



CSRC
WORKING
PAPER

NO. 1 NOVEMBER 2011

AN OCCASIONAL SERIES AVAILABLE IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT

QUANTIFYING HATE SPEECH
ON COMMERCIAL TALK RADIO
A PILOT STUDY

CHON A. NORIEGA
AND
FRANCISCO JAVIER IRIBARREN

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:

UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center • 193 Haines Hall • Los Angeles, CA 90095-1544
Phone: 310-825-2642 • Fax: 310-206-1784 • E-Mail: press@chicano.ucla.edu

Editor: Chon A. Noriega • Senior Editor: Rebecca Frazier • Production: Bill Morosi
This series is a project of the CSRC Latino Research Program, which receives funding from
the University of California Committee on Latino Research.

MISSION STATEMENT

The UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center supports interdisciplinary, collaborative, and policy-oriented research
on issues critical to the Chicano community. The center's press disseminates books, working papers,
and the peer-reviewed *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies*.

For more information visit www.chicano.ucla.edu.

The CSRC Working Paper series is intended to convey the preliminary results of ongoing research at the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center. The research presented in these papers is preliminary and has not gone through the usual peer review process for CSRC publications. The authors invite your comments and critique: cnoriega@ucla.edu and jiribarren@chicano.ucla.edu.

I. INTRODUCTION

The considerable and often heated debate over hate speech has produced numerous reports, articles, and books. These studies have looked at the issue from a number of disciplinary perspectives, including those of journalism, law, linguistics, economics, history, and philosophy.¹ These studies offer valuable theoretical, conceptual, interpretive, and descriptive insights into hate speech, but they often rest upon unsubstantiated empirical premises about the phenomenon itself. Indeed, to date there is limited research on hate speech using scientific approaches to medium, content, and impact.² The main goal of this pilot study is to develop a sound, replicable methodology for qualitative content analysis that can be used to examine hate speech in commercial broadcasting that targets vulnerable groups—ethnic, racial, religious, and/or sexual minorities. This pilot study establishes data-driven descriptive categories for such speech and creates a preliminary baseline or reference point for future research.

The backdrop for this study is the 1993 National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Report to Congress, which addressed the role of telecommunications in the commission of hate crimes (1993). The NTIA advises the president on telecommunications and information policy and manages the

federal government's use of the radio frequency spectrum. Mindful of First Amendment protections as well as related federal legislation and policy, the 1993 NTIA report established a definition of hate speech drawn from the Hate Crimes Statistics Act (1990). Now, nearly two decades later, the NTIA report continues to provide a viable definition for hate speech, but it no longer reflects significant recent changes in federal policy, telecommunications platforms, and programming formats and content. Furthermore, the original study relied on data that were, by the NTIA's own account, "scattered and largely anecdotal," and it therefore failed to provide a scientific basis for data assessment, let alone a methodology or baseline for future study.

In developing this pilot study we considered areas in which we expected to see significant results, so as to establish and test data-driven descriptive categories. Future full-scale analysis would need to include a comparative dimension.

Commercial talk radio is the focus of the pilot study. Radio has the greatest penetration of any media outlet (print, broadcast, or digital), reaching 90 percent of Americans each week, and the news-talk format is the predominant radio format in terms of dedicated stations nationwide (over 1,700). We examined commercial radio talk programs reaching audiences in Los Angeles County because it is the most populous county in the United States and because Latinos comprised nearly half (48 percent) of the county's population in 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). The fastest-growing, and largest, minority group in the United States, Latinos represented 15.8 percent of the U.S. population, or about 48.5 million people, in 2009 (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Non-citizens make up 44 percent of the adult Latino population, of which 55 percent is undocumented (Pew Hispanic

Center 2007). Nationally, hate crimes against Latinos, when compared with hate crimes against other racial/ethnic groups, have risen at the highest rate, with a 25 percent increase between 2004 and 2008 (Federal Bureau of Investigation 2004, 2008). This increase may be linked to the media-generated negative discourse against immigrants that has been prevalent on the airwaves. In a 2007 national survey, about 64 percent of U.S. Latinos reported that the immigration debate had negatively impacted their lives, while 78 percent reported feeling that discrimination remained a problem affecting their community (Pew Hispanic Center 2007).³

II. METHODOLOGY

The 1993 report was the result of the NTIA's mandate to examine and report to Congress on the media's role in "crimes of hate and violent acts against ethnic, religious, and racial minorities." The report defined hate speech as either (1) "words that threaten to incite 'imminent unlawful action,' which may be criminalized without violating the First Amendment"; or (2) "speech that creates a climate of hate or prejudice, which may in turn foster the commission of hate crimes" (U.S. Department of Commerce 1993, 6). The definition of hate speech used in this pilot study is derived from this definition and the definition used in the hate crimes legislation: hate speech is speech that targets a vulnerable group and threatens or fosters the commission of hate crimes against that group, as defined by law.⁴

INCLUSION CRITERIA

The 1993 NTIA report considered all telecommunication at that time: "broadcast television and radio, cable television, public access television, computer bulletin boards, and other electronic media" (U.S. Department of Commerce 1993, i). For the

purposes of this pilot study, we focused our attention on samples from one medium (radio), and one programming format (news-talk), in one market (Los Angeles County). We decided to look specifically at conservative talk radio, which accounts for 91 percent of total weekday talk radio programming (Halpin et al. 2007). This allowed us to consider exemplary instances with respect to media penetration, a predominant format, and the largest and most diverse market. Furthermore, by examining the news-talk format, program content could also be measured against established professional journalistic standards—specifically, the Code of Ethics developed by the Society of Professional Journalists (1969).

Segments of thirty- to forty-minutes were selected from each of three programs: *The Lou Dobbs Show: Mr. Independent* (syndicated by the United Stations Radio Networks), broadcast on July 31, 2008; *The Savage Nation* (produced at KFMB 760 AM and syndicated by Talk Radio Network), broadcast on July 24, 2008; and *The John & Ken Show* (KFI AM 640, Los Angeles), broadcast on July 30, 2008 (table 1).⁵ These programs share certain general features of the news-talk format (news commentary, guest interviews) and focus on conservative topics (anti-immigration and free speech). At the same time, each program has a distinct profile: *The Lou Dobbs Show* is an example of a program featuring a high-profile media personality who has access to multiple traditional media platforms (at the time of the broadcast, Dobbs hosted radio and television shows). *The Savage Nation* is a prominent example of popular syndicated talk radio. *The John & Ken Show* represents successful local-market news-talk radio (it is also syndicated nationally).

We selected the broadcast segments shortly after the start of a project grant from the Social Science Research Council. This coincided with the

Table 1. Description of Program Segments

<i>The John & Ken Show</i>	
Medium:	Talk radio
Station:	KFI AM 640
Hosts:	John Chester Kobylt, Kenneth Robertson Chiampou, Terri-Rae Elmer
Air Date:	July 30, 2008
Guests:	Jim Gilchrist, founder and director, Minutemen Project
Topics:	The June 22, 2008, murders of Tony, Matthew, and Michael Bologna and their suspected murderer, Edwin Ramos; San Francisco mayor Gavin Newsom, his administration, and San Francisco's sanctuary policy for undocumented immigrants; Newsom and his administration's response to the Bologna killings; the Minutemen rally and Answer Network's counter-rally outside San Francisco City Hall shortly after the Bologna shootings; the Los Angeles City Council and specifically Councilwoman Jan Perry's initiative to place a one-year moratorium on the construction of new fast-food restaurants in South Los Angeles; the obesity epidemic in South Los Angeles.
<i>The Lou Dobbs Show: Mr. Independent</i>	
Medium:	Talk radio
Station:	Syndicated by the United Stations Radio Networks
Host:	Lou Dobbs
Air Date:	July 31, 2008
Guests:	Peter Brimelow, founder and editor, Vdare.com; Stephen A. Camarota, director, Center for Immigration Studies
Topics:	The issue of race in the 2008 presidential campaign, particularly in the campaigns of Barack Obama and John McCain; congressional efforts to shape or enforce immigration policy; offshