

Hanna Völker

Causing, Staging, and Negotiating Disruption

Language Thematisations in Political Debates on Immigration

Abstract Immigration discourses are controversial and disruptive discourses within which ideological questions around the protection or destruction of existing social and political orders are discussed. These debates are increasingly revolving around political language use itself. Disruptions are identified in the debates not only on the level of socio-political implications of immigration, but also on the communicative level. A relevant communicative means hereby is public political language criticism voiced in language (use) thematisations. Methodologically, the analysis of communicative disruptions (i.e. a word choice or formulation is not recognized as usable without disruption or is highlighted as worthy of criticism or problematic through metacommunicative marking) or stagings of disruptions (i.e. strategies of staging political competition and assigning and denying authority on the basis of notable linguistic evidence to decouple and delegitimize opposing ideologies) and interruptions of ongoing interaction to negotiate language use is carried out on the basis of an interactional-pragmatic discourse analysis. Thus, the instances are conceptualised as strategically employed language thematisation practices and attempts at (dis)clarification within mediatised public political communication contexts.

Keywords language thematisations, political language use, discourse analysis, immigration discourse

1. Debates and/as Intervention

Anyone who debates, intervenes (Felder 2020, p.32). Within the immigration discourse, which is examined here at the example of the phase of the so-called *refugee crisis* in Germany from 2015 onwards, debates about political and social upheavals are conducted. In these debates, controversy arises from the polyphonic, heterogeneous assessment of moments of upheaval and the resulting plans of action deemed necessary to avert (perceived) danger, preserve or actively change existing sociopolitical orders. The controversially negotiated perceptions and collective forms of thought within the immigration discourse in post-war Germany represent “dominant fictions” (Silverman 1992, pp.15–51) of disruption (Koch/Nanz/Pause 2018, p.7), which are involved in the construction and organisation of society. Disruptions are identified in the immigration discourse not only on the level of sociopolitical implications of immigration, but also on the communicative level which will be examined here. The focus and goal of this article thus lies in a particular form of intervention on the political stage: critical thematisations of language use in political debates. We will see that who debates, intervenes and who intervenes, disrupts.

Controversial concepts or disputed lexis that carry a high disruptive potential can be determined empirically via explicit language thematisations (Wengeler 2022, pp.201 f.). Explicit thematisations of communicative devices themselves hold a disruptive potential in interactions where they interrupt and shift an ongoing interactional project. Interactionally speaking, these pragmatic quaestio shifts, or shifts in the theatre of war (Niehr 2002, p.97), can be

described as “side sequences” (Jefferson 1972), in which the contiguity of the ongoing interactional project is seemingly broken, or rather paused, to open a new interactional project. Another aspect of their disruptive potential lies in their usage to realise negative assessments and devaluations which aim at assigning the discourse position (Warnke/Spitzmüller 2008, pp. 34–36) of the disruptor to the interlocutor. The basis for this wide functional spectrum is that language (usage) thematisations can be used to address and critically evaluate “far more than just [the use of] language” (Cameron 2004, p. 319). This is rather taken as an occasion (i.e. as evidence on the language surface) to criticise the content of speech, the interlocutor, the political party or group they represent, or the underlying ideology. This paper will thus focus on the disruptive potential of public political language criticism, not (only) as an analytical approach to controversial lexemes in discourses (Stötzel/Wengeler 1995; Domasch 2007), but as a polyfunctional and complex communicative practice in public political discourses.

2. Analysing Disruptive Language Thematisations in the Immigration Discourse

Language thematisations in public political discourses can provide information about perceived or supposed (un)ambiguities as well as communicative (strategically employed) practices of (un)ambiguating (Völker/Spieß 2022; Völker 2023a). Especially in highly controversial debates on the topics of immigration/refuge/asylum, metacommunicative practices of political actors provide a relevant access to negotiations of agonality and controversy against the backdrop of heterogeneous assessments of political topics and communication. By means of an interactional-pragmatic discourse analysis (Völker 2023a; Roth 2015), the public political language thematisations are formally and functionally examined using pragmatic, politolinguistic and conversation-analytical methods to analyse a corpus of stenographic transcripts of parliamentary debates in the German Bundestag and conversation-analytical transcripts of relevant episodes of the German political talk show *Hart aber fair*. This approach links the micro and macro levels of discursive interaction in order to describe the specifics of individual interactions and also place them in the discursive context.

3. Disrupting the Immigration Discourse

Language thematisations can cause disruptions in discourse by temporarily introducing or placing a new interactional project, therefore they can be seen **as** disruptions; they are used to identify disruptions and disruptors and are instruments of debate **on** disruptions; and finally, they are part of a debate **in** a time of socio-political disruption around the topic of immigration to Germany. Three aspects at play here will be explored in the following chapters: These chapters will be dedicated to language thematisations’ capacity to **cause**, **stage** and **negotiate** disruptions in discourse.

3.1 Causing Disruption in Discourse

Discursive disruption can be understood as a disturbance or interruption that can occur in discourse, or through discourse, or through communicative actions within discourse. Discursive disruptions are empirically verifiable in that they trigger “an interruption of an empirical regularity or of a normal expectation” (Koch/Nanz/Pause 2018, p. 63) or identify and

address such an interruption in an evaluative statement. In the comparison of communication acts and expectations, adequacy assessments (Niehr 2019) are made on the levels of language usage, content, and relationship, which can interrupt or shift the currently ongoing interactional activity.

Language thematisations can temporarily interrupt and pause the ongoing activity, shifting the focus of attention to language and communication itself. Consider the following dialogue occurring in the political talk show *Hart aber fair* between the talk show host Frank Plasberg (FP) and the politician Alice Weidel (AW) from the party Alternative für Deutschland (AfD, Alternative for Germany):¹

1	FP:	Bevor wir nochmal zu den Zahlen kommen, Frau Weidel, was glauben Sie, wer integriert sich besser? Ein junger Mann, der, der allein in Deutschland unterwegs ist, dann aber vielleicht auch mehr Druck spürt, ähm, die Sprache zu lernen und sich zu bewegen, oder jemand, der einen Familienverband um sich herum hat?
2	AW:	Die Frage ist ja zu stellen, wer sich als Syrer ausgibt. Wir haben ja das Problem, wir haben ja das Problem bereits–
3	FP:	Gestatten Sie mir, dass ich die Fragen so stelle und Sie können ja Ihre Meinung gleich dazu sagen, aber bleiben Sie doch erstmal bei dieser Frage.
4	AW:	Aber das sind ja auch Grundsatzfragen.
5	FP:	Bleiben Sie doch erstmal bei der Frage. Ich würd's gerne grundsätzlich einmal klären. Hier kann jeder jede Frage stellen, die er will und jeder kann antworten, was er will. Schön wäre aber, wenn man erstmal die Frage beantwortet und dann kann man ja immer noch was sagen. Also was glauben Sie, was besser ist?
6	AW:	Es geht doch letztendlich um die Identitätsfeststellung und da haben wir allein schon das Problem aufgrund der Politik der offenen Grenzen. Genau das wurde uns versprochen auch vom Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, dass die Identitätsfeststellung einwandfrei erfolgt. Wir haben sehr viele Flüchtlinge, die sich auch als Syrer ausgegeben haben und dort muss eine ganz klare Identitätsfeststellung erst erfolgen, um überhaupt in irgendeiner Form über die nächsten rechtlichen Schritte nachzudenken.
7	FP:	Erklären Sie mir noch den Zusammenhang mit der Frage, was glauben Sie, wenn es um Familiennachzug gibt, vorausgesetzt, es ist eine festgestellte Identität, was ist besser, dass jemand einen Familienverband stützend um sich herum hat, dann aber vielleicht doch in seiner Sprache bleiben kann oder dass er alleine gezwungen ist, sich in der Gesellschaft zu bewegen?
8	AW:	Es ist eine Frage der Quantität. Wir haben darüber schon gesprochen. Dies hier ist ein Beispiel: Ich glaube, dass Ihre Eltern vor dem Khomeini-Regime geflohen sind, ähm, das passt ungefähr von der Zeit und das unterstützt ja eben auch die Forderung der AfD, dass wenn das Recht und Gesetz auch vollzogen wird und die Bundesregierung tut ja genau das Gegenteil, ja, dass es da auch zu überhaupt gar keinen Problemen führt. Wir haben aber vorangegangene Probleme, die entstanden sind, weil man sich über das deutsche Asylgesetz, über das deutsche Grundgesetz, aber auch über Dublin III-Abkommen hinweggesetzt hat.

(*Hart aber fair*, 18.9.2017, “Der Bürgercheck zur Wahl: Was muss sich ändern bei Sicherheit und Zuwanderung?”)²

1 Translations of the German sequences into English are given in footnotes throughout this article and are my own. For the purpose of this article, orthographic transcripts of the talk show sequences are used. In these transcripts, turn termination is marked by –, presumed wording is in round brackets. Unintelligible utterances are indicated in round brackets with the syllable length indicated by xxx (one syllable), xxx xxx (two syllables).

2 1 FP: Before we come back to the figures, Mrs Weidel, who do you think integrates better? A young man

In this sequence, the host FP questions the relevance of AW's statement as a reply to his question (2). FP does this to then pause the meaning-making and *clarify in principle* (5) how communicative conduct in the talk show is intended: *But it would be nice if one answered the question first and then one can still say something* (5). The topic of talk thus shifts from the initial question around the effect of the family environment on the integration of young migrants to the negotiation of a content (mis)match between question and answer in this particular case, and then further to a general clarification and turn to communication rules in the talk show addressed to all participants.

In language-thematising comments that do not occur within metalanguage discourses (Spitzmüller 2005 on the discussions on the subject of anglicisms in German), language and language use are temporarily taken up as the current topic of speech or interaction. Depending on the length as well as degree of complexity and interaction of the language thematisation, a distinction can be made between three types: Firstly, language-thematising sequences, secondly, language-thematising statements, and thirdly, language-reflexive minimal forms (Völker in progress). Type 1 comprises (critical) language-thematising disputes in which several speakers negotiate language and language use over multiple turns of speech. Type 2 involves shorter language-thematising statements by one speaker that temporarily open up a subtopic and occur within one turn of speech. Brief language-reflective markings occur en passant and are used to express e.g. distancing from word usage or characterisations of one's own language use and are summarised under type 3. Both types 2 and 3 can be part of the complex disputes on language (use) that form type 1.

Language thematisations can be used to mark, critically comment on and communicatively rectify disruptions dealt with as communicative problems. Here, self-initiation and other-initiation can occur when marking trouble sources as well as self-repair and other-repair when dealing with problems in conversation (Schegloff/Jefferson/Sacks 1977; Arendt/Kiesendahl 2015, p.174). Due to the characteristics of public political communication, which is geared towards antagonism and agonality (Mattfeldt 2018), there will rarely be any external ratification of a criticised use of language. Thus, disruptions are retained

who, who is travelling in Germany on their own, but then perhaps also feels more pressure to, um, learn the language and move around, or someone who has a family group around them?

2 AW: The question that needs to be asked is who is pretending to be Syrian. We have the problem, we have the problem already–

3 FP: Allow me to ask the question like this and you can give your opinion in a moment, but stick to this question for now.

4 AW: But these are questions of principle.

5 FP: Why don't you stick to the question for now. I'd like to clarify it in principle. Anyone can ask any question they want here and anyone can answer what they want. But it would be nice if one answered the question first and then one can still say something. So what do you think is better?

6 AW: Ultimately, it's about establishing identity and that's where we already have the problem due to the policy of open borders. That's exactly what we were promised by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees that the identification process would be flawless. We have a lot of refugees who have also claimed to be Syrian and there we need a clear identification process before we can even think about the next legal steps.

7 FP: Explain to me the connection with the question of what do you think when it comes to family reunification, assuming it is an established identity, what is better, that someone has a supportive family group around them, but can then perhaps remain in their own language, or that they are forced to move around in society alone?

8 AW: It's a question of quantity. We've already talked about it. This here is an example: I believe that your parents fled from the Khomeini regime, um, that fits roughly with the time and that also supports the AfD's demand that if the law is enforced, and the German government does exactly the opposite, yes, that it won't lead to any problems whatsoever. But we have previous problems that have arrived because the German Asylum Act, the German Basic Law, and the Dublin III Agreement have been disregarded.

rather than resolved. Instead, criticism of another’s language use serves to, at the same time, criticise the speaker based on their communicative choices and the communicative consolidation or establishment of boundaries between political opponents (Völker 2023b). Particularly, critical language-thematising statements are therefore not always only used to negotiate content or political vocabulary but can also be used strategically to attack interlocutors, and especially political opponents in conversation, or convince the audience, and the public, of their own authority through language thematisations’ pointedness and distinctiveness. Language use is marked as problematic and therefore a disruption, or symptom of a disruption that lies in the political ideas and attitudes behind the language use through which it is expressed. Thus, the discussants treat perceived problematic expressions or divergent attributions of meaning as “characteristic and sometimes even metonymic reflections” (Deppermann 2000, p. 17) of the political and ideological positions of the interlocutors. The application of language criticism towards others in mediated settings of public political communication will be explored in the following section as *stagings* of disruption.

3.2 Staging Disruption

Communication in political talk shows and plenary debates in the German Bundestag can be described as television conversations (Luginbühl 2021) in the case of talk show discussions and debates in a showcase parliament (Burkhardt 1995). In both cases, the face-to-face interaction of politicians is directed at persuading and legitimising points of view and, especially in the case of Bundestag debates, decisions in front of and for an audience. The majority of the audience of political mass communication is absent and follows the communication events with spatial and, in most cases, temporal distance. Dissemination via the mass media requires communicators to follow a media logic that is geared towards gaining the public’s contested attention. Specific communicative practices are to be understood in this context and include delegitimising of the opposing political party, attempts at positive self-positioning and negative other-positioning, as well as the attribution and denial of authority with the aim of gaining sympathy and votes for themselves and their political party. In political talk shows, decisions about winners and losers of a discussion are sometimes already made in the studio, as the studio audience can act as a juror by applauding, ending discussion sequences with applause and thus deciding on one of the communicative fighters as the winner in the wrestling arena (Diehl 2017). Political communication on the public stage serves not only to inform the public but to agonise and antagonise the political actors and their views/standpoints and the political content they represent.

By critically thematising a political opponent’s language usage, a speaker on a talk show or in a parliamentary debate can be identified, via the language thematisation, as a political disruptor based on their use of language. In this context, *staging disruption* refers to the targeted use of critical language thematisations as an effective means of criticising individuals or parties on other sides of the political spectrum. The following talk show dialogue takes place between the host Frank Plasberg (FP), the AfD politician Alice Weidel (AW), the journalist Nikolaus Blome (NB), and Cem Özdemir, a politician from Bündnis 90/Die Grünen (Green Party) (CÖ):

1	FP:	Seine Frage war und ich bin der Anwalt jedem hier, auch jeden Bürgers, dessen Frage nicht beantwortet wird. Es ging da auch um die Sprache. Ich werde Ihnen–
2	AW:	Dann bitte konkreter, um welche Sprache denn?

3	NB:	Ich geb' Ihnen ein konkretes Beispiel–
4	CÖ:	Wenn Ihr Spitzenkandidat sagt, ein Mitglied der Bundesregierung türkischer Herkunft–
5	AW:	Ach das kommt jetzt auch noch (xxx xxx).
6	CÖ:	–soll in Anatolien entsorgt werden, (glauben Sie das trägt dazu bei), dass diese Gesellschaft friedfertiger wird, dass wir vernünftig miteinander umgehen, guten Diskurs–
7	AW:	Was hat denn Herr Gabriel gesagt im Jahr 2012? Was hatte denn er, genau das gleiche Wort genutzt (xxx). ³

(*Hart aber fair*, 18.9.2017, „Der Bürgercheck zur Wahl: Was muss sich ändern bei Sicherheit und Zuwanderung?“)

In the sequence, the political party AfD is other-positioned as a disruptor of good discourse and peaceful societal conduct. The criticised language use serves as justification and evidence for the criticism of the political party itself as it is seen as characteristic of the party rendering it the political opponent of the other discussants in these segments.

Language thematisations are involved in negotiations on matters both internal as well as external to language (use). In the following segments, a CDU-politician refers to a political opponent (i. e. a member of the AfD) as *Typen* in a derogatory manner, whereby the labelling expresses a combative attitude and communication that is quotable and connectable to other discursive contexts.

Alexander Throm (CDU/CSU): Es geht letztlich darum, dass wir Typen wie Dr. Curio wieder aus diesem Parlament herausbekommen. (Beifall beim BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN – Dr. Alexander Gauland [AfD]: „Typen“ ist eine Frechheit! Was ist denn das für eine Antwort? Das ist ungeheuerlich! Das ist ein parlamentarischer Kollege, Herr Präsident! Der Typ steht vorne!) (DB 19040, p. 4023)

Vizepräsident Wolfgang Kubicki: Herr Kollege Throm, ich behalte mir vor, Ihnen wegen des Hinweises auf den Abgeordneten Curio als „Typen“ einen Ordnungsruf zu erteilen. Ich muss aber noch einmal darüber nachdenken. Ich behalte mir das ausdrücklich vor. Ich glaube nicht, dass wir so miteinander umgehen sollten in diesem Parlament, und zwar wechselseitig. (DB 19040, p. 4024)

Vizepräsident Wolfgang Kubicki: Ich möchte die Gelegenheit nutzen, an die Worte von Dr. Schäuble zu erinnern, dass die Art und Weise, wie wir im Parlament miteinander umgehen, nicht nur das Bild dieses Parlaments nach außen prägt, sondern auch das Verhalten in der Gesellschaft prägt. Deshalb bitte ich noch einmal ganz inständig darum – das ist eine herzliche Bitte des gesamten Präsidiums –, alles zu vermeiden, was die persönliche Integrität von Kolleginnen und Kollegen, gleich welcher Couleur, beeinträchtigen könnte.⁴ (DB 19040, p. 4024)

-
- 3 1 FP: His question was, and I am the advocate of everyone here, including every citizen whose question is not answered. It was also about language. I will give you–
 2 AW: Then please be more specific, what language?
 3 NB: I'll give you a concrete example–
 4 CÖ: When your top candidate says that a member of the Cabinet of Germany of Turkish origin–
 5 AW: Oh, that's also coming now (xxx xxx).
 6 CÖ: –should be disposed of in Anatolia, (do you think that contributes to) making this society more peaceful, that we treat each other reasonably, good discourse–
 7 AW: What did Mr Gabriel say in 2012? What did he, used exactly the same word (xxx).
- 4 Alexander Throm (CDU/CSU): Ultimately, it's about getting types like Dr Curio out of this parliament again. (Applause from Alliance 90/The Greens – Dr Alexander Gauland [AfD]: “Types” is an imperti-

In this sequence, the labelling of a member of parliament as *Typen*, which is interpreted as a denunciation, is marked as inappropriate in an interjection and afterwards critically commented on twice by the vice president of the German Bundestag. The VP first mentions the possibility of a call to order for the speaker and later on criticises it again with regards to not affect the *personal integrity* of any MP. The expected call to order is accepted here by the speaker in order to publicly and efficiently express the rejection of the party and its members.

3.3 Negotiating Disruption

Assessments of disruption are subject of further discussion. Negotiations of the different, sometimes contrary, assessments of a subject matter as disruption can sometimes take place agonally, and can provide indications of which agonal centers (Felder 2013) form the basic framework of premises behind the debates on various topics or justify the tension between the opposing views.

The following speech excerpt comes from a metalinguistic debate in the German Bundestag on the replacement of the word *Rasse* (engl. *race*) in Germany's Basic Law:

Dr. Marc Jongen (AfD): **Bürger trauen sich kein Wort mehr dazu zu sagen**, weil sie sich dann von der herrschenden **Ideologie** als rassistisch und menschenfeindlich denunziert sehen. (Beifall bei der AfD) Dass Sie die offen gewalttätige und aggressiv antiweiße Black-Lives-Matter-Bewegung, die übrigens auch Schwarze massiv geschädigt hat, mehrfach positiv erwähnen, spricht Bände und zeigt Ihre **linksradikale** Gesinnung. (DB 19196, p. 24773; my emphasis)

(...)

Zugleich wollen Sie jetzt das Wort „Rasse“ aus dem Grundgesetz tilgen, nach dem Motto: Rassismus ohne Rassen. **Wie das Geschlecht in der Genderideologie sollen auch alle sonstigen naturgegebenen Unterschiede zwischen den Menschen nur noch eine böswillige gesellschaftliche Konstruktion sein.** (Dr. Franziska Brantner [BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN]: Was für ein Stuss!) Ob der Begriff „Rasse“ heute noch angemessen ist, darüber kann man zweifellos diskutieren. Aber es ist doch nicht **bereits das Sehen und Benennen** von natürlichen Unterschieden rassistisch; rassistisch ist, einen Überlegenheitsanspruch, eine Unterdrückung daraus abzuleiten. Zu diesem sachgerechten Rassismusbegriff müssen wir zurückkehren, meine Damen und Herren.⁵ (DB 19196, p. 24774; my emphasis)

nence! What kind of answer is that? That's outrageous! That's a parliamentary colleague, Mr President! The type is at the front!

Vice-President Wolfgang Kubicki: Mr Throm, I reserve the right to call you to order for referring to MP Curio as "type". But I will have to think about it again. I explicitly reserve the right to do so. I do not believe that we should treat each other like that in this parliament, and this is mutual.

Vice-President Wolfgang Kubicki: I would like to take this opportunity to reiterate Dr Schäuble's words that the way we treat each other in parliament not only shapes the image of this parliament to the outside world, but also shapes the behaviour in society. I would therefore ask you once again – this is a heartfelt request from the entire Presiding Committee –, to avoid anything that could jeopardise the personal integrity of colleagues of any political colour.

- 5 Dr. Marc Jongen (AfD): Citizens no longer dare to say a word about this because they then see themselves denounced as racist and misanthropic by the prevailing ideology. (Applause from the AfD) The fact that you repeatedly mention the openly violent and aggressively anti-white Black Lives Matter movement, which, by the way, has also massively harmed black people, in a positive light speaks volumes and shows your radical left-wing mindset. (...) At the same time, you now want to erase the word "race" from the Basic Law, according to the motto: racism without races. Like gender in gender ideology, all other nature-given differences between people are to be nothing more than a malicious social construction. (Dr. Franziska Brantner [Alliance 90/The Greens]: What a load of rubbish!) Whether the term

For the supporters of the amendment of the Basic Law, the metalinguistic debate about the lexeme *Rasse* in the Basic Law represents a transformation and positive change insofar as new knowledge that disrupts old knowledge or beliefs represented by this lexeme is at the core of this debate which intervenes in the name of transformation (Butler 2004, p. 27). *To replace the term “race” with a modern term that corresponds to current scientific knowledge* (DB 19196, p. 24774) is seen as necessary. For the opponents, the motion represents another example of left-wing *ideology* and censorship, as was the case with the topic of *gender ideology*, in which biological facts were reclassified as cultural constructs, stigmatising and defaming critics who no longer *dare to say something about it*. The underlying premise is that the parliamentary debate therefore has a negative impact on citizens’ ability to communicate and must be discontinued in this form. The agonal negotiations are tied together with different judgements of appropriateness of lexemes or communicative devices, and disagreement over semantic conceptions, pointing to the wider debate over limits of sayability.

4. Concluding Remarks

In political communication in parliamentary debates and political talk shows, politicians discuss possibly disruptive events and topics explaining and justifying political measures and demands, negotiate language use and its possible meaning(s), while aiming at a positive self-presentation and negative portrayal of political opponents that is directed at the public. Since language and communication enable politics (Girnth 2015, p. 1), language thematisations are a means to (critically) address and negotiate not only language and communication and its meaning(s), but also the speakers and their ideas and political beliefs. The evaluative potential of language thematisations is what makes this practice a polyfunctional instrument in public political communication. Formally, language thematisations can be described as disruptions of the interactional order (3.1 Causing Disruptions). Functionally, they can be used to highlight and posit specific communicative means as disruptors of a political or societal constellation or framework as well as their users using the criticised language (3.3 Negotiating Disruption), using the conciseness and catchiness to reach the speakers’ communicative goals and persuade the public (3.2 Staging Disruption). Since language thematisations are institutionally anchored and routinised disruptions that aim at transformations of communicative and socio-political orders, rather than their destruction, they do not represent moments of crisis (Truan 2017 on interjections in parliamentary debates). They instead should be understood as interruptions on various levels, as quasi-disruptions: “To intervene in the name of transformation means precisely to disrupt what has become settled knowledge and knowable reality” (Butler 2004, p. 27).

References

Primary sources

DB (= Deutscher Bundestag). Stenographic report. 19th Electoral term. Berlin 2017–2021. <https://www.bundestag.de/dokumente/protokolle/> (last accessed: 9-12-2024).

“race” is still appropriate today is undoubtedly open to debate. But it isn’t racist just to recognise and name natural differences; it is racist to derive a claim of superiority, of oppression, from them. We must return to this adequate concept of racism, ladies and gentlemen.

Hart aber fair. 18-9-2017. "Der Bürgercheck zur Wahl: Was muss sich ändern bei Sicherheit und Zuwanderung?". Das Erste.

Scientific literature

Arendt, Birte/Kiesendahl, Jana (2015): Sprachkritische Kommentare in der Forenkommunikation – Form, Funktion und Wirkung. In: Bucker, Jörg/Diedrichsen, Elke/Spieß, Constanze (Hg.): Perspektiven linguistischer Sprachkritik. (= Perspektiven Germanistischer Linguistik 13). Stuttgart: ibidem, pp. 159–198.

Butler, Judith (2004): *Undoing gender*. New York/London: Routledge.

Burkhardt, Armin (1995): Zwischen Diskussions- und Schaufensterparlamentarismus. Zur Diagnose und Kritik parlamentarischer Kommunikation - am Beispiel von Zwischenfragen und Kurzdialogen. In: Dörner, Andreas/Vogt, Ludgera (Hg.): *Sprache des Parlaments und Semiotik der Demokratie. Studien zur politischen Kommunikation in der Moderne*. (= Sprache, Politik, Öffentlichkeit 6). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, pp.73–106.

Cameron, Deborah (2004): Out of the bottle. The social life of metalanguage. In: Jaworski, Adam/Coupland, Nikolas/Glasinski, Dariusz (Hg.): *Metalanguage. Social and ideological perspectives*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, pp.311–321.

Deppermann, Arnulf (2000): Semantic Shifts in Argumentative Processes. A Step Beyond the 'Fallacy of Equivocation'. In: *Argumentation* 14, pp.17–30.

Diehl, Paula (2017): Antipolitik und postmoderne Ringkampf-Unterhaltung. In: *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 67, pp.25–30.

Domasch, Silke (2007): Biomedizin als sprachliche Kontroverse. Die Thematisierung von Sprache im öffentlichen Diskurs zur Gendiagnostik. (= Sprache und Wissen 1). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Felder, Ekkehard (2013): Faktizitätsherstellung mittels handlungsleitender Konzepte und agonaler Zentren. Der diskursive Wettkampf um Geltungsansprüche. In: Felder, Ekkehard (Hg.): *Faktizitätsherstellung in Diskursen. Die Macht des Deklarativen*. (= Sprache und Wissen 13). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, pp.13–28.

Felder, Ekkehard (2020): Strukturelle Dialogizität. In: Vogel, Friedemann/Deus, Fabian (Hg.): *Diskursintervention. Normativer Maßstab der Kritik und praktische Perspektiven zur Kultivierung öffentlicher Diskurse*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, pp.29–37.

Girnth, Heiko (2015): *Sprache und Sprachverwendung in der Politik. Eine Einführung in die linguistische Analyse öffentlich-politischer Kommunikation*. 2. Aufl. (= Germanistische Arbeitshefte 39). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Jefferson, Gail (1972): Side Sequences. In: Sudnow, David N. (Hg.): *Studies in social interaction*. New York: Free Press, pp.294–338.

Koch, Lars/Nanz, Tobias/Pause, Johannes (2018): Imagined scenarios of disruption. A concept. In: Koch, Lars/Nanz, Tobias/Pause, Johannes (Hg.): *Disruption in the arts. Textual, visual, and performative strategies for analyzing societal self-descriptions*. (= Culture & Conflict 11). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, pp.63–81.

Luginbühl, Martin (2021): Fernsehgespräche. In: Hess-Lüttich, Ernest W. B. (Hg.): *Handbuch Gesprächsrhetorik*. (= Handbücher Rhetorik, 3). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, pp.247–278.

Mattfeldt, Anna (2018): Wettstreit in der Sprache. Ein empirischer Diskursvergleich zur Agonalität im Deutschen und Englischen am Beispiel des Mensch-Natur-Verhältnisses. (= Sprache und Wissen 32). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.

Niehr, Thomas (2002): Kampf um Wörter? Sprachthematizierungen als strategische Argumente im politischen Meinungsstreit. In: Panagl, Oswald (Hg.): *Politische Konzepte und verbale Strategien. Brisante Wörter - Begriffsfelder - Sprachbilder*. (= Sprache im Kontext 12) Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, pp.5–104.

- Niehr, Thomas (2019): Was linguistische Sprachkritik will, soll, kann. In: *Aptum. Zeitschrift für Sprachkritik und Sprachkultur* 15, pp. 71–80.
- Roth, Kersten Sven (2015): Diskursrealisationen. Grundlegung und methodischer Umriss einer pragmatisch-interaktionalen Diskurssemantik. (= *Philologische Studien und Quellen* 247). Berlin: ESV.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A./Jefferson, Gail/Sacks, Harvey (1977): The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. In: *Language* 53, pp. 361–382.
- Silverman, Kaja (1992): *Male Subjectivity at the Margins*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Spitzmüller, Jürgen (2005): Metasprachdiskurse. Einstellungen zu Anglizismen und ihre wissenschaftliche Rezeption. (= *Linguistik, Impulse & Tendenzen* 11). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Stötzel, Georg/Wengeler, Martin (1995): Kontroverse Begriffe. Geschichte des öffentlichen Sprachgebrauchs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. (= *Sprache, Politik, Öffentlichkeit* 4). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Truan, Naomi (2017): Zwischenrufe zwischen parlamentarischer Routine und Kreativität. Die Bundestagsdebatten aus dem Blickwinkel von unautorisierten Unterbrechungen. In: *Cahiers d'études germaniques* 73, pp. 125–138.
- Völker, Hanna (2023a): Politische Vereindeutigungsversuche. Zur Funktion von Sprachthematierungen in kontroversen Diskursen. In: *Aptum. Zeitschrift für Sprachkritik und Sprachkultur* 19, pp. 49–68.
- Völker, Hanna (2023b): “Deshalb verweise ich auf die Wortwahl” – Zur Funktionalität parlamentarischer Sprachthematierungen im Kontext sprachlicher Grenzziehungspraktiken. In: Merten, Marie-Luis/Bülow, Lars/Kabatnik, Susanne/Kuck, Kristin/Mroczyński, Robert (Hg.): *Sprachliche Grenzziehungspraktiken. Analysefelder und Perspektiven*. (= *Studien zur Pragmatik* 5). Tübingen: Narr Francke Attempto, pp. 25–45.
- Völker, Hanna (in progress): Sprachthematierungen im Migrationsdiskurs 2015–2021. Politolinguistische Untersuchung eines kommunikativen Verfahrens (Dissertation).
- Völker, Hanna/Spieß, Constanze (2022): Veruneindeutigungen. In: Völker, Hanna/Spieß, Constanze (Hg.): *Veruneindeutigungen. Themenheft der Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik (LiLi)* 52, pp. 543–548.
- Warnke, Ingo H./Spitzmüller, Jürgen (2008): Methoden und Methodologie der Diskurslinguistik – Grundlagen und Verfahren einer Sprachwissenschaft jenseits textueller Grenzen. In: Warnke, Ingo H./Spitzmüller, Jürgen (Hg.): *Methoden der Diskurslinguistik. Sprachwissenschaftliche Zugänge zur transtextuellen Ebene*. (= *Linguistik – Impulse & Tendenzen* 31). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, pp. 3–54.
- Wengeler, Martin (2022): Kontroverse Diskurse. Sprachgeschichte als Zeitgeschichte seit 1990. Ein Forschungsprojekt. In: *Aptum. Zeitschrift für Sprachkritik und Sprachkultur* 18, pp. 201–206.

Contact information

Hanna Völker
Philipps-Universität Marburg
Pilgrimstein 16
35037 Marburg
E-Mail: hanna.voelker@uni-marburg.de

Bibliographic information

Dieser Text ist Teil der Publikation: Meier-Vieracker, Simon/Bonacchi, Silvia/Acke, Hanna/Dang-Anh, Mark/Warnke, Ingo H. (eds.) (2025): Discourses in/of Disruption. Diskurs – interdisziplinär 12. (= *IDSopen* 9). Mannheim: IDS-Verlag. <https://10.21248/idsopen.9.2025.49>.