “common sense” (low style of performativity) (Moffitt and Ostiguy 2016), which is vital for spreading their message to the majority of the population, mobilising resentment and protest and normalising discriminating language. Social media affordances are key in offering the perfect platform for their performance (Moffitt 2016; Gerbaudo 2018).

3. Political Discourse and Racism

Political discourse is crucial in the production and reproduction of racism in society, since as a form of social practice it acts on people's mental models and frames, not only spreading and reinforcing ideological stances but also legitimising and favouring prejudice, hate speech and intolerance towards minorities (Van Dijk 2002a; Lakoff 2014).

Racism can be defined as a complex societal system of domination resulting in inequality and discrimination that "inscribes itself in practices [...], discourses and representations articulated around stigmata of otherness" (Balibar 1991: 17). It acts by conferring the dominated groups stereotyped features, and it is the combination of these practices of intolerance and contempt, discourses and representations based on negative stereotyping that enables us to account for the formation of racist communities.

Whilst real racism, with its explicit endorsement of racist ideologies and myths can be currently found only in the extreme right usually ostracised from the political spotlight, neo-racism tends to be very different from forms of slavery, apartheid and explicit derogation (Balibar 1991). New racism typically wants to prove itself democratic and respectable. Hence it denies being racism at all, and due to its often subtle and indirect nature, discourse is its primary setting of reproduction. What appears as "mere talk", far removed from forms of subjugation and segregation associated with the old practices of racism, may nevertheless be ultimately effective in marginalising and excluding specific minorities since ethnic prejudices and ideologies are neither innate nor spontaneous but acquired and learned through communication, i.e. through text and talk.

Racism rests on pseudo-scientific theories that, mimicking academic discourse, associate visible facts to hidden causes and connect with the spontaneous process of theorisation typical of the racism of the masses (Balibar 1991). In today's society, social media platforms, taking advantage of the social affordances of the Internet, which is alleged to cultivate homophily, the "tendency of similar individuals to form ties with each other" (Colleoni, Rozza and Arvidsson 2014: 318), are preferential settings for the spread and proliferation of such theories through the logic of virality enhanced by the exponential growth of fake news (Van Aelst et al. 2017; Gerbaudo 2018).

The periodical return of racism is a symptom of the inability of societies to accept their inherent heterogeneity, the vexing plurality of human beings, and cope with difficulty and difference (Young 1999; Bauman 2000; 2016), while at the same time it underscores an insurmountable dependency on archaic structures of collective thinking (Balibar 2005). Post-modern racism of the globalised world stems from mixophobia, the "fear of the unmanageable volume of the unknown, untamable, off-putting and uncontrollable" (Bauman 2016: 9). It is the product of some of the uncertainties of the individual in liquid society, namely existential precariousness, and material insecurity endemic in the social structure (Young 1999).

A characterising feature of these new forms of racism is that the category “immigration” today assumes the function that “race” had for earlier racism. This is a racism without races developed in the era of decolonisation, with a reversal of population movement from former colonies to big cities in the industrialised world. Minorities are no longer portrayed as biologically inferior, but as different. This racism postulates an alleged insurmountability of cultural differences, due to different values, customs, and lifestyles, without, at first glance, suggesting the superiority of certain groups of people over others. It is what Taguieff (2001) terms differentialist racism.

Differentialism posits the inevitability of group conflicts and the impossibility of conviviality among cultures. Its ultimate thesis is that it is necessary to keep “us” separate from “them”. Despite an apparently hierarchical neutrality, the different culture associated with minorities is regularly presented as having deficiencies or pathologies that need to be corrected, or as deviant based on the moral values and norms of dominant groups (Bonilla-Silva 2003).

The theory of cultural differentialism at the basis of differentialist racism suggests that globalisation occurs only on the surface, while the nuclear elements of each culture remain unaffected. The world is seen as a mosaic of separate cultures largely independent of one another. Huntington’s *Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of the World Order* with its telling title is the most famous and controversial example of this theory. Displaying a concern for the decline of the West, and especially of the US, threatened by multiculturalism, Huntington (2011) argues in favour of cultural continuity and cultural purity within civilisations. In his ideal sense globalisation is a process, where civilisations will continue to exist and move in largely parallel fashion. Behind a simplistic representation of cultures as monolithic entities, it is not hard to detect ideas, like the purity of culture, or the exclusion of minorities, that recall “spectres of the past”, like fascism and nazism, and promote racism and Islamophobia.

3.1 Critical Discourse Analysis and the Structural Properties of Racist Discourse

The main characteristic of racist discourse is the negative portrayal of “the others” combined with the positive presentation of one’s own group. A corollary of this strategy is to avoid or mitigate the positive representation of the others and the negative presentation of one’s group. Such a goal may be accomplished through multiple levels of discourse, or more effectively, with the joint combination of multiple linguistic strategies.

Critical discourse analysis (or critical discourse studies) is the broad research framework focusing on the relationship between language, power and domination, and investigates the ways language and discourse, in general, may contribute to enacting a system of power abuse and discrimination (Van Dijk 2001; 2006; Wodak 2015).

This paper sets itself within this research paradigm and, influenced by Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and framing (Lakoff 2014), builds on Van Dijk’s (2002b; 2013) socio-cognitive framework, viewing discourse as a social practice.

Based on Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) metaphors are structuring principles of thought that organise most of our experiences through mappings between familiar (source) and unfamiliar (target) knowledge domains, and language presents evidence of the metaphorical nature of our conceptual system⁶.

Van Dijk's socio-cognitive model, on the other hand, is characterised by its reliance on the Discourse–Cognition–Society triangle and studies the relationship between discourse and society, arguing that it is cognitively mediated. Social structures and discourse structures can only be related through the mental representations of language users, in both their roles as individuals and as social beings. In this line of research, the linguistic structures of texts which contribute to their discursive component are interpreted and explained in terms of underlying, socially shared beliefs and ideologies, considering the ways they influence people's mental models (Van Dijk 2002b; 2006; 2013). Finally, the extent to which and how such discourses and their underlying cognitions are socially and politically functional in the (re)production and spread of inequality is investigated.

