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The articles included in this special issue demonstrate a widespread and generalised crisis of relentless othering, evident in the sustained attack by parts of the media and some politicians against notions of multiculturalism, transnationalism and cosmopolitanism. Included in the ‘blame game’ are not only immigrants and refugees, but also diasporic groups, and ethnic and religious national minorities. However, the papers included in this issue also prove that despite the apparent collapse of European solidarity, the seemingly relentless onslaught of nativist forces in public debate and the attack on equality, diversity and human rights values and ethos, pockets of resistance remain and may be becoming bigger.

As anti-immigrant rhetoric has swept across Europe in the wake of the so-called ‘migrant crisis’, the media and public discourse have often been identified as catalysts, blamed for fanning the flames of populism and exacerbating Europe’s slide towards illiberalism (Balch 2016, Krzyzanowski, Triandafyllidou and Wodak 2018, Triandafyllidou 2018, Krzyżanowski 2020a). Commentators have been quick to suggest that this undermining of human rights norms calls into question Europe’s liberal consensus that emerged after the fall of communism (Mudde 2015, Krastev 2017). There is a growing body of evidence demonstrating how communitarian ideas have displaced cosmopolitan notions and monopolised the public debate (Balch and Balabanova 2016).

Other research has shown how sensationalism, bias, poor quality reporting, ownership structures and ‘fake news’ have shaped public debates on immigration, refugees, and free movement and have contributed to the crisis of confidence in policies in these areas (Burack and Snyder-Hall 2012, Philo et al 2013, Berry et al 2015, Wodak and Krzyżanowski 2017). In the United Kingdom, Brexit has further deepened the tensions between multiculturalism, nationalism and nativism (Calhoun 2017, Powell 2017, Iakhnis et al. 2018), escalating a national political decision into a fully blown European ‘crisis’ (Zappettini and Krzyżanowski 2019, Krzyżanowski 2019).

Initial populist opportunism has now resulted in the mainstreaming and normalization of radical stances (Balch and Balabanova 2017, Wodak and Krzyżanowski 2017, Cammaerts 2018). These discursive shifts (Krzyżanowski 2018 and 2020b) add further weight to the argument that the globalising media is failing to meet the cosmopolitan promise on human rights (Balabanova 2014). Recent contributions have also highlighted that the rise of right-wing populism is neither new, temporary or localized and the underpinning concepts and definitions are complex and overlapping (Burack and Snyder-Hall 2012, Wodak and Krzyżanowski 2017; Krzyżanowski et al. 2018, Fekete 2019, Poole and Giraud 2019, Stockemer 2019).

In this special issue we move the focus onto instances of resistance against the erosion of liberal norms and human rights justice. We chose therefore to explore more closely the reaffirmation of principles such as social inclusion, engagement, agency, cosmopolitanism, equality and fairness, critical citizenship, as well as the duty to protect refugees and human rights. Previous research confirms that visual representation of human suffering brought about by the so-called ‘refugee crisis’, for example, can, under certain conditions, foster transnational solidarity (Chouliaraki, Orwicz and Greeley 2019).

This special issue uses the hostile media and political environments characterising Europe in recent years (Huysmans 2000, Andreas 2003, Buchanan et al. 2003, Buonfino 2004, Cohen 2011, Moore 2012, Gerard and Pickering 2013, Balabanova 2014, Berry et al 2015, Reinemann et al. 2019) as a context within which to scrutinise the intersection between media, language, discourse, migration and human rights. The research showcased here acknowledges the centrality of media, including social media, in the way societies talk about, comprehend, develop positions and support actions around cosmopolitanism, solidarity and hospitality towards the ‘other’.

This issue expresses an interdisciplinary focus on the ways in which different forms of media, and political communication systems, can limit, reframe and reimagine populist and anti-immigrant ideas. It also exemplifies the way public actors, including opposition and marginalized groups, reconfigure rights and responsibilities, accountability and pluralism, and reaffirm freedom of expression. The special issue’s contributions come from a range of scholars and experts who share a concern over the deleterious effects of populist ‘othering’ of migrants and refugees. Together, they offer an original combination of perspectives on a crucial area of research, bringing together insights from the fields of communication studies, politics, political theory, sociology, critical discourse analysis, human rights and minority studies.

The contributions traverse Europe from East to West and North to South, providing empirically informed case-studies from Turkey, Hungary, Italy and the United Kingdom, that include the Kurdish minority and Syrian refugees in Turkey, the Romanian diasporic community and pro-refugee groups in the UK, as well as EU nationals living abroad who emerged as a site of politicized discourse during the Brexit referendum. The studies specifically focus on the media in these countries and the way they have discussed the topics of refugees, asylum and immigration identifying discourses of human rights and resistance to discrimination, populism and xenophobia.

