Karin Stögner, PhD, studied sociology and history in Vienna and Paris and is currently lecturer at the Department of Sociology, University of Vienna and senior researcher at the Institute of Conflict Research in Vienna. 2009-2011 Marie Curie Fellow at Central European University, Budapest; 2013-2014 Erwin Schrödinger-Fellow at Lancaster University and at Georgetown University, Washington DC.
Recent publications: Nationalism and Antisemitism in the Postnational Constellation: Thoughts on Horkheimer, Adorno and Habermas. In C. A. Small (Ed.). *Global Antisemitism: A Crisis of Modernity* (pp. 121-134). Boston: Brill 2013. *Antisemitismus und Sexismus. Historisch-gesellschaftliche Konstellationen*. Baden-Baden: Nomos 2014.

Ruth Wodak, Distinguished Professor of Discourse Studies at Lancaster University, UK. Member of the British Academy of Social Sciences and the Academia Europaea. Co-editor of the journals *Discourse & Society, Critical Discourse Studies* and *Language and Politics*, and of the book series *Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture (DAPSAC)*. Recent book publications: *Analysing Fascist Discourse: European Fascism in Talk and Text* (with John Richardson, 2013, Routledge), *Rightwing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse* (with KhosraviNik and Mral, 2013, Bloomsbury) and *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual* (Palgrave, 2011). Her monograph *The Politics of Fear: The Meanings of Right-wing Populist Discourse* (Sage) is in press.

'The man who hated Britain' – the discursive construction of 'national unity' in the *Daily Mail*

Karin Stögner, University of Vienna
Ruth Wodak, Lancaster University

Abstract
In the fall of 2013 the British right-wing tabloid *Daily Mail* triggered a fierce controversy in the British media and public sphere, focused on the topics of antisemitism and patriotism/nationalism. It was sparked by the publication of an article on the famous British economist Ralph Miliband with the provocative headline "The man who hated Britain". The lead refers directly to the current leader of the British Labour Party, Ed Miliband: "Ed Miliband's pledge to bring back socialism is homage to his Marxist father. So what did Miliband Snr really believe in? The answer should disturb everyone who loves this country". In this paper, we analyse how Ralph Miliband is discursively constructed as a dangerous 'Other' in the *Daily Mail,* and the way in which this construction is subsequently politically instrumentalized in a campaign against his son, Ed Miliband. We focus on how a particular concept of national unity is constructed in this case with reference to the stereotype of the 'disloyal, intellectual, international, non-authentic Jew'. This figure emerges as the '*Iudeus ex machina*' in the scenario of impending doom in order, we assume, to distract attention from domestic politics and the structural issues facing British society and the British economy. In our analysis we tackle the multi-layered and complex interdependencies of - mostly coded -

1

antisemitic and nationalist rhetoric with the help of an interdisciplinary framework that integrates theoretical approaches to secondary antisemitism, nationalism, media studies, and Critical Discourse Studies, and related methodologies.

Keywords: Antisemitism, nationalism, national identity, Labour Party, United Kingdom, *Daily Mail*, Discourse-historical Approach, calculated ambivalence, coded antisemitism

1. Introduction: Staging a Debate about 'the Real British'

In April 2015, a couple of weeks before the general elections in the UK on May 7, Gulzabeen Afsar, a Tory candidate for Derby, posted on Facebook that she "can't take Mr. Ed Miliband seriously!!". In response to the comment that she should show "some respect for the future PM", she posted that she would "never ever drop that low to support the Al Yahud! Lol".[1] Also during the election campaign of 2015, another incident of antisemitism occurred in Britain: *The Sun* columnist Katie Hopkins twittered that Justine, Ed Miliband's wife, was "the least popular of party wives" and suggested that Ed Miliband "might stick her head in the oven and turn on the gas".[2]

Against the background of these explicit antisemitic incident, we illustrate in the following that they did not occur "out of the blue". Instead, antisemitic slurs directed against Ed Miliband were already instrumentalised at an earlier stage of the election campaign. In the fall of 2013 the *Daily Mail* triggered a fierce controversy in the British media and public sphere focused on the topics of antisemitism and patriotism/nationalism. It was sparked by the publication of an article on Ralph Miliband on September 27, 2013, under the provocative headline "The man who hated Britain". The lead refers directly to the current leader of the British Labour Party, Ed Miliband: "Ed Miliband's pledge to bring back socialism is homage to his Marxist father. So what did Miliband Snr really believe in? The answer should disturb everyone who loves this country".

The author of the piece, Geoffrey Levy, delves into Ralph Miliband's Marxist convictions and recounts Ralph Miliband's flight from Nazi persecution and his arrival as a Jewish refugee in Britain in 1940. It is against this background that Levy characterizes Ralph Miliband, a well-known and internationally acknowledged critical economist who taught at the London School of Economics after World War II, as a person who – it is alleged in this article – was not reliable in his commitment to Britain. This accusation rests on a range of presuppositions which refer both to common-sense claims and fallacious arguments such as: A Jewish refugee from Belgium can never become truly British; a Marxist is not reliable; if the son of such a person still respects his father, then the son is also not reliable; if the father was a Marxist, then the son is probably also a Marxist; and so forth.

---

[1] http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2015/04/26/ed-miliband-gulzabeen-afsar_n_7146376.html?1430063196
[2] http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2015/03/30/katie-hopkins--vile-holocaust-joke--ed-miliband-wife_n_6968230.html

However, these presuppositions are not stated explicitly and can thus be easily denied; systematic text- and discourse-analysis are needed in order to make them apparent. The *Daily Mail* is renowned for its right-wing conservative stance and opposition to any "Left" politics.[3] We assume that this article and the claims made therein are neither coincidental nor an exceptional or unique instance. On the contrary, we further assume that such allegations refer to well-known antisemitic stereotypes, and specifically to traditional beliefs about Jews and Jewish Marxist intellectuals, perceived as 'dangerous traitors' in various national contexts, including that of the UK. Indeed this rhetoric is neither new nor surprising and has already been documented in many in-depth studies on the relationship between nationalism/chauvinism and the instrumentalisation of antisemitic prejudice (e.g., Kovács 2010, 2013; Musolff 2010; Reisigl & Wodak 2001; Wodak 2007, 2011a).

Interestingly, the media debates, both online and in print, were primarily concerned with the question whether antisemitism could or could not be detected in the above-mentioned attack on Ralph Miliband; the question of how nationalism/patriotism is actually defined within the article's argument was almost completely neglected. This is quite surprising, given the headline of the newspaper article.

Our claim is that the text attempts to establish a relationship between being a Marxist and Jewish refugee, on the one hand, and the implicit suggestion that such people could not be 'really British', i.e. patriotic, on the other. We assume – as mentioned above - that the *Daily Mail* chose to instrumentalize antisemitic rhetoric in order to accuse Ed Miliband of only speaking for working class and unemployed, 'non-productive' members of society[4], and not for the entire British society. This is achieved, we further assume, via portraying him as being rooted in a personal, thus purportedly insurmountable, Jewish Marxist family tradition represented by his father, hence by an *ad hominem* argument. Furthermore, both Miliband Sr. and Jr. are depicted as remaining outsiders, as not belonging to the centre of the nation, and thus, as being unpatriotic.

In what follows, we first discuss the socio-political context in which the newspaper article appeared, in order to assess its presuppositions and implied meanings (2). After summarizing the debate on Miliband in the *Daily Mail* (3) we will analyse it in more detail in the light of salient theoretical considerations on the link between antisemitism and the construction of national unity (4, 5).

---

[3] With an average daily circulation of 1.7 million copies (March 2014) the middle-market tabloid *Daily Mail* reaches almost 4 million readers. In our context it is more than a marginal historical detail that Lord Rothermere, former owner of the tabloid before WWII, was a friend of Hitler and Mussolini and supported Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daily_Mail#cite_ref-2; cf. Taylor 1996; Griffiths 1980). A number of commentators explicitly referred to this historical connection when assessing the *Daily Mail*'s campaign against Miliband: e.g. BBC (http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-24505656), *The Guardian* (http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/oct/01/daily-mail-ed-miliband-attack/print).

[4] The demonization of individuals or groups considered as not contributing to the generation of national wealth has a longstanding history and often involves racism, sexism, antisemitism and class resentment. In Nazi terminology, Jews were considered as 'unproductive parasites' that lived at the expense of national wealth to which they themselves, however, would not contribute (cf. Musolff 2013). In neoliberal discourse, unemployed or unskilled workers are likely to be denigrated as 'parasites' (cf. Jessop et al. 1984).

2. Immediate socio-political context – The Labour Party Conference 2013

The article on Ralph Miliband appeared a few days after Ed Miliband's speech on September 25, 2013 at that year's annual Labour Party conference, in which he had presented the cornerstones of Labour's political program for the immediate future after the next national election in May 2015, including specific plans to freeze energy prices for 20 months[5] as well as to seize land which developers refused to build on.[6] The *Daily Mail* referred to these plans as outspokenly left-wing, even Marxist, apt to overthrow the long-lasting tradition of the free market and individual entrepreneurship. Accordingly, Miliband's plans are perceived as state paternalism. In the same speech, Miliband reiterated a slogan that he had placed at the centre of his argumentation in his previous party conference speech in 2012, namely the 'One Nation' concept towards which Britain should reorient. Under the motto 'Britain can do better than this', the One Nation concept reappears in the 2013 speech.[7]

In this speech, Miliband claimed to speak not only for the working class, but also for the whole nation in the name of overcoming the division of Britain into two nations, i.e. into a poor and a rich nation, under the Tories. Accordingly, in the speech, the concept of 'class' is replaced by that of 'nation'. This was regarded as a smart move in the media[8], as One Nation rhetoric had hitherto been a long-established Tory theme. Initiated by Tory Prime Minister Benjamin Disraeli in the 19th century, it had indeed turned into a conservative brand, although a consensus-oriented policy that tried to mediate between the diverging demands of the different classes in a capitalist society soon became a major element of social democracy as well (Jessop et al. 1984; Heywood 2007).

While it is not surprising that Ed Miliband tried to integrate small businesses into the clientele of the Labour Party, the reversal of slogans that could be observed during the party conferences of Labour and the Conservative Party 2013 is remarkable: Labour flagged the conference hall with the slogan 'One Nation. Labour', the Conservative Party, however, labelled the Union Jack with the slogan 'For hard working people'. This switch illustrates the way in which political slogans and frameworks have taken on the characteristics of interchangeable commodities (Wodak 2015). Like hollow shells (or indeed, empty signifiers)

---

[5] "Your bills will be frozen, benefiting millions of families and millions of business. […] The companies won't like it because it will cost them more. But they have been overcharging people for too long because the market doesn't work. It's time to reset the button." (cited in *Daily Mail*, 24 September 2013)

[6] "We'll say to private developers, you can't just sit on land and refuse to build. We'll give them a very clear message – either use the land or loose the land. That is what the next Labour government will do." (Ibid.)

[7] "Britain can do better than this. We're Britain, we're better than this. […] Are you satisfied with a country where people are working harder for longer for less, year after year? Are you satisfied with a country divided, losing touch with the things we value the most? Are you satisfied with a country that shuts out the voices of millions of ordinary people and listens only to the powerful? Are you satisfied with a country standing apart as two nations? Well I'm not satisfied. We're Britain, we're better than this! We have to rebuild a new One Nation, an economy built on your success, a society based on your values, a politics that hears your voice. Rich and poor alike, accepting their responsibilities to each other. One Nation – we are going to make it happen and today I'm going to tell you how."

[8] In 2012 Ed Miliband's reference to the One Nation concept was debated extensively in the British media.

they can be filled with any meaning (Stögner 2015). Who is actually meant by 'hard working people' can be deciphered only in the light of the Tory government under Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s. As Jessop et al. (1984, 50) argue, Thatcher broke with the One Nation consensus in the name of a clearly stated productivist ideology. In so doing, the Tories engendered new cleavages and polarized society; at the same time, however, they managed to increase their votes amongst skilled manual workers, at the expense of the unemployed and unskilled.

It is precisely these latter groups that the *Daily Mail* defines as Ed Miliband's primary target groups: Thus, the *Daily Mail* argues that behind the 'One Nation' rhetoric Ed Miliband was actually hiding appeals to class warfare. And that is why, the *Daily Mail* continues, Ed Miliband should be denied the middle ground which he claims for Labour by reaching out to small businesses: "The Labour leader claimed to offer himself to the electorate as a 'one nation' prime minister, but positioned himself defiantly on the side of the have-nots against the haves or even against those accustomed to doing a day's work."[9] Here the *Daily Mail* insinuates that Ed Miliband stands for a part of society that many consider as non-productive and non-hard working and thus prone to exploit the welfare system.[10] Such a claim, of course, implies other presuppositions, namely that the poor are themselves to blame for their situation (a typical *victim-perpetrator reversal* strategy) and, furthermore, that the poor and unemployed do not want to work anyway as living off benefits is easier. This line of argument further implies that Miliband stands for people who do not deserve a better life. Such an interpretation resonates with the anti-benefit rhetoric of the British coalition government since 2010 and also the global free-market rhetoric that has intensified following the 2008 global economic crisis (cf. Demirović 2013; Plehwe et al. 2006; Sayer 2015).

3. Analyzing the Debate: The Discourse-Historical Approach

For our analysis, we endorse a critical perspective and employ important dimensions of the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA) that has been extensively presented elsewhere and was developed during the study of Austrian post-war antisemitic writings and speech.[11]

The DHA focuses on the analysis of audio, spoken, visual and/or written *texts* as they relate to structured knowledge (*discourses*) and as they are realised in specific *genres*. Texts cannot

---

[9] Max Hastings, 'Miliband's evasions and untruths would shame even a dodgy estate agent', *Daily Mail*, 24 September 2013.

[10] While Ed Miliband is thus deprived of the legitimacy to talk and act for the sake of the whole nation, David Cameron, in his speech at the Conservative Party Conference in 2013, made a clear move against those considered as non-productive and not contributing to the positive development of the British economy: "On welfare, benefits will be stripped from the long-term jobless unless they work full time picking up litter, removing graffiti or preparing meals for the elderly." This rhetoric corresponds to what Jessop et al. 1984 labelled as "Mrs. Thatcher's Two Nations", i.e. the construction of a new order that increasingly took on the form of a unification of a privileged nation of 'good citizens' and 'hard workers' against a contained and subordinate nation which included much of the non-skilled working class and the unemployed. According to the authors this is a clear break with the Conservative One Nation approach that also characterised the Keynesian Welfare State (Jessop et al. 1984, 50).

[11] See e.g. Wodak et al. 1990; Wodak 2007; 2011b; 2013; 2014 c; 2015; Richardson & Wodak 2009a, b; Engel & Wodak 2013; Wodak & Reisigl 2002.

be fully understood without considering different layers of context, following a *four-level model* of context (Wodak 2014a, b): the historical context of the Labour Party (*socio-historical context)*; debates which dominated the British public after the publication of the above-mentioned article (*the current context)*; a *text-internal co-text* (*textual level*); and *intertextual and interdiscursive relations*. The last pair are of particular significance as they permit the deconstruction of the *interdiscursive* and *intertextual* links, presuppositions, implications and insinuations in the article. Interdiscursivity/intertextuality denotes the linkage between discourses and texts across time and space – established via explicit or implicit references (Reisigl & Wodak 2009).

Thus, the article by Levy can be understood as a text that draws on existing opinions and collective memories about British history, British identity and current discourses on British politics and the financial crisis, as well as *mobilising* and *radicalising* these discourses. Positive self- and negative other-presentation is realised via *discursive strategies* (Reisigl & Wodak 2001, 45-90). Here, we primarily focus on nomination (how events/objects/persons are referred to) and predication (what characteristics are attributed to them). A paradigmatic case might be the 'naming' of a protagonist or an institution metonymically (*pars pro toto*), for example, Ralph Miliband for Marxism; or as synecdoche (*totum pro parte*), e.g., the socialist party (or the Unions) for Ed Miliband.

Finally, argumentation schemes allow for the justification and legitimation of specific claims. Within the DHA (ibid., 74f.; Wodak 2014b), the notion of *topos* designates both formal and content-related 'conclusion rule[s] that connect[s] the argument or arguments with the conclusion, the claim'. Here, the DHA draws on Wengeler's and Kienpointer's context-specific notion of *topos*, defined as semiotically manifested 'figures of thought in approaching a political issue' (Wengeler 2003, 67). These conclusion rules are either sound or fallacious, enabling or preventing the *more or less* undistorted exchange of standpoints through particular ways of representing events, objects or persons (Reisigl 2014; Forchtner 2011; 2014).

Hence, the DHA focuses on the power-dependent semiotic means that are used to construct positive self- and negative other-presentations (US and THEM, the pro and contra of socialism, the Jews and Ralph Miliband). This also captures the ability to select specific events in the flow of a narrative as well as increased opportunities to convey messages through opening up space for 'calculated ambivalence' (Engel & Wodak 2009; 2013). The latter is defined as a strategy where one utterance carries at least two more-or-less contradictory meanings, oriented towards at least two different audiences. This enables the speaker/writer to deny any responsibility: after all, 'it wasn't meant that way'.

At this point, it is important to emphasize that *antisemitic language behaviour* implies the presence of prejudicial assumptions about the Jews perceived *as a homogenous group*. Which antisemitic contents are expressed depends, among other things, on the setting (public, private or media), the formality of the situation, the participants, the topic, and the presence or absence of Jews. Antisemitic language behaviour, moreover, covers a wide range of speech acts, from explicit remarks or appeals for action to mere allusions. Antisemitic

6

language behaviour includes all levels of language, from text or discourse to the individual word, or even sounds, for example, the Yiddish intonation of certain words or phrases (e.g. Wodak 2011a, 2015).

Furthermore it is important to note that antisemitism, particularly its latent and coded forms, need not necessarily rely on a conscious intention on the part of the speaker or writer. Rather, the long tradition of antisemitism and it's tabooing after the Holocaust have led to communicative latency. Coded antisemitic utterances may be void of intention on the part of the speaker/writer – this is also referred to as "antisemitism without antisemites" (Stögner 2015; Marin 2000). What we are analysing here is not the author of the article, Geoffrey Levy, but the article itself – we are deciphering its explicit and implicit meaning. The question of intention on the part of Levy, however, is not our concern.

4. Demonizing the 'Miliband Family'

The attacks against Ralph Miliband, and by implication against Ed Miliband, have to be assessed within this specific historical and methodological context. There are – broadly speaking – two interwoven aspects: Firstly, an attack on the Left, related furthermore to the stereotype of the Jewish Bolshevik; and, secondly, a distraction from current economic and social problems in a crisis-ridden society in which the divisions are becoming ever more apparent. The conservative *Daily Mail* attempts to vilify the Left by constructing a scenario of impending doom around Labour politics and by demonizing them as (Jewish) Marxist and therefore in contradiction with real 'Britishness'. The actual meaning of real Britishness is only implied by demarcating British patriotism from Ed Miliband and his family tradition. Here are the opening paragraphs of the article:

> "Miliband, father of Ed and David Miliband, died in 1994, aged 70, soon after the publication of his last book, *Socialism for a Sceptical Age*. In it, the venerated Marxist philosopher and academic continued to espouse his lifelong 'socialist' cause. One voice, however, vehemently informed him that he was still pursuing a lost cause. It was that of his elder son David. He did not mince his words. Having read the manuscript before publication, David wrote to his father asking, 'whether you are restating a case that has been traduced in theory or practice, or whether you are advancing a new case. I think that the book reads like the former. The word 'traduced' - which means 'disgraced' or 'denigrated' - was surely rather harsh, considering his aged father had always included his two sons (even when they were small), in the trenchant political discussions with ever-present academics and Left-wing thinkers that took place round the basement dining table of the family home in Primrose Hill, North London.
> Indeed, some family friends feel this episode, not long before their father died, could have been a contributory factor towards the younger - and considerably more Left-wing - son Ed unexpectedly deciding to fight his elder brother for the leadership of the Labour Party in 2010, and, of course, beating him. In his explosive memoirs, serialised last week in the Mail, Gordon Brown's spin doctor Damian McBride argued that Ed Miliband was obsessed with maintaining his father's legacy. Winning the leadership was Ed's 'ultimate tribute' to his father - an attempt to 'achieve his father's

7

vision and ensure David Miliband did not traduce it'. Again, that word 'traduce'. Ed is now determined to bring about that vision. How proud Ralph would have been to hear him responding the other day to a man in the street who asked when he was 'going to bring back socialism' with the words: 'That's what we are doing, sir.' Ed's victory over David, made possible only with the unions' block votes, was perfectly in step with his father's fervent and undimmed conviction that 'alliance with the trade unions is not only one of the party's great strengths; it is by far its greatest strength'. Ralph's Marxism was uncompromising. 'We want this party to state that it stands unequivocally behind the social ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange,' he told the 1955 Labour conference, as the delegate from Hampstead. 'We are a socialist party engaged on a great adventure.'

In this passage, a particular narrative is constructed: Ralph Miliband is predicated as the "venerated Marxist philosopher who never stopped fighting for his Marxist views", who deeply influenced Ed Miliband. Furthermore, a contrast between the two sons, David and Ed is discursively constructed, evidenced by unsourced quotes, where David allegedly opposed his father's views whereas Ed believed in them; it is further alleged that he was actually "obsessed with them", a predication which implies irrationality. This, the story continues, is the real reason why Ed, still in thrall to his father's uncompromising Marxism, decided to stand against his brother, and ultimately won the leadership of the Labour Party in 2010. Ralph Miliband's words, quoted from the 1955 Party conference, are thus insinuated to encapsulate his younger son's views as well.

A clear divide is constructed – between the father and the younger son, with their 'fervent and undimmed conviction', in contrast to the older son, David, who saw his father (and thus also Ed) as following a 'lost cause'. Apart from anonymous family friends, Gordon Brown's spin doctor is also quoted as an authority who seems to know that winning the leadership of the Labour Party was "Ed's ultimate tribute to his father". The attributes selected as predication to Ralph and Ed emphasize the obsession with Marxist philosophy, which – it is alleged – also entails the Unions' support for Ed, as another perceived consequence.

In contrast, the older son David is represented as the voice of reason that is defeated in the struggle for control of the party. Through the way in which Ralph Miliband is characterised in the article, quoting various unspecified sources, Levy legitimizes the discursive construction of Ed Miliband's persona as being the same kind of Marxist as his father. Moreover, Socialism is predicated as an 'adventure', thus full of risks. Politics is recontextualised as a family affair, winning the leadership of the Labour Party a contest between brothers, and, thus, politics and history are personalised and de-historicized. It is a Labour Party with the face of Ralph Miliband's fervent Marxism and Socialism from the 1940s and 1950s that are transferred into the 21st century, and viewed as dangerous and anachronistic.

The core paragraph states:

As for the country that gave him and his family protection, the 17-year-old wrote in his diary: 'The Englishman is a rabid nationalist. They are perhaps the most nationalist

people in the world; you sometimes want them almost to lose (the war) to show them how things are. They have the greatest contempt for the Continent. To lose their empire would be the worst possible humiliation.'

This passage from Ralph Miliband's diary as a 17 year-old refugee who has just become acquainted with British culture is used as evidence for the overall claim of the *Daily Mail*: That Ralph Miliband actually "hated Britain" and was unpatriotic although Britain saved his life. It brands him a traitor with an utterly unjustified, negative opinion about Britain – which is, it seems, not permissible, at least not for a foreigner. This argument clearly establishes a *post hoc propter hoc* fallacy. Many other details about Ralph Miliband's life are listed, amongst others that his teacher, Harold Laski, was also a Marxist, that Eric Hobsbawn, a very well-known Communist historian and Austrian Jewish refugee, was frequently invited to Miliband's house, and that Ralph Miliband opposed the Falkland War; in this way various anecdotal bits and pieces are presented as historical 'evidence' for the overall conclusion. This entire characterization serves as an *ad hominem* argument that is eventually also used against Ed Miliband: Like father, like son. Ralph Miliband is attacked personally, and all his alleged characteristics are transferred on to his son Ed. The coda of the Miliband saga as narrated by the *Daily Mail* finally provides the evidence for this *ad hominem* attack: "As his son, Red Ed - who lives less than a mile away from Highgate cemetery in a £1.6 million townhouse - talks of 'socialism' being the key word for the next Labour government, perhaps that ground is indeed now being prepared."

In sum, the *Daily Mail* attacks Ed Miliband's left-wing politics (including his proximity to the unions) in a productivist manner, by referring to his father, the Marxist academic. Thereby old, both explicit and implicit antisemitic stereotypes are applied: of the eternally alien, cosmopolitan Jew who lacked any true patriotic feeling for the nation.[12] Thus, the entire debate is recontextualised into a dispute over 'true Britishness' represented in the One Nation concept advocated by Ed Miliband.[13]

5. The "Jewish Alien": Some traditional coded and explicit antisemitic Stereotypes

---

[12] Evidence for this interpretation is given by postings in the online forum, e.g.: "I am sure that i read some time ago in this very newspaper that Ralph Milliband sneaked into this country from Belgium, if he did sneak in to Britain in my book that makes him and all his offspring illegal immigrants, and should bar any of his offspring from vying to rule this country." (www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2435751/Red-Eds-pledge-bring-socialism-homage-Marxist-father-Ralph-Miliband-says-GEOFFREY-LEVY.html#comments, viewed 5 February 2014)

[13] As David Rickard points out, there is a deep opposition between Miliband and Cameron as to what true 'Britishness' could actually mean: "One Nation Britishness involves, among other things, an emphasis on collective, 'national' solutions to economic and social problems, including powers to limit the rights of private enterprises and property owners to pursue profit to the detriment of the public interest. Opposed to One Nation Britain is David Cameron's conference speech vision of Britain as a 'land of opportunity', based on things like: individual aspiration and hard work; the moral 'greatness' of British people, and their determination to defend their liberty; and the enduring strength of Britain's established institutions." (David Rickard, 'The Daily Mail, the Milibands and the failure to talk about England', 9 October 2013, http://www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/david-rickard/daily-mail-milibands-and-failure-to-talk-about-england, viewed 14 November 2013.)

Numerous stereotypes are applied in this characterization that relate to traditional antisemitism. In order to decode them, in-depth analysis of different discursive strategies is needed, which themselves can only be understood against the background of a discourse-historical archive of antisemitic language use in Europe (Wodak et al. 1990; Stögner 2014). The *Daily Mail*'s primary target is undoubtedly the Labour Party and its alleged Marxist orientation that is represented via a *topos* of danger as a threat to Great Britain and its national unity. The metaphorical scenario of impending doom that is constructed here operates with motifs known from the stereotype of the "Jewish conspiracy". In the following sections we elaborate on the central antisemitic stereotypes that are thereby used and situate them in the context of the debates around the purported radical left-wing politics of Labour.

5.1. The "Anti-National Jew"

Obviously, Ralph Miliband is denied any patriotic feeling towards Britain. The complex of the "Jewish alien" that is incapable of integrating into the European nation-states reaches back to the period of Enlightenment and French Revolution. With the development of the nation-state as a political concept and reality, Jews were denied the ability to build a nation themselves as well as to integrate into existing nations.[14] Jews were regarded as a threat to the very principle of the nation that ideologically should enhance an international equilibrium between warring nations (Arendt 2001, 70). The consistent meaning of the stereotypical "antinational Jew" is to be seen in the insinuation that Jews were not trustworthy with regard to their national identity (Postone 1988; Salzborn 2010).

Nationalism and the construction of a homogeneous national community – all closely tied to the development of international and human rights law (Fine 2007) – were not only constituted against an outer enemy, but also by delineating the alien within the nation's borders. In European nation states in the age of rapid capitalist development in the 19th century, this inner alien was primarily associated with the Jews. Franz Oppenheimer accordingly called antisemitism the face of aggressive chauvinistic nationalism turned inward (cf. Massing 1949). Similarly, Benedict Anderson argues that antisemitism manifests itself not so much across national borders, but rather within the nation and is therefore an instrument that legitimizes national and class repression (Anderson 1993, 149f.; Stögner & Höpoltseder 2013).

Against this background the overarching argumentation targeted at Ralph Miliband can be deciphered. Both antisemitic and nationalist ideologies merge into one ideological framework and achieve their illocutionary and perlocutionary effects by means of this intertwining. Nationalism and antisemitism, as closely related ideologies with regard to their discursive history, both veil class antagonism. They are both part of a broader ideological syndrome that might be referred to as an "antidemocratic syndrome" (cf. Stögner & Höpoltseder 2013). After the Holocaust, manifest antisemitism was widely tabooed but not actually overcome. It found *coded ways of expression* on the one hand, and on the other hand it occurred *hidden by*

---

[14] See e.g. Volkov 2006; Claussen 1994; Stögner 2014; Stögner & Schmidinger 2010; Sznaider 2010.

other, functionally equivalent ideologies, one of the most prominent being nationalism (cf. Stögner 2014, 146-158).

In the *Daily Mail* article Ralph Miliband's alienness to the British nation is constructed primarily on the basis of his flight from the Nazis to Britain:

> "This was the immigrant boy whose first act in Britain was to discard his name Adolphe because of its associations with Hitler, and become Ralph, and who helped his father earn a living rescuing furniture from bombed houses in the Blitz."

This remarkable passage operates with a combination of subtle allusions that eventually turn Miliband's experience of Nazi persecution into its opposite: that Miliband changed his name is mentioned in passing, a strategy that in fact might serve to relate him intertextually to Hitler. Furthermore, Miliband is predicated as an immigrant boy, not refugee, i.e. his escape from the Nazis is turned into a quasi-voluntary migration. In this twisted context, the change of names insinuates that he sneaked into Britain as a migrant, by hiding his true identity.[15] This strategy is further maintained by mentioning that he "earned a living rescuing furniture from bombed houses in the Blitz". Here the wording is essential: "to rescue" is quite an uncommon expression in this context; *people* are rescued rather than furniture. This wording insinuates that Miliband rescued furniture (instead of people) while he himself was rescued by Britain, the nation that he criticised; and secondly, Miliband is implicitly presented as a war profiteer earning a living from other people's disasters.

An editorial that appeared a few days later in the *Daily Mail* linked Miliband's alleged alienness to the British nation openly with both National Socialism and Stalinism. According to the editorial, the fact that Miliband fought as a volunteer in the Royal Navy against the Nazis was not evidence of patriotism. The author, while repeating the diary entry of the 17-year old, asks:

> "Isn't it permissible to surmise that a man who had expressed such views joined the Royal Navy not so much to fight for Britain as to fight, like the Soviet Union, against the Nazis?"[16]

It is precisely the fact of his persecution and flight that makes him vulnerable to appearing as unreliable, possibly even as a traitor. The argument alleges that he had instrumentalized the Royal Navy for his own purposes. The argument further insinuates that Miliband's loyalty was not to Great Britain but to the Soviet Union, creating a fallacious causal link between being a Marxist and aligning with the Soviet Union, combined with a reinterpretation of historical events: "the fight for Britain" necessarily implied "the fight against the Nazis";

---

[15] In fact, many refugees and political opponents to National Socialism who bore the name Adolf – which was quite a common name – changed it after Hitler came into power in order to distance themselves from National Socialism.

[16] "An evil legacy and why we won't apologise", *Daily Mail* 1.10.2013 (http://dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2439714/Ed-Miliband-evil-legacy-wont-abologisee.html).

obviously, both the Soviet Union and Britain were part of the Allied Forces (together with the US and France) fighting against the Nazis and for their respective countries.

In sum, Ralph Miliband seems to be an almost perfect target for the accusation of not being British *enough*. He is perceived as combining all the characteristics the antisemitic worldview abhors: refugee (thus alien), intellectual (thus unproductive), international and cosmopolitan (thus rootless), critical of the nation's institutions and the establishment (thus threatening the status quo). To doubt and to criticize the status quo is anathema for a nationalistic-antisemitic worldview, which, on the contrary, is meant to produce unquestioned (national) loyalty, especially in crisis-ridden periods.

5.2. Anti-Intellectualism

In nationalist discourses, antisemitic motives are regularly combined with anti-intellectualism. This becomes evident when Ralph Miliband's purported hatred of the British nation is discursively linked to his international academic network and intellectual exchanges, in the sense of a "Jewish world conspiracy".

In antisemitism and nationalism Jews are usually viewed as intellectuals divorced from "concrete" reality, as people who live in their books, since they have no real home country and are not regarded as part of the nation. The critical element in the spirit ascribed to the Jews is connected to social mobility and thus has a strong connotation with the age of emancipation. Modest and straightforward behaviour and thinking, down-to-earthness, practicality, wholeness and unity are features of the anti-intellectual ideology that by definition excludes Jews (Stögner 2013; 2014).

Against this background, it is also not surprising that anti-intellectual stereotypes inform the attacks on Ralph Miliband in the *Daily Mail*. In this, the particular construction of English/British national identity as opposed to the Continent is crucial. A Jewish refugee having escaped the continent, overrun by the Nazis, is utilized to bring forward a traditional British resentment against the Continent as too intellectual and abstract, as opposed to the English who are celebrated for being commonsensical, practical, down-to-earth, i.e. less abstract and intellectual, but gentlemanly and passionately devoted to their country.[17]

The link to anti-intellectualism in the articles on Ralph Miliband can be deciphered in at least two ways. Firstly, Miliband's international academic and intellectual networks are mentioned in a manner that – at the very least – elicits associations with the idea of secret cliques:

> "…his [David Miliband's] aged father had always included his two sons (even when they were small), in the trenchant political discussions with ever-present academics and Left-wing thinkers that took place around the basement dining table of the family home in Primrose Hill, North London."

---

[17] Cf. interview with David Sugarman, 21st November 2013, Lancaster.

That these gatherings would have taken place "around the basement dining table" lends the whole scene a mysterious atmosphere. This chain of insinuation is further developed in the editorial that followed the initial article on Ralph Miliband, where the latent antisemitism of the first article is topped by an explicit antisemitic prejudice:

> "We do not maintain, like the jealous God of Deuteronomy, that the iniquity of the fathers should be visited on the sons. But when a son with primal ministerial ambitions swallows his father's teachings, as the younger Miliband appears to have done, the case is different."[18]

With the hint to the "jealous God of Deuteronomy" the relation to Miliband's Jewishness is clearly established and kin liability (as performed par excellence by National Socialism) is implicitly passed off as something genuinely Jewish. Thus, the attacks on Ed Miliband, i.e. that he is allegedly genuinely bound to Marxism due to his father's "evil legacy", are legitimized by an alleged Jewish tradition.

5.3. The 'Jewish Bolshevik'

Closely related to the two stereotypes of the 'anti-national' and the 'intellectual Jew' is the antisemitic image of the 'Jewish Bolshevik', which reaches back to the Russian civil war. The opponents of the revolution accused Jews of responsibility for the murder of the Tsarist family. These accusations led to horrible pogroms which claimed over 100,000 Jewish victims (cf. Pipes 1997). After the First World War, this stereotype spread to the West, including Germany, Great Britain and the USA and became an important component of ideologies concerning an alleged 'Jewish world conspiracy'.

The stereotype of the "Jewish Bolshevik" was very important in National Socialist ideology where it was paradoxically combined with anti-liberalism and pseudo-anticapitalist rhetoric.[19] This might seem contradictory at first glance, but once again turns out to be a manifestation of antisemitism as an ideological syndrome, characterized by a combination of contradictory elements (Stögner 2014, 109-136). Since Jews are seen as the universal and ultimate evil, the contradicting moments can be combined within one argument, in the sense of the "*Iudeus ex machina*" – all antisemitic stereotypes can be functionalized together for political ends, even when in contradiction to each other (Wodak 1989).

---

[18] "An evil legacy and why we won't apologise", *Daily Mail* 1.10.2013 (http://dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2439714/Ed-Miliband-evil-legacy-wont-abologisee.html).

[19] Bolshevism and Intelligentsia were combined in the image of the "Jewish Bolshevist", as Hitler expressed it in 1944: "The Jewish-bolshevist intelligence, the ongoing oppressor, has to be eliminated" (cf. Musolff 2013). The combination of "Jewish capital" and "Jewish bolshevism" is also part of Hitler's prophesy of the Holocaust on 30 January 1939: "Today I will once more be a prophet. If the international Jewish financiers in and outside Europe should succeed in plunging the nations once more into a world war, then the result will not be the bolshevization of the earth, and thus the victory of Jewry, but the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe." (United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Washington DC)

In the article on Miliband, the connection between Bolshevism and Jewishness is established in detail, firstly, by dropping the names of well-known Marxists in Britain who (coincidentally?) happen to be Jewish: Eric Hobsbawn[20] and Harold Laski who were regular guests at Miliband's house and thus, the article suggests, influenced Ed and David Miliband from a very early age on. Secondly, by the allusion to an international network of Marxists that Miliband was perceived to participate in. In addition, there is a chain of associations established by the subsequent listing when it comes to Ralph Miliband's Marxist critique of British institutions:

> "He [Ralph Miliband] also made plain his disdain for the Establishment, which was, to his mind, nothing less than the old boy network. This included, he wrote in a letter to his old friend Wright Mills, 'Eton and Harrow, Oxford and Cambridge, the great Clubs, the Times, the Church, the Army, the respectable Sunday papers … It also means the values … of the ruling orders, keep the workers in their place, strengthen the House of Lords, maintain social hierarchies, God save the Queen, equality is bunk, democracy is dangerous, etc. Also respectability, good taste, don't rock the boat, there will always be an England, foreigners, Jews, natives etc are all right in their place and their place is outside…' Given this tirade, one is entitled to wonder whether Ralph Miliband's Marxism was actually fuelled by a giant-sized social chip on his shoulder as he lived in his adoptive country."

The discursive framing of this quote – a private message to C. Wright Mills – represents Miliband's social critique not as a result of upright indignation with institutionalized social inequality, but as the product of a "giant-sized social chip on his shoulder" – thus, it is individualised and decontextualised. It is alleged that Miliband had to make up for a minority complex, which, according to the context the article sketches, could only stem from his Jewish background.

Miliband as the 'Jewish Bolshevik' represents ideas that endanger the nation and its tradition from all sides: top-down (due to the amalgamation of bolshevism and capital) and bottom-up (the 'Jewish Bolshevik' representing the demands of the oppressed).

The danger coming from 'Jewish Bolshevism' - as a *topos of danger* - is made more explicit in the *Daily Mail* editorial defending the original article. As mentioned already above, this piece reiterates the attacks on Ralph Miliband and adds an explicitly antisemitic stance by referring to the (supposedly) vindictive and unforgiving "God of Deuteronomy". The editorial finishes with a reference to the plans for press regulation subsequent to the Leveson Inquiry. These are viewed as threatening the freedom of the press and are taken by the *Daily Mail* as another example of Ed Miliband's purportedly socialist politics going back to his father's influence:

---

[20] On 2 October 2012, one year before the article on Ralph Miliband, the *Daily Mail* published an article on Eric Hobsbawm, entitled "He hated Britain and excused Stalin's genocide. But was hero of the BBC and the Guardian, Eric Hobsbawm a TRAITOR too?" The similar wording concerning an alleged hatred of Britain is hardly a coincidence, just as Hobsbawm framed a major critique of nationalism (cf Hobsbawm 1991.

"That's why the Mail — which is not *Pravda* — said that readers who love this country would be truly disturbed if they understood about Miliband's father's views."21

Thus, the attacks on Ralph Miliband are passed off as a normal expression of press freedom that is allegedly threatened by Miliband who, it is implied, would like to turn British newspapers into state directed media like *Pravda*, the main newspaper during the Soviet period. The final sentence of the editorial reads as follows:

"If he crushes the freedom of the Press, no doubt his father will be proud of him from beyond the grave, where he lies 12 yards from the remains of Karl Marx. But he will have driven a hammer and sickle through the heart of the nation so many of us genuinely love."22

This can be read as a reference to the stab-in-the-back myth – the conspiracy theory developed by German nationalists: the German defeat in WWI was allegedly caused by betrayal on the home front, especially by Bolsheviks and Jews (cf. Kolb 2005). This myth has become a fixed component of nationalist antisemitic rhetoric ever since which in this case has been recontextualised and transformed into the emblem of Communism. Again, the overall intention of the *Daily Mail* seems to be a denigration of the Left that is in part achieved by antisemitic rhetoric. Whether this happened intentionally or not is a different question that, however, has no direct relevance to the issues which we have been analysing here: the instrumentalisation of antisemitic meanings – coded as well as manifest – that can be extrapolated from the text itself.

6. Conclusion: The "*Iudeus ex Machina*"-Strategy

The *Daily Mail's* intention of discrediting the Left as unpatriotic is expressed by reference not only to Ralph Miliband's Marxist, cosmopolitan and republican convictions, but also to his Jewishness. He is thereby depicted as a refugee who seemed to have sneaked into Britain and/or as somebody who is ungrateful to such an extent that he fouls his own nest. He is constructed as a stranger who lacks any feeling of belonging, a 'knave without fatherland' – a trope that has been frequently used to discredit socialist internationalists (Simmel 1950; Wodak et al. 1990).

The form of patriotism presented in the *Daily Mail* is obviously nationalistic, and by excluding Ralph Miliband as a foreigner and Jew, it also bears significant traces of ethnic nationalism. In the *Daily Mail*, opposing nationalism as an exclusionary ideology is regarded as unpatriotic, even as hatred against the nation (and its people). Simultaneously, the *Daily Mail* blames Miliband for massively benefiting from what he criticized – an *ad hominem* argument that renders any further discussion impossible. The *Daily Mail* characterizes Ralph

---

21 http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-2439714/Ed-Miliband-evil-legacy-wont-apologise.html
22 ibid.

Miliband explicitly as a disloyal defeatist who represents socialist internationalist, and by implication Jewish, interests that are diametrically opposed to the supposedly true interests of the nation.

In today's mainstream media, antisemitism is usually not articulated in an open manner. A taboo has been placed on antisemitism due to the Holocaust and the history of European antisemitism. Direct recourse to antisemitic imagery and stereotypy is usually no longer used in mainstream public discourse, except by extreme-right and neo-fascist parties such as the Greek Golden Dawn and the Hungarian Jobbik (Wodak 2015) and some radical Islamist circles (Grigat 2015). Instead, we encounter coded "particles of resentment" (Diner 2004, 310) that can be linked to different narratives and – intentionally or not – utilized for different political goals. Readers/listeners/viewers may still draw on the old archive of stereotypes and images of the anti-national, hyper-intellectual, subversive and cosmopolitan Jew, even though those prejudices might not be conscious.

The debate about Ralph and Ed Miliband illustrates this clearly: antisemitic stereotypes are used in order to delegitimize the political Left. Miliband is produced as the "*Iudeus ex machina*". This can only be detected via a systematic in-depth analysis that explicitly refers to the immediate as well as wider socio-political context of the discourse in question and combines sociological, historical and linguistic approaches.

References

Adorno, Th. W. (1997). Studies in the Authoritarian Personality. In: *Gesammelte Schriften* 9-1 (pp. 143-509). Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Anderson, B. (1993). *Imagined Communities. Reflection on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso.

Arendt, H. (1981). *Rahel Varnhagen. Lebensgeschichte einer deutschen Jüdin aus der Romantik*. München: Piper.

Arendt, H. (2004). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Schocken Books.

Claussen, D. (1994). *Grenzen der Aufklärung. Die gesellschaftliche Genese des modernen Antisemitismus*. Frankfurt a. M.: Fischer.

Demirović, A. (2013). Multiple Krise, autoritäre Demokratie und radikaldemokratische Erneuerung, *PROKLA* 171, 193-215.

Diner, D. (2004). Der Sarkophag zeigt Risse. Über Israel, Palästina und die Frage eines „neuen Antisemitismus". In D. Rabinovici, U. Speck & N. Sznaider (Eds.). *Neuer Antisemitismus? Eine globale Debatte* (310-329). Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Engel, J, Wodak, R. (2009). Kalkulierte Ambivalenz: ‚Störungen' und das ‚Gedankenjahr': Die Causen Siegfried Kampl und John Gudenus'. In de Cillia, R., Wodak, R. (Eds). *Gedenken im Gedankenjahr* (79-100). Innsbruck: Studienverlag.

Engel, J., Wodak, R. (2013). "Calculated Ambivalence" and Holocaust Denial in Austria. In R.Wodak, J. E. Richardson (Eds.). *Analysing Fascist Discourse: European Fascism in Talk and Text* (73-96). London: Routledge.

Evans, E. (2004). *Thatcher and Thatcherism.* London: Routledge.

Fine, R. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism.* London: Routledge.

Forchtner, B. (2011). Critique, the discourse-historical approach and the Frankfurt School. *Critical Discourse Studies* 8(1), 1-14.

Ford, H. (2007). *The International Jew.* Minneapolis: Filiquarian Publishing.

Heywood, A. (2007). *Political Ideologies.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hobsbawm, E. J. (1991). *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jessop, B., Bonnet, K., Bromley, S., Ling, T. (1984). Authoritarian populism, two nations, and Thatcherism, *New Left Review*, vol. I/147, 32-60.

Kovács, A. (2010) *The Stranger 'at Hand'.* Antwerp: Brill.

Kovács, A. (2013) 'The post-communist extreme right: The Jobbik Party in Hungary', in Wodak, R., Khosravinik, M. and Mral, B. (eds), *Rightwing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse.* London: Bloomsbury, 223–34.

Kolb, E. (2005). *The Weimar Republic.* New York: Routledge.

Marin, B. (2000). *Antisemitismus ohne Antisemiten. Autoritäre Vorurteile und Feindbilder*, Frankfurt a. M./New York: Campus.

Massing, P. (1949). *Rehearsal for Destruction. A Study of Political Anti-Semitism in Imperial Germany.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Musolff, A. (2010) *Metaphor, Nation, and the Holocaust.* London: Routledge.

Musolff A. (2013). The Reception of Antisemitic Imagery in Nazi Germany and Popular Opinion – Lessons for Today. In R. Wodak & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *Analysing Fascist Discourse. European Fascism in Talk and Text* (pp. 56-72). New York/London: Routledge.

Pipes, D. (1997). *Conspiracy. How the Paranoid Style Flourishes and Where It Comes From.* New York, London: Free Press.

Plehwe, D., Walpen, B. & Neunhöffer, G. (Eds.) (2006). *Neoliberal Hegemony. A Global Critique.* London: Routledge.

Postone, M. (1986). Anti-Semitism and National Socialism. In A. Rabinbach, J. Zipes (Eds.). *Germans and Jews since the Holocaust.* New York: Holmes & Meier.

Reisigl, M. (2014) 'Argumentation analysis and the discourse-historical approach: A methodological framework', in Hart, C. and Cap, P. (eds), *Contemporary Critical Discourse Studies,* London: Bloomsbury, 67–96.

Reisigl, M., Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination. Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism.* London: Routledge.

Reisigl, M., Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In Wodak R., Meyer, M. (Eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (87-121pp). London: Sage (2nd revised edition).

Richardson, J. E., Wodak, R. (2009a) 'The Impact of Visual Racism - Visual Arguments in Political Leaflets of Austrian and British Far-right parties', *Controversia* 2, 45–77.

Richardson, J. E. , Wodak, R. (2009b) 'Recontextualising Fascist Ideologies of the Past: Rightwing Discourses on Employment and Nativism in Austria and the United Kingdom', *Critical Discourse Studies* 4, 251–267.

Salzborn, S. (2010). Antisemitismus und Nation. Zur historischen Genese der sozialwissenschaftlichen Theoriebildung, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 4, 393-408.

Simmel, G. (1950) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel.* New York: Free Press References:

Stögner, K. (2013). On Antisemitism and Nationalism at the Fin de Siècle: Walter Benjamin's Critique of German Youth Movement. In F. Rash, G. Horan & D. Wildmann (Eds.). *English and German Nationalist and anti-Semitic Discourse 1871-1945* (pp. 117-144). Frankfurt a. M./New York: Peter Lang.

Stögner, K. (2015). "We are the new Jews!" and "The Jewish Lobby" – Holocaust inversion, antisemitism and the construction of a national identity by the Austrian Freedom Party, *Nations and Nationalism* (in press).

Stögner, K. (2014). *Antisemitismus und Sexismus. Historisch-gesellschaftliche Konstellationen.* Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Stögner, K., Höpoltseder, J. (2013). Nationalism and Antisemitism in the Postnational Constellation: Thoughts on Horkheimer, Adorno and Habermas. In C. A. Small (Ed.). *Global Antisemitism: A Crisis of Modernity* (pp. 121-134). Boston: Brill.

Stögner, K., Schmidinger, T. (2010). Antisemitismus und die Transformation des Nationalen. Eine Einleitung, *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 4 , 387-392.

Stögner, K., Bischof, K., Rajal, E. (2015). *Antisemitismus und Finanzkrise: Eine Untersuchung österreichischer Printmedien*. Vienna: Wiener Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Stögner, K. and Wodak, R. (2014) ',,Nationale Einheit" und die Konstruktion des „fremden Juden": die politische Instrumentalisierung rechtspopulistischer Ausgrenzung in der *Daily Mail', OBST*42 *(special issue* edited by F. Januschek and M. Reisigl): 130-161.

Sznaider, N. (2010). Hannah Arendt and the Sociology of Antisemitism. *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft* 4, 421-434.

Volkov, S. (2006). *Germans, Jews, and Antisemites.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wengeler, M. (2003a) *Topos und Diskurs. Begründung einer argumentationsanalytischen Methode und ihrer Anwendung auf den Migrationsdiskurs (1960–1985).* Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Wengeler, M. (2003b) 'Argumentationstopos als sprachwissenschaftlicher Gegenstand. Für eine Erweiterung linguistischer Methoden bei der Analyse öffentlicher Diskurse', in Geideck, S. and Liebert, W-A. (eds), *Sinnformeln. Linguistische und soziologische Analysen von Leitbildern, Metaphern und anderen kollektiven Orientierungsmustern.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 59–82.

Wodak, R. (1989). "Iudeus ex Machina", *Grazer Linguistische Studien*, 153- 180.

Wodak, R. (2007) 'Pragmatics and critical discourse analysis', *Pragmatics and Cognition*, 15/1: 203–225.

Wodak, R. (2011a). Suppression of the Nazi Past, Coded Languages, and Discourses of Silence: Applying the Discourse-Historical Approach to Post-War Anti-Semitism in Austria. In W. Steinmetz (Ed.), *Political Languages in the Age of Extremes* (pp. 351-379). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (2011b). *The Discourse of Politics in Action. Politics as Usual.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Wodak, R. (2013). "Anything Goes" - The Haiderization of Europe. In R. Wodak, M. Khosravinik & B. Mral (Eds.). *Rightwing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse* (pp. 23-38). London: Bloomsbury.

Wodak, R. (2014a) 'Political discourse analysis – Distinguishing frontstage and backstage contexts. A discourse-historical approach', in: Flowerdew, J. (Ed.) *Discourse in Context* (pp. 522-549) London: Bloomsbury.

Wodak, R. (2014b) 'Argumentation, Political', in: G. Mazzoleni (Ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of Political Communication* NY: Wiley & Sons (in press).

Wodak, R. (2015) *The Politics of Fear: The Meanings of Rightwing Populism Discourse.* London: Sage.

Wodak, R., Nowak, P., Pelikan, J., Gruber, H., De Cillia, R., Mitten, R. (1990). „*Wir sind alle unschuldige Täter!" Diskurshistorische Studien zum Nachkriegsantisemitismus.* Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Wodak, R., Reisigl, M. (2002). „... WENN EINER ARIEL HEISST ..." Ein linguistisches Gutachten zur politischen Funktionalisierung antisemitischer Ressentiments in Österreich. In A. Pelinka, R. Wodak (Eds.). *Dreck am Stecken* (pp. 134-172). Vienna: Czernin Verlag.