Van Dijk (2002a; 2013) outlines several linguistic and discursive dimensions in which this system of domination can be linguistically enacted:

- At the syntactic level, passives and nominalisations help in mitigating the role of ingroup members in negative actions, whereas the role of outsiders as agents is emphasised in active constructions.
- At the lexical level, negatively connoted lexemes are selected to refer to "them", while more positive terms are chosen for "us".
- At the propositional level, negative meanings about outgroups may be emphasised with an accumulation of negative predicates and their related implications, pointing to the portrayal of immigrants as criminals or abusers, also thanks to a high level of granularity in the event description. Conversely, negative actions by ingroup members are vaguely and indirectly mentioned.
- At the topic level, in the polarised structure of ideological discourse, negative aspects about the outgroups are underlined, such as crimes, deviance, or violence, with the result that immigration is framed as dangerous or problematic in multiple respects. Positive aspects about outgroup members are largely de-emphasised or altogether ignored, while ingroup members are globally presented as tolerant, often with disclaimers mitigating any negative comment they are about to make ("I have nothing against blacks/Muslims/ immigrants, but..."). One of the functions of such disclaimers is to form a positive self-presentation, ensuring that the second part of the utterance is not interpreted as racist.
- At the global level of *schemata* or frames (Fillmore 1982), narrative argumentation is tailored to provide evidence that immigration is a problem, a burden, a danger, or a threat. Frames allow human beings to understand reality, shape the way we

⁶ An example of metaphorical mapping is LOVE IS A JOURNEY, that goes from the source domain (JOURNEY) to the more abstract target domain (LOVE). In CMT mappings are conventionally written in capital letters with the mapping from source to target domain being presented in the reverse order, as TARGET IS SOURCE (Lakoff and Johnson 1980).

think and even impact on how we act. The more such deep frames are activated through repetition, and reinforced, the more they become entrenched in people's mind, pre-empting the activation of the opposite frame or blocking relevant concerns if those concerns are outside the scope of the frame. In the case of immigration, right-wing populist politicians have an interest in strengthening the "immigration is a problem" frame. Hence moral concerns related to *pietas* or solidarity are blocked (Lakoff 2006; 2014).

- Rhetorical devices, such as metaphor, metonymy, hyperbole, euphemism, and irony, are extremely effective in underlining the "us" versus "them" dichotomy leading to the emergence of specific mappings. Metaphor is undoubtedly the most widely employed rhetorical figure and is particularly effective in political discourse. Not only is it used to simplify and make issues more intelligible, stir emotions and bridge the gap between the logical and the emotional, but Charteris-Black (2011) argues, it is also effective for its ability to resonate with latent symbolic representations at our unconscious level. Moreover, it frames the debate, thus setting the political agenda (Lakoff 2014) contributing to the formation of covert ideologies through myth-making.

In relation to immigration, metaphor is pivotal in conveying ideologically-biased interpretations, also due to the range of conflicting representations that may be activated in public discourse. The possibility of embracing the victims of dictatorial regimes or repression is often counterbalanced by fear of terrorism. Alternatively, immigrants are associated with burdens, for the alleged possibility of driving down natives' wages. Moreover, in right-wing populist discourse, the rhetorical potential of metaphor is exploited in reinforcing both conscious and subliminal fears of alien invasions and consequent conflicts (IMMIGRATION IS WAR), while dehumanising metaphors, of immigrants as natural disasters or as animals have also been repeatedly identified (Santa Ana 1997; Musolff 2015). An important asset for political leaders using metaphors of this kind, it is here argued, is that in most cases an alleged racist or discriminatory intention may be easily denied as accidental and unwanted.

The skilful interplay of multiple rhetorical strategies in the same speech makes it particularly effective, distracting the audience from the single strategy and any on-going manipulatory intent (Van Dijk 2006; Lakoff 2014).

4. Data and Methodology

For the purpose of investigating the rhetorical representation of immigration in Donald Trump's and Matteo Salvini's oratory, two corpora have been created, including policy-making speeches, consensus-building ones (electoral campaign speeches) (Charteris-Black 2013), and Twitter posts of the two leaders.

Both corpora selected contain approximately 65000 tokens. Speeches range from the period 2015-2019. As for Twitter, 1000 tweets of the leaders have been collected from their two accounts, @realDonaldTrump and @matteosalvinimi, from December 2018 to April 2019, excluding retweets. The time range chosen is significant, because it coincides with both Donald Trump's candidacy as American President and subsequent start of presidential term, and also marked Matteo Salvini's rising success as *League* secretary,

senator, Deputy-Prime Minister, and Interior Minister⁷. Moreover, the growing threat of Islamic terrorism and the dramatic increase in immigration from Africa and the Middle East make this time frame salient from the perspective of anti-immigration rhetoric.

Some remarks are in order on the decision to include social media data in this study. The rise to public prominence of social media has coincided with a moment of deep discontent with politics and of profound global crisis. Social networks have become preferential platforms for people as *cahiers de doléances*, where they can make their voice heard with attacks against the economic and political establishment and the mainstream media (Gerbaudo 2018). Online discussions provide a sort of meeting place, where individuals can gather in a temporary fusion into a new collective identity with some shared sense of community or purpose.

The interactive features of social networks have also increasingly provided populist movements and media-savvy leaders with a way not just to constantly update their followers on their political agenda, but also to market consensus through never-ending propaganda. Both Trump and Salvini are renowned for their ability to exploit the mediatic affordances of social networks. Since his candidacy in 2015, Trump has constantly used Twitter as a preferred channel over press conferences also due to his disdain for the alleged “fake news media”. As President, he keeps using his private account to disseminate his ideology with an impactful, simple, and straightforward language of common words, while media channels often report his tweets as news (Demata 2018).

As for Salvini, since his party started to grow in consensus, passing from niche ethno-nationalist party promoting the independence of Northern Italy (the so-called *Padania*)⁸ to national party with representation in the Italian government, nationwide support, and an increasingly nationalistic and anti-immigration agenda, he skillfully exploited the power of social media communication to demonise his opponents, stoke fears about marauding migrants, and accuse bureaucrats (Donadio 2019). However, he also displays an aura of authenticity mixing incendiary rhetoric with cheeriness and pizza- or pasta-posts to present himself as “one of the people”.

This study has a primarily qualitative aim and comparatively investigates the structures and strategies employed in the framing of immigration by the two leaders. Particular attention is devoted to the lexical level of analysis and rhetorical devices employed. However, the first part of the analysis has been conducted which a mixed quantitative-qualitative methodology, searching for relevant collocates of selected lexemes through the Sketch Engine query interface. Meanings are mostly constructed in context, through words in combinations, but in non-compositional ways, not by merely summing individual units, and features such as patterns of co-occurrence have a central function in the language system (Rundell 2018). Furthermore, collocations can provide insights into the narrative polarisation of discourse.

⁷ Matteo Salvini had the roles of Deputy-Prime Minister and Interior Minister until September 2019, after the end of the so called “yellow-green” government with *Five Star Movement (Movimento 5 Stelle)*.

⁸ It is worth noticing that the *League* was called *Northern League (Lega Nord)* until 2017. That was a turning point explicitly marking a new political agenda for the party. Changes in the political interests and tactics of the party, however, had started when Matteo Salvini became Secretary in 2013.

5. Donald Trump's and Matteo Salvini's Anti-Immigration Rhetoric: Linguistic Analysis

The study consists of two parts. Firstly, a co-occurrence pattern analysis using a corpus-linguistic methodology is presented, while a qualitative analysis of the rhetorical strategies employed follows.

5.1 Co-occurrence patterns analysis

The corpora collected have been queried through the Sketch Engine interface to outline the most relevant co-occurrence patterns for the terms "immigrant", "immigration" (and their Italian counterparts). The term "alien" has also been queried in the case of Trump, being a relevant and established legal term in Common Law Jurisdictions.

"Immigrant(s)" occurs 67 times in the Trump corpus, "alien" is reported 37 times, while "immigration" has 74 occurrences. The adjective "illegal"⁹ in combinations, such as "illegal immigrants" or "illegal aliens" frames immigrants as criminals who must be punished, although their offence is of a very different entity compared to prototypical criminals (1), while "criminal" often occurs in clusters with other elements (2). "Immigrant" may be found with post-modifiers, in constructions of the form (Pre-mod+N+Post-mod) (3). Both these cluster-combinations of negatively connoted elements have an intensifying function to stress the "illegal frame", activating the idea of an emergency that must be fought.

A few *hapax legomena* as pre-modifiers are also worth mentioning since despite not being statistically significant, they are indicative of the general attitude towards the phenomenon. For instance, "low-skilled" emphasises the problem of economic migrants, portrayed as unfit for the competitive American job market. At the same time "many", "million", and "uncontrolled" as pre-modifiers of "immigration" in turn stress the idea of an overwhelming number of incoming people.

- (1) "Notice that *illegal immigrants* will be given ObamaCare and free college tuition, but nothing has been mentioned about our VETERANS". (D. Trump)
- (2) "We will begin *removing* the more than 2 million *criminal illegal immigrants* from the country". (D. Trump)
- (3) "Texas Police arrested a *serial illegal immigrant rapist* who had been *deported* five times". (D. Trump)

"Alien" frequently co-occurs with the adjective "criminal" but may be preceded by a 2-adjective group, as in (4). These combinations do not just stress criminality, but also otherness since "alien" in popular culture is associated with nonhuman beings invading from outer space to take over the planet. This language is dehumanising, emphasising an assumed 'diversity' of "them" on multiple grounds, thus pre-empting the activation of any solidarity-frame with feelings of empathy for people crossing the border in precarious conditions.

⁹ Potter (2014) provides evidence of the emergence of "illegal" used as a noun in public discourse, in the plural "illegals". Although this usage is not documented in our corpus, it appears as a further strategy aimed at the dehumanisation of immigrants.

- (4) “Donald Trump will end *illegal immigration* once and for all and remove *dangerous criminal aliens* from our country”. (D. Trump)

The lexicon employed highlights security as the primary concern. The issue-defining frame is also activated by such verbs as “stop”, “end”, or “control”. Moreover, a dehumanising strategy is employed with verbs like “deport”, associated with jail detention, or “remove”, equating people with objects. Results are summarised in Tables 1, 2 and 3 with the 3 most frequent collocates.

Pre-modifier + <i>Immigrant/s</i>		<i>Immigrant</i> + post-modifier		Verb + <i>Immigrant</i> as Object		<i>Immigrant</i> as Subject	
<i>illegal</i>	34	<i>killer</i>	2	<i>deport</i>	3	<i>kill</i>	22
<i>criminal</i>	10	<i>rapist</i>	2	<i>detain</i>	2	<i>murder</i>	19
<i>undocumented</i>	2	<i>gang member</i>	2	<i>apprehend</i>	2	<i>beat</i>	4

Table 1: Co-occurrence patterns for “immigrant” in the Trump Corpus

Pre-modifier + <i>Immigration</i>		<i>Immigration</i> + post-modifier		Verb + <i>Immigration</i> as Object		<i>Immigration</i> as Subject	
<i>illegal</i>	35	<i>proposal</i>	9	<i>end</i>	25	<i>cost</i>	10
<i>unlimited</i>	7	<i>reform</i>	5	<i>stop</i>	15	<i>control</i>	5
<i>massive</i>	5	<i>security</i>	2	<i>control</i>	10	<i>come</i>	3

Table 2: Co-occurrence patterns for “immigration” in the Trump Corpus

Despite the different situational contexts, similar patterns emerge in the Salvini corpus for “immigrant(s)” (*immigrato/i*) and “immigration” (*immigrazione*)¹⁰. “Immigration” occurs 59 times, while 44 occurrences are reported for “immigrant(s)”. Salvini’s use of adjectives with the two terms highlights the idea of something necessarily wrong and defying standards of lawfulness and regularity, as someone “clandestine” hides from the law, and as such is construed as inherently bad (5). The presence of apparently benevolent verbs, like “disembark”, or “recover”, references to the salvages of migrants at sea, strategically employed for positive self-presentation, is counterbalanced by “stop” or “block” as co-occurring terms of “immigration” framed as a problem (6). The term “invasion” is also

Pre-modifier + <i>Alien</i>		Verb + <i>Alien</i> as Object	
<i>criminal</i>	18	<i>deport</i>	9
<i>violent</i>	11	<i>remove</i>	5
<i>dangerous</i>	8	/	

Table 3: Co-occurrence patterns for “alien(s)” in the Trump Corpus

¹⁰ Translation from Italian into English of the terms and examples reported by the author.

significantly used as a mantra by the leader, depicting a scenario of a society at war, a right-populist reference to the “us” versus “them” dichotomy in a nativist sense, implying that outsiders are usurpers who claim rights they do not have.