Although mainstream media have once again been recognized as a main source of populism and hostility (Balabanova and Balch; Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan; Vathi and Trandafoiu; Doğanay in this issue), media also provide conduits for resistance. Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan make the point, for example, that diasporic media provide symbolic resources for oppositional political and identity articulations, although they remain limited in scope due to their semi-public status, their symbolic exclusion from the mainstream and a partial tendency to rearticulate mainstream positions and reproduce “good immigrant” stereotypes. Nevertheless, as the authors point out, diasporic media analyses allow “the identification of practices and symbolic resources that may inspire among publics the expression of opposition and political action around common interests, on the basis of moments of critical awareness” (Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan in this issue). Balabanova and Balch identify limits to the ways in which media coverage erodes liberal principles, and even point to “pockets of resistance” in the UK exemplified by *The Guardian*’scalls toenforce and expand refugee protection in the context of a picture of hostility across Europe’s mainstream press. Doğanay highlights the existence in the Turkish press of examples of “rights-based journalism”, however limited they are. Moreover, social media thrive as a central space for the articulation of oppositional political debates and battles (Keaveney; Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan; Vathi and Trandafoiu;), a resonating chamber for political news (Vathi and Trandafoiu), an information but also pro-refugee lobbying and advocacy tool (Keaveney), and a place where the cultural can quickly become politicized (Vathi and Trandafoiu).

The politicization of the public space in the current political context in Europe is a recurrent phenomenon (Balabanova and Balch; Doğanay; Korkut, Gyollai and Terlizzi; Özdüzen; Vathi and Trandafoiu) resulting in the emergence of new spaces of contestation and political articulation, based on universal values, cosmopolitanism, ethics and human rights considerations. One of the biggest battles being currently fought is that against the relativization of ethics and rights (Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan). A key insight resulting from this special issue is the formation of new types of collectiveness (Özdüzen; Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan; Vathi and Trandafoiu), based on moral and civic reconsiderations and on a refocus on human rights, which in the following papers is addressed either directly (Özdüzen; Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan) or indirectly, via an emphasis on political engagement and participation (Vathi and Trandafoiu). Despite the expectation that some political and media contexts might be more illiberal, for example those in the East, the studies presented here provide evidence of “the emergence of a transnational and uniform hostility across Europe’s mainstream press” towards the foreign other (Balabanova and Balch). This, however, is to an extent moderated by the survival of key liberal norms through the presence of a rights-oriented journalistic style (Doğanay), the reluctance to explicitly push for the narrowing of the key norms of refugee protection (Balabanova and Balch) and the use of humanitarian human rights-centred discourse in the construction of the migration debate (Korkut, Gyollai and Terlizzi).

From a methodological viewpoint, text and discourse are at the heart of all the analyses included in this issue. They are the natural outcome of a variety of qualitative methodologies deployed by the authors that include audience ethnography, go-alongs and interviews (Özdüzen), qualitative content analysis, critical discourse analysis and argumentation (Doğanay; Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan; Vathi and Trandafoiu), ‘ethical framing’ analysis and ‘normative terrain’ analysis (Balabanova and Balch), Twitter feed analysis (Keaveney), and sociological interviews (Vathi and Trandafoiu). The oppositional and resistance discourses showcased in this special issue are founded on the development of a new critical language, expressing much needed rationalized political and constitutional choices.

Thus, the points of connection observed above in the papers that make up this special issue (giving visibility to marginalized groups and spaces, a renewed focus on rights, accountability and pluralism, and proposing alternatives) are coupled with diverse methodologies and rich empirical studies, as outlined in more detail below.

**Outline of contributions**

Opening the special issue, Korkut, Gyollai and Terlizzi offer an overview of the macro-discursive links at the humanitarianism/securitisation intersection in the context of migration controls. In their paper entitled ‘Migration controls in Italy and Hungary: From conditionalized to domesticized humanitarianism at the EU borders’ they trace the presence and significance of the humanitarian discourse by looking at “how politicians conceptualise humanitarianism for the self and for the extension of the self” as well as “how they subscribe to humanitarianism for the other as long as the other follows what the self demands”. The study explores these tensions in two EU border states – Italy and Hungary – and puts forward the argument for the existence of a conditionalised humanitarianism (where the *migrant* is the subject of humanitarian discourse but security objectives prevail as a condition of humanitarianism) and a domesticised humanitarianism (where the *self* is the subject of humanitarianism). What becomes evident is that the human rights discourse is reserved for “the self, the extended self, or the other as long as they meet the demands of the self” in both Italy and Hungary despite the explicit differences in the dominant political narratives in the two countries.