- (5) “DP¹¹ has already caused enough problems to the country, allowing *reckless clandestine immigration*”. (M. Salvini)
 (6) “*Stop irregular immigration. Stop Invasion*”. (M. Salvini)

As reported in the case of Trump in (2) and (3), although in fewer instances, the noun “immigrant(s)” may be used as a post-modifier (7a) or be followed by other post-modifiers (7b). Even in this case, the function of the construction is to reinforce the idea of a security danger with a group of lexemes pertaining to the domain of unlawful activities.

- (7a) “Thanks to our Police, who arrested 7 *drug dealers (most of them immigrants)*”. (M. Salvini)
 (7b) “*An immigrant with a criminal record* was arrested after causing panic”. (M. Salvini)

A summary of the main co-occurring patterns is reported in Tables 4a and 4b.

Pre-modifier + Immigrant(s)		Verb + Immigrant/s as Object	
<i>clandestine</i>	17	<i>disembark</i>	7
<i>irregular</i>	11	<i>recover</i>	5
<i>illegal</i>	7	<i>individuate</i>	3

Table 4. a: Co-occurrence patterns for “immigrant(s)” (Immigrato/i) in the Salvini Corpus

Pre-modifier + Immigration		Verb + Immigration as Object	
<i>clandestine</i>	27	<i>stop</i>	25
<i>illegal</i>	16	<i>block</i>	13
<i>irregular</i>	10	<i>handle</i>	5

Table 4. b: Co-occurrence patterns for “immigration” (immigrazione) in the Salvini Corpus

What emerges from this co-occurrence pattern analysis is that immigration is never presented in a favourable light. On the contrary, both leaders stress the view of a security danger and display a tough-on-crime attitude, although Salvini tries to show a benevolent humanitarian side with references to the salvages at sea.

5.2 Anti-Immigration Rhetorical Strategies: Immigration as a threat

Coherently with the results in 5.1, and showing similar trends as identified in academic research on political discourse about immigration (Santa Ana 1997; Van Dijk 2002a; 2013; Charteris-Black 2006; Hogan and Haltinner 2015; Musolff 2015; Wodak 2015), the data examined suggest that in the discourse of both Donald Trump and Matteo Salvini the category “immigration” displays a strongly negative polarisation.

The effectiveness of the anti-immigration rhetoric enacted by the two leaders, it is here argued, rests on its being strategically articulated around multiple aspects

¹¹ Democratic Party (*Partito Democratico*), the Italian leading centre-left party.

which cover some of the basic fears of the individual in liquid society, insisting on one's existential precariousness and insecurity (Bauman 2000). The narratives put forward by the two leaders trigger the interpretation of immigration as a threat on multiple grounds:

- A threat to security
- A threat to the economy
- A threat to culture

These three alleged threats, it is here argued, are not equally salient, but stronger emphasis is placed on security, which, also thanks to an effective "visual rhetoric", as exemplified by images of Trump's wall at the border with Mexico on tv, or of the police dismantling Gypsy camps, can generate "an atmosphere of a state of emergency, of an enemy at the gates" (Bauman 2016: 27).

The "(naturally) good insiders" *versus* "bad outsiders" dichotomy typical of nationalistic rhetoric, which in a nativist sense promotes the interests of native inhabitants over immigrants (Wodak 2015) is portrayed in (8), with an emphasis on border politics evoking the NATION IS A CONTAINER mapping (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). The IMMIGRATION IS WAR mapping is also indirectly evoked, with hints at conflicts and invasions, while the word "border" represents an ideological trope evoking a *limen* between American exceptionalism and Latin American weakness, separating law from the absence of law (Demata 2017; Heuman and González 2018).

- (8) "Countless innocent American lives have been *stolen* because our politicians have failed in their duty to *secure our borders*". (D. Trump)

In (9) Trump operates a discriminatory generalisation equating Mexicans with crime. Such equivalence leads to the metonymic chain CRIMINAL FOR IMMIGRANT, which on occasion may turn into TERRORIST FOR IMMIGRANT. The noun *Mexico* here is also used metonymically to refer to the government, thus licensing the idea that immigrants are passive objects expelled by a government colluded with criminals. Outsiders are portrayed as inherently defective, ('they have lots of problems') (Taguieff 2001; Van Dijk 2002a) and are accused of letting those problems penetrate the country from without, thus activating the IMMIGRATION IS A WAR mapping, but also indirectly another fear, that of immigrants bringing disease into the country (IMMIGRATION IS A WEED/IMMIGRATION IS A DISEASE/IMMIGRATION IS POLLUTION).

The disease is figurative here, referring to the corruption and crime allegedly insinuated into the country, thus putting the good American people in danger. The security problem is reinforced by parallelism and the list of three apodictic statements underlining Trump's negative stance, a derogatory evaluation presented as common knowledge, as something that does not need to be substantiated any further. The last part of this passage, on the other hand, is a face-saving hedged disclaimer attempting to mitigate his discriminatory stance.

- (9) "When Mexico sends its people, *they're not sending their best*. [...]They're sending *people with lots of problems*, and they're bringing those problems with

us. They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people". (D. Trump)

In (10) with a strategy that shows a remarkable similarity to that of other right-wing populists¹², but also partly licensed by the media frequently talking about migratory waves or migratory flows, immigrants are compared with liquids, with floods and with some apocalyptic plague licensing the dehumanising mapping IMMIGRATION IS A NATURAL DISASTER, but also IMMIGRANTS ARE INSECTS/RATS, and IMMIGRATION IS A DISEASE (Santa Ana 1997).

(10) "They don't care about crime and want *illegal immigrants*, no matter how bad they may be, to *pour into* and *infest our country*". (D. Trump)

Salvini also thrives on equating immigrants with crime, thanks to the deeply rooted fear of terrorism in Europe. In (11) his strategy is casting doubt about the legitimacy of their refugee status, claiming that they are not genuine. Either they are economic migrants or terrorists, thus in one case they would be classified as parasites for the economy, or simply as criminals. His argumentation goes on by evoking the war scenario with alleged enemies disembarking on the Italian shores and infiltrating the country with crime. The mapping IMMIGRATION IS WAR is relevant here, together with the metonymy TERRORIST FOR IMMIGRANT. It is worth noticing that similarly to Trump in (9), here the fact that immigrants bring a rise in crime rates is treated as a fact and is not substantiated.

(11) "In the last few years 160.000 fake refugees disembarked in our country. They do not flee from war, but bring war to our country. Look at crime statistics, rape, burglaries and homicides". (M. Salvini)

In anti-immigration rhetoric, immigrants are mostly treated as collectivities, and their otherness, their not being rightful members of "the people" is their defining feature in a way that deprives them of their humanity and identity as single human beings and does not attract feelings of empathy. Coherently with the strategies outlined by Van Dijk (2013) to enact the rhetoric of exclusion, when single outgroup members are mentioned, the focus is on their negative acts presented with a fine-grained description, as in (12), leading to the CRIMINAL FOR IMMIGRANT equivalence chain. It is worth noticing that the slogan preceded by the hashtag is very similar to Trump's "Zero tolerance for criminal aliens", showing a perfect strategy coordination between the two leaders.

(12) "A clandestine from Northern African armed with a knife got on a bus in Milan causing panic among the passengers. We are working for his EXPULSION to his home country. #Zerotolerance for criminals". (M. Salvini)

The second type of relevant threat articulated is about the economy and thrives on the fear of the individual of losing personal economic independence. It is commonly held that in many countries, immigrants readily accept underpaid jobs that natives

¹² Marine Le Pen of *Rassemblement National* often talks of *vagues migratoires* (migratory tides) in her speeches.

would not want. The economic threat narrative focuses on the alleged possibility of immigrants driving down wages, or reducing jobs, thus emphasising their parasitic nature, with the mappings IMMIGRATION IS A BURDEN, and IMMIGRANTS ARE PARASITES. In (13), this is strategically reinforced by two additional elements. One is the fact that immigrants are presented as low-skilled, therefore not fit for the American highly competitive job market, which also makes them inherently defective by nature (Taguieff 2001), hence unwanted. The second element used by Trump to strengthen his point is a *captatio benevolentiae* strategy directed at African Americans and other Latinos in the country. Explicitly addressing other minorities, who have been targets of discrimination and racism in the past, and still are today, enables him to show a benevolent attitude including them as legitimate members of “the American people”, and hence inherently good (Bonilla-Silva 2003). The parasitic nature of immigrants is also hinted at in (1), where they are juxtaposed with veterans, implying that they do not deserve any help or provisions because they have not contributed to the American society and its values as veterans have.

- (13) “Uncontrolled, low-skilled immigration that continues to reduce jobs and wages for American workers, and especially for African-American and Hispanic workers within our country. Our citizens”. (D. Trump)

Salvini resorts to a ridiculing strategy through hyperbole to dismiss refugees as a fraud (14), also indirectly criticising his left-wing opponents for the rise in crime on account of their “do-gooder” (*buonista*) attitude towards “illegal” immigrants, and for not caring about Italians still resenting of the economic crisis.

- (14) “The party is over for clandestines in luxury hotels, while Italians are unemployed”. (M. Salvini)

Part of this strategy is also explicitly stating who is entitled to a job and a welfare service, hence the nativist slogans “America First”, and its Italian mirror copy “Italians first”, thus once again separating those IN, worthy of attention as lawful citizens, from those OUT, not deserving anything as aliens, others, unimportant.

On the other hand, the parasitic nature of (criminal) immigration is highlighted in (15), where through a hyperbole Salvini ridicules the previous government attitude blamed for saving not just human lives (“taxi service”), but criminals’ lives (CRIMINAL FOR IMMIGRANT), while economic resources should be used for honest Italians (IMMIGRANTS ARE PARASITES).

- (15) “I don’t want any wall. I just don’t like that our military ships are used as a taxi service by thousands of clandestine migrants”. (M. Salvini)

The third type of threat articulated focuses on a danger for the alleged cohesion of the country, its values and culture. In (16) and (17) Trump delineates his prototype of the ideal immigrant candidate. Immigrants are supposed to endorse the American values, although those values are just vaguely articulated and are supposed to be unanimously shared by the people, and never changing. Here the contrast rests on different values and an alleged cultural incompatibility leading to a problematic coexistence. The

main point is that foreigners are supposed to renounce to their own original culture and identity to enter a new one. The verb “assimilate” in this respect is indicative of what Lévi-Strauss (1955) called an anthropophagic strategy. Anthropophagic societies, he argued, deal with strangers and deviants by swallowing them up, making them their own and gaining strength from them. This strategy involves the “annihilation of their otherness” (Bauman 2000: 101). Lévi-Strauss associated this aspect with primitive societies, claiming that modern societies are anthropoemic, that is they vomit out the deviant, keeping them outside of society, barring dialogue and physical contact with them, to the extreme of deportation or incarceration, or the more modern variants of ghettos and spatial separation. Modern society, however, Young (1999) contends, still contains both swallowing and ejecting aspects, and is nevertheless based on the presumption that all that is alien is inherently defective, hence must be either corrected (redeemed from a Christian point of view) or expelled, as it happens in the case of immigrants’ deportations, or the building of separation walls.

(16) “I only want to admit individuals into our country who will support *our values* and love *our people*”. (D. Trump)

(17) “Not everyone who seeks to join our country will be able to successfully *assimilate*. Sometimes it’s just not going to work out. It’s our right to choose immigrants that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us”. (D. Trump)

Salvini expresses the same stance in a coarse language in (18). Immigrants here are framed as invaders, usurpers, and criminals, thus triggering the overlapping of more threats.

(18) “This city welcomes you with values, roots and culture. It’s an open city but demanding respect, if you don’t pay respect, we’ll kick your ass out of here”. (M. Salvini)

The thesis of cultural differentialism (Huntington 2011) at the basis of differentialist racism (Balibar 1991; Taguieff 2001) is explicitly presented in (19), where Salvini hints at an alleged Western cultural superiority. Differentialist racism views cultures as homogenous, dogmatic and monolithic entities not supposed to embrace differences or multiculturalism since the integration of a different culture would lead to a sort of (cultural) pollution of their original values (IMMIGRATION IS WAR, IMMIGRATION IS POLLUTION). Islamism is a favourite target for the cultural differentialist threat, with the generalisation TERRORISM FOR ISLAMISM. This is countered by “our house”, referring at the same time to the country/continent (NATION/EUROPE IS A BUILDING) and to Judaic-Christian values (20).

(19) “Immigration is a system to *dismantle those values* grown together with the progress of this continent”. (M. Salvini)

(20) “Islamic terrorist uses mass immigration to affirm that Europe is theirs. Europe is not Islamic; it’s our house. It’s not and will never be Islamic”. (M. Salvini)

The threat to culture, concerning one’s identity, is less prominent than the security

and the economy ones that have to do with people's and society's interests. Threat-to-culture discourse relies on colour-blind language, which explains contemporary racial inequalities as the outcome of non-racial dynamics, such as market dynamics, naturally occurring phenomena and outgroup-imputed limitations (Bonilla-Silva 2003). Arguing that race no longer matters and that society has moved beyond racism more subtly and insidiously enables people and politicians to employ derogatory and covert racist rhetoric, while at the same time mitigating possible accusations of racism (Holling, Moon and Jackson 2014).

6. Conclusions

Despite the contextual differences in the phenomenon of immigration in the US and in Italy, our linguistic analysis reveals similar stances, and a strong negative polarisation of immigration in the rhetoric of both Donald Trump and Matteo Salvini, with the absence of any positive mapping or frame. The rhetorical representation of immigration as something that "does not belong to us", without any sympathy in two countries that have both been characterised by in-coming or out-going migration in the past, is here articulated around the threat trope. The emphasis on a nuclear view of society based on the right-wing populist IN/OUT dichotomy in a nativist sense (Wodak 2015), and the remarkably similar lexical and rhetorical strategies adopted by the two leaders, sometimes resorting to identical slogans, point to a cross-fertilisation of ideas among right-wing populists across the globe, and the emergence of a "script" that may be flexibly adapted to different national contexts. Immigration is framed as a security threat activating fears of crime, drugs and terrorism invading the country from outside, with the IMMIGRATION IS WAR and IMMIGRATION IS A DISEASE mappings. The economic threat narrative highlights the view of immigrants as parasites (IMMIGRATION IS A BURDEN) pitting them against the forgotten men and women of the country that these two leaders claim to bring back at the centre of the political scene. Dehumanising metaphorical mappings are also relevant to the flood imagery (IMMIGRATION IS A NATURAL DISASTER) stressing the overwhelming number of incoming people.

Immigrants are mostly framed as collectivities with a focus on their otherness and their presumed criminal status, and when single cases are discussed, the focus is still on the negative actions of the outgroup member. The last threat highlights an alleged cultural incompatibility, in particular between Christianity and Islamism, but also presuming a veiled Western cultural superiority, thus enacting differentialist racism (Taguieff 2001).

A rhetoric of exclusion is enacted framing the arguments in a colour-blind language, while forms of both covert and more overt racist discourse can be outlined in the rhetoric of the two leaders pointing out the importance to keep "us" separate from "them" (Bonilla-Silva 2003). Self-glorification of American exceptionalism and Italian endorsement of Christian values is counterbalanced by the dehumanising language used for minorities, treated as homogeneous entities, as undifferentiated

and as alien. An instrumental logic leading to the criminalisation of immigration is supported by a process that pre-empts the activation of solidarity- or human rights-frames, obscuring the sufferings and pain of human beings from view. This technique is facilitated by what Bauman terms *adiaphorisation*, the restriction of “the realm of moral obligations that we are ready to admit and take responsibility for” (Bauman 2016: 80). *Adiaphoric* action is measured only against a purpose-oriented logic, dismissing a moral evaluation. The use of a stigmatising and dehumanising language, diminishing the moral status of immigrants, highlighting an alleged criminal intent, and turning them into perceived threats as undesirables to be controlled or expelled facilitates this logic of immorality and legitimates the spread of discriminatory behaviour in society.

References

- Anderson Benedict (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Balibar Étienne (1991). "Is there a 'neo-racism'?". In: Étienne Balibar, Immanuel Wellerstein (eds). *Race, Nation, Class. Ambiguous Identities*. London: Verso, 17-28.
- Balibar Étienne (2005). "The construction of racism". *Actuel Marx*, 38/2, 11-28.
- Bauman Zygmunt (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bauman Zygmunt (2016). *Strangers at Our Door*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bonilla-Silva Eduardo (2003). *Racism without Racists. Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Canovan Margaret (1984). "People, politicians and populism". *Government and Opposition*, 19/3, 312-327.
- Canovan Margaret (1999). "Trust the people! Populism and the two faces of democracy". *Political Studies*, 47/1, 2-16.
- Charteris-Black Jonathan (2006). "Britain as a container: immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign". *Discourse & Society*, 17/5, 563-581.
- Charteris-Black Jonathan (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric. The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. London: Palgrave.
- Charteris-Black Jonathan (2013). *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. London: Palgrave.
- Colleoni Elanor, Rozza Alessandro and Arvidsson Adam (2014). "Echo chamber or public sphere? Predicting political orientation and measuring political homophily in Twitter using big data". *Journal of Communication*, 64/2, 317-332.
- 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.
- Demata Massimiliano (2018). "' I think that maybe I wouldn't be here if it wasn't for Twitter'. Donald Trump's populist style on Twitter". *Textus*, XXXI/1, 67-90.
- Donadio Rachel (2019). "The new populist playbook". *The Atlantic*, 5 September 2019. <https://theatlantic.com/international/archive/2019/09/matteo-salvini-italy-populist-playbook/597298/>. Accessed 30 November 2019.
- Fillmore Charles J. (1982). "Frame Semantics". In: The Linguistic Society of Korea (ed). *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Company, 111-137.
- Freedon Michael (1996). *Ideologies and Political Theories: A Conceptual Approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gerbaudo Paolo (2018). "Social media and populism: an elective affinity?". *Media, Culture and Society*, 40/5, 745-753.
- Heuman Amy N., González Alberto (2018). "Trump's essentialist border rhetoric: racial identities and dangerous liminalities". *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 47/4, 326-342.

- Hogan Jackie, Haltinner Kristin (2015). "Floods, invaders and parasites: immigration threat narratives and right-wing populism in the USA, UK and Australia". *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 36/5, 520-543.
- Holling, Michelle, Moon G. Dreama and Jackson Nevis Alexandra (2014). "Racist violations and racializing apologia in a post-racism era". *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 7/4, 260-286.
- Huntington Samuel (2011). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Kazin Michael (2016). "Trump and American populism: old wine, new bottles". *Foreign Affairs*, 95/6, 17-24.
- Laclau Ernesto (2005). *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso.
- Lakoff George (2006). *Thinking Points. Communicating Our American Values and Vision*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Lakoff George (2014). *The All New Don't Think of an Elephant. Know your Values and Frame the Debate*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lakoff George, Johnson Mark (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Lee Michael J. (2006). "The populist chameleon: The People's Party, Huey Long, George Wallace, and the populist argumentative frame". *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 92/4, 355-378.
- Lévi-Strauss Claude (1955). *Tristes Tropiques*. New York, NY: Penguin.
- Lorenzetti Maria Ivana (2016). "Crafting an effective message for the masses, or the art of populism. An analysis of new populist rhetoric from a contrastive perspective". In: Marta Degani, Paolo Frassi and Maria Ivana Lorenzetti (eds). *The Languages of Politics/La politique et ses langages*. Newcastle Upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 125-157.
- Lorenzetti Maria Ivana (2018). "A cross-linguistic study of new populist language". In: Michael Kranert, Geraldine Horan (eds). *Doing Politics. Discursivity, Performativity and Mediation in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 153-177.
- Mair Peter (2003). *Ruling the Void. The Hollowing Out of Western Democracy*. London: Verso.
- Mazzoleni Giampietro, Bracciale Roberta (2018). "Socially mediated populism: the communicative strategies of political leaders on Facebook". *Palgrave Communications*, 4, 1-10.
- Moffitt Benjamin (2016). *The Global Rise of Populism. Performance, Political Style and Representation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Moffitt Benjamin, Ostiguy Pierre (2016). "Of course Donald Trump goes low. That's the populists' winning style". *The Washington Post*, 20 October 2016.
- <https://washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/10/20/of-course-donald-trump-goes-low-thats-the-populists-winning-style/>. Accessed 27 November 2019.
- Mudde Cas (2004). "The populist zeitgeist". *Government and Opposition*, 39/4, 541-563.
- Musolf Andreas (2015). "Dehumanizing metaphors in UK immigrant debates in press and online media". *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, 3/1, 41-56.

- Pelinka Anton (2013). "Right-wing populism: concept and typology". In: Ruth Wodak, Majid Khosravi-Nik and Brigitte Mral (eds). *Right-Wing Populism in Europe. Politics as Discourse*. London: Bloomsbury, 3-22.
- Potter Jennifer E. (2014). "Brown-skinned outlaws. An ideographic analysis of 'illegal(s)'". *Communication, Culture and Critique* 7, 228-245.
- Ritzer George, Dean Paul (2010). *Globalization. A Basic Text*. London: Blackwell.
- Rundell Michael (2018). "Searching for extended units of meaning – and what to do when you find them". *Lexicography*. 5/1, 5-21.
- Santa Ana Otto (1997). "Empirical analysis of anti-immigrant metaphor in political discourse". *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics* 4/1, 317-330.
- Smith Roger M. (2001). "Citizenship and the politics of people-building". *Citizenship Studies*, 5/1, 73-96.
- Taggart Paul (2000). *Populism*. Buckingham, PA: Open University Press.
- Taguieff Pierre-André (2001). *The Force of Prejudice: On Racism and Its Doubles*. Minneapolis, MA: University of Minnesota Press.
- UN DESA - United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2019). "International migrants numbered 272 million in 2019, continuing an upward trend in all major world regions". *Population Facts* 2019/4. http://un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/populationfacts/docs/MigrationStock2019_PopFacts_2019-04.pdf Accessed 25 November 2019.
- UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2019). "Global Trends. Forced Displacement in 2018" <http://unhcr.org/5d08d7ee7.pdf> Accessed 25 November 2019.
- Van Aelst Peter et al. (2017). "Political communication in a high-choice media environment: a challenge for democracy?". *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 41/1, 3-27.
- Van Dijk Teun (2001). "Critical discourse analysis". In: Deboah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton and Deborah Schiffrin (eds). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Blackwell, 352-371.
- Van Dijk Teun (2002a). "Discourse and racism". In: David Theo Goldberg, John Solomos (eds). *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*. London: Blackwell: 145-159.
- Van Dijk Teun (2002b). "Political discourse and political cognition". In: Paul Chilton, Christina Schaffner (eds). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 203-237.
- Van Dijk Teun (2006). "Discourse and manipulation". *Discourse & Society*, 17/2, 359-383.
- Van Dijk Teun (2013). "Ideology and discourse". In: Michael Freeden, Lyman Tower Sargent and Marc Stears (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 175-196.
- Van Leeuwen Theo, Wodak Ruth (1999). "Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis". *Discourse Studies* 1/1, 83-118.
- Wodak Ruth (2015). *The Politics of Fear. What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean*. London: SAGE.
- Wodak Ruth (2017). "The 'establishment', the 'élite' and the 'people'". *Journal of Language and Politics*, 16/4, 551-565.

Young Jock (1999). "Cannibalism and bulimia: patterns of social control in late modernity". *Theoretical Criminology*, 3/4, 387-407.

Sitography

Salvini Matteo (2015). Annual Report on Human Rights and Democracy in the World 2014 and the EU Policy on the Matter. 16/12/2015.

<http://europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/28404/seeall.html?type=CRE>. Accessed 25 November 2019.

Salvini Matteo (2016). Speech in Support of Stefano Parisi, candidate as Mayor of Milan. 30/04/2016. <https://youtube.com/watch?v=Hztxa0Fo8ck>. Accessed 25 November 2019.

Salvini, Matteo (2016). Speech in the Plenary Session of the European Parliament. 10/05/2016. <http://europarl.europa.eu/meps/en/28404/seeall.html?type=CRE>. Accessed 25 November 2019.

Salvini Matteo (2017). Speech in Koblenz. 21/01/2017. <https://youtube.com/watch?v=7dT5OXy7efs>. Accessed 25 November 2019.

Salvini Matteo (2018). League Speech in Piazza del Popolo, Rome. 08/12/2018. <https://facebook.com/salviniofficial/videos/366828123893170/>. Accessed 25 November 2019.

Salvini Matteo (2019). Speech in Piazza Duomo, Milan with right-wing European leaders. 18/05/2019. <https://youtube.com/watch?v=l2yYxKqgztl>. Accessed 25 November 2019.

Salvini Matteo Twitter Profile. https://twitter.com/matteosalvinimi?ref_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Eauthor. Accessed 28 November 2019.

Sketch Engine. *Lexicography* © Copyright - Lexical Computing CZ s.r.o. <https://sketchengine.eu/>. Accessed 30 November 2019.

Trump Donald (2015). Presidential Announcement Speech. New York, NY, 16/06/2015. <https://time.com/3923128/donald-trump-announcement-speech/>. Accessed 28 November 2019.

Trump Donald (2016). Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention. Cleveland, OH, 21/07/2016. <https://politico.com/story/2016/07/full-transcript-donald-trump-nomination-acceptance-speech-at-rnc-225974>. Accessed 28 November 2019.

Trump Donald (2016). Remarks on Immigration at the Phoenix Convention Center. Phoenix, AZ, 31/08/2016. <https://washingtonexaminer.com/full-text-donald-trumps-immigration-speech>. Accessed 28 November 2019.

Trump Donald (2017). Inaugural Presidential Address. Washington, DC, 20/01/2017. <https://whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/the-inaugural-address/> Accessed 28 November 2019.

Trump Donald (2018). State of the Union Address 2018. Washington, DC, 30/01/2018. <https://whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/president-donald-j-trumps-state-union-address/>. Accessed 28 November 2019.

Trump Donald (2019). State of the Union Address 2019. Washington, DC, 05/02/2019. <https://whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/president-donald-j-trumps-state-union-address-2/>. Accessed 28 November 2019.

Trump Donald Twitter Profile. <https://twitter.com/realdonaldtrump>. Accessed 28 November 2019.

Acknowledgments

This paper is part of the MIUR-founded Department of Excellence Project 2018-2022 “Digital Humanities applied to Modern languages” of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, University of Verona.

EDITOR

Umberto Morelli (Università di Torino)

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Marinella Belluati (Università di Torino)

Paolo Caraffini (Università di Torino)

Lara Piccardo (Università di Genova)

Rachele Raus (Università di Torino)

MANAGING EDITOR

Filippo Maria Giordano (Università di Torino)

DEPUTY MANAGING EDITOR

Giuseppe Sciara (Università di Torino)

SCIENTIFIC BOARD

María del Rosío Barajas Escamilla

(El Colegio de la Frontera Norte)

Marco Brunazzo

(Università di Trento)

Olga Butorina

(Institute of Europe, Russian Academy of Sciences)

Michelangelo Conoscenti

(Università di Torino)

Niccolò Conti

(Università di Roma Unitelma Sapienza)

Matthew D'Auria

(University of East Anglia)

Jean-Michel De Waele

(Université libre de Bruxelles)

Michel Dumoulin

(Université catholique de Louvain)

Corinne Gobin

(Université libre de Bruxelles)

Aylin Güney Gevrek

(Yaşar Üniversitesi)

Faizel Ismail

(University of Cape Town, School of Economics)

Herman J. Kraft

(University of the Philippines Diliman)

Thomas Kroll

(Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena)

Francisco Lara-Valencia

(Arizona St. University, School of Transborder Studies)

Garth Le Pere

(University of Pretoria)

Jacqueline Lo

(ANU, College of Arts and Social Sciences)

Corrado Malandrino

(Università del Piemonte Orientale "Amedeo Avogadro")

Antonio Moreno Juste

(Universidad Complutense de Madrid)

Luciano Morganti

(Vrije Universiteit Brussel)

Edoardo Novelli

(Università Roma Tre)

Joanna Nowicki

(Université de Cergy-Pontoise)

José Paradiso

(Universidad Nacional de Tres de Febrero)

Massimo Pendenza

(Università di Salerno)

Laura Polverari

(University of Strathclyde Glasgow)

Daniela Preda

(Università di Genova)

Vivien Ann Schmidt

(Boston University)

Mario Telò

(Royal Academy of Sciences, Brussels)

Jovan Teokarević

(University of Belgrade)

Pier Domenico Tortola

(University of Groningen)

Francesco Tuccari

(Università di Torino)

Enrique José Varela Álvarez

(Universidade de Vigo)

Pascaline Winand

(Director of Studies, College of Europe, Natolin)

Ruth Wodak

(Lancaster University)

EDITORIAL BOARD

Luca Barbaini, Andrea Becherucci,

Tiziana Bertaccini, Andrea Cofelice,

Angela Condello, Federico Donelli,

Giovanni Finizio, Giuseppe Gabusi,

Guido Levi, Anna Mastromarino, Marzia Ponso,

Stefano Quirico, Stefano Saluzzo, Marco Stolfo,

Federico Trocini, Lorenzo Vai

SPECIAL ISSUE - 2020

Publisher: Dipartimento di Culture,
Politica e Società (Università di Torino)

Review of manuscripts: double-blind review process

Contacts: redazione.deeuropa@unito.it

Website: www.deeuropa.unito.it

Logo and cover layout: Silvio Ortolani

Euro-American Relations in the Age of Globalization: Risks and Opportunities

Guest Editors

Massimiliano Demata, University of Turin

Marco Mariano, University of Turin

The special issue of *De Europa* on “Euro-American Relations in the Age of Globalization: Risks and Opportunities” includes multi-disciplinary approaches to the current Euro-American relations, with a focus on the new scenarios created by the Trump administration as well as at the crises and transformations in transatlantic relations during the three decades between 1989 and 2019



De Europa

Special Issue - 2020