Continuing the focus on the normative dimension, Balabanova and Balch’s article zooms in on the specific principles of refugee protection in Europe and challenges the narrative of the ‘illiberal wind’ from the East driving the populist and nationalist backlash to the ‘migrant crisis’ of 2015-2016. In their paper ‘Norm destruction, norm resilience: The media and refugee protection in the UK and Hungary during Europe’s ‘Migrant Crisis’ they explore how, and to what extent, the two foundational norms of refugee protection: asylum and burden-sharing, were undermined or sustained in the media coverage in two European countries – Hungary and UK - that experienced the migrant crisis in different ways, but ended up adopting strikingly similar stances in terms of their restrictive response. By employing an innovative methodology combining an ethical framing approach with analysis of the ‘normative terrain’ underpinning the system of refugee protection the authors uncover “little evidence of resistance to right-wing populism in the media”. The two analysed norms were sometimes ignored, sometimes discussed, but also often challenged in the examined media sample. With the exception of *The Guardian*, calls to enforce or expand protection for refugees were almost absent. However, there is some scope for optimism in that only a minority of articles “explicitly pushed for a narrowing of the key norms. More frequent were articles raising the issue in an apparently neutral way, relying on the readers’ pre-existing attitudes to ‘join the dots’ and come to their own conclusions about the need to reduce, or increase, commitments to refugees”.

In her paper, ‘’Cinema as a common activity’: Film audiences, social inclusion, and heterogeneity in Istanbul during ‘Occupy Gezi’’, Özge Özdüzen describes how a transnational and cosmopolitan alternative public sphere mediated by film festival spaces and based on social inclusion, heterogeneity, community-building and global citizenship can take shape during times of political crises and authoritarian rule. The two festivals analysed, the Istanbul International Film Festival (IIFF) and Documentarist, have provided Turkish audiences in recent years with a much-needed counter-hegemonic space, defined by political opposition, a struggle against censorship and the promotion of human rights. Organizers and audiences have come together to create a space for the Kurdish minority and Syrian refugee communities that gives visibility to their political concerns, expresses different aspects of their respective identities and offers an “opportunity for global encounter”. As the author explains, “in the absence of a functioning public sphere in Turkey, small events and mediating festivals like Documentarist turned into counter-public spheres in addressing social, economic and cultural issues whereby the traditional protest spaces were increasingly repressed”. This case shows that social engagement can attempt to resist government efforts to homogenize political expression and restrict freedom of speech.

A counterpublic also emerges in the work of Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan, entitled ‘Diasporic media and counterpublics: Engaging nativist stances on EU immigration in the UK’, through the recognition, contestation and rejection of mainstream majority racism and populism and the articulation of alternative counter readings by diasporic media. The authors point out that the discursive practices of diasporic media aim towards visibility, but their impact is limited by their micro and semi-public nature. The authors ask what aspects of exclusion or discrimination are articulated in the Romanian diasporic media in the UK and whether these ‘articulations’ create an opposition to dominant nativist stances on EU immigration. Their analysis found that the Romanian diasporic media in the UK provides an expert articulation of the conditions that generated widespread anti-immigrant stances, which, according to the authors, can “provide a solid basis for dealing with it through political action”. Although diasporic media occasionally fall into the trap of becoming complicit in the mainstreaming of ‘welfare chauvinism’ and the reproduction of the ‘good versus bad immigrant’ trope, a new political awareness has emerged in the wake of the Brexit referendum. Complex and valid analyses of the role of media and politicians in stoking populism and nativism are expressed via feelings of shock, critical commentary, but also humour and a celebration of absurdism. The article concludes on a positive note, observing that “at certain moments, particular sections of diasporic media may constitute themselves and their audiences into counterpublics, who come into existence through the articulation of exclusion (recognition and performance), followed, ideally, by a ‘resolve’ to deal with this state of affairs”.

Some of these themes are echoed in the work of Vathi and Trandafoiu ‘EU Nationals in the UK after BREXIT: Political engagement through discursive awareness, reflexivity and (in)action’. Their work shows that as a result of Brexit, EU nationals in the UK have exhibited anincreased political awareness and the appetite to problematize the historical context, leading to new political attitudes, reflexivity, civic engagement and micropolitics. Although their engagement is mainly at a cognitive, affective and discursive level, it does not exclude participation in more formalized political activities. It is therefore important to recognize the value of “a range of attitudes and behaviours that express understanding, reflexivity and the intention to participate symbolically or actively in political acts”. The study also highlighted that a minority of EU nationals seem to partially internalize elements of the anti-migrant rhetoric, to adopt majority views in their quest to belong and disengage from the political process, mainly because of the perceived precarity of their position as EU nationals after Brexit and their commitment to integrate at all costs. The authors argue that both disengagement and mainstreaming still represent political stances, based on calculating best options. The article surmises that new forms of moral commitment, participation and citizenship may be emerging, that transcend purely ethnic affiliations: “What brings EU nationals together is their role within the same historical process and not their ethnic or national affiliations. They are equal in their quest to stay informed, protect their rights and exercise their political duties as members of a community, more or less symbolic. This quest leads them to seeking to become the agents of their own destiny”.

The battle for rights and visibility is not limited to the margins but can also originate from inside the political system, as Keaveney’s paper entitled ‘Insider outside: Freedoms and limitations in the Twitter communications of the United Kingdom’s All Party Parliamentary Group on Refugees’ demonstrates. In this paper, the author analyses the Twitter feed of the All Party Parliamentary Group on Refugees, a little known entity of the UK Parliament. Providing rare access to the workings of the group and its Secretariat, the paper looks at who is speaking out for refugees and migrants and how pro-refugee advocacy is carried out by a group that is both inside the system and therefore constrained by Parliamentary rules and all-party membership, but at the same has some freedoms that only external advocacy organizations enjoy. Keaveney demonstrates that the Group’s main communication activities aim to inform, win support for a cause or particular course of action, attract media attention and forge relationships and alliances with external campaign groups. As the author points out, “as a body which is both inside and outside the system”, the Group has a unique place and role to play. However, its communication achievements are limited by its multi-party nature and its location within official parliamentary structures. Yet, as the paper demonstrates, the Group is “able to speak up for refugees and has the potential to achieve policy change by virtue of the place it holds in the parliamentary network”.

Arguing for the importance of media in the acceptance and integration of refugees in Turkish society as a starting point, Doğanay’s paper – ‘Immigrants and Syrian refugees in the Turkish press: Analysis of news discourse in the context of the ‘Refugee Crisis’ – both reveals patterns of discriminatory discourses towards refugees in the Turkish newspapers and identifies discourse that could facilitate their acceptance and help them to be perceived as equipped with public rights. Turkey currently hosts over 3.6 million Syrian refugees which makes it the country with the highest Syrian population in the world after Syria[[1]](#footnote-1). As such, in the context of the ‘migrant crisis’ it faces different challenges to the ones experienced by the other countries discussed in this special issue. The examination of the Turkish press coverage of refugees discovered that due to the newspapers’ pro-government position they “publish a lesser amount of directly negative and discriminative discourse on refugees in order to avoid criticizing the government’s policy on Syria”. This is an important finding and significant difference. However, despite this the author concludes that the press portrayal of refugees and immigrants in Turkey remained “far from a rights-based perspective”.

Together, the research presented in this special issue demonstrates that the contexts and causes of the populist crisis are complex and stretch beyond simply racism, predatory politicians and xenophobic media. The ways marginalised groups respond to populist and nativists discourses and practices are also varied and complex. These groups are united, nevertheless, by their increased political awareness, critical reflexivity and attempt to make themselves and their plight visible, in the hope of establishing a dialogue between the dominant and the marginalised or racialised. A beast is at its most aggressive when wounded or in danger. It could be that the current exacerbation of populism and nativism is also an indication of their lack of sustainability in the long run, a sign of their incipient decline, to which resistance and opposition are contributing.

Hafez (2017: 6) makes an interesting point when he writes that “quite ironically it is the leftist liberal idea of integrating peripheral voices into the public sphere that lends legitimacy to the representation of the new right. Liberal theory which was designed to widen the social spectrum is turned against itself by the illiberal right”. While we agree that we must “also protect the participation of civilized deliberations of the radical right” (Hafez 2019: 6), we need to note the danger of the rapid rise, aggressiveness and dominance in the popular media and increasingly social media, of a range of discriminatory discourses, with anti-immigration populist rhetoric now being mainstreamed. It is against this “irrational”, as Hafez deems it, rhetoric that we aim to chart instances of resistance and reaction. Liberal voices have also been marginalized and need to regain recognition and visibility.

The evidence presented here partially stultifies any room for optimism (see also Poole and Giraud 2019). Alongside resistance and mobilisation, we have ongoing political and institutional constraints (Balabanova and Balch; Keaveney; Korkut, Gyollai and Terlizzi), outright censorship and decline in opportunities for free expression (Doğanay; Özdüzen), limited access to the public sphere (Vathi and Trandafoiu), and partial visibility of minority groups and media (Madroane, Ciocea and Cârlan). However, and in contrast to so much literature that has focused on the conditions, expressions and threats generated by right-wing populism, this special issue, articulates a slightly more complex view. The awareness, self-reflexivity, engagement and visibility displayed by marginal and oppositional groups and select mainstream media in a number of European countries shows both a recontextualization of right-wing populism and the mobilisation of liberalism or the stickiness of core liberal values that shape, limit or modify existing power relations.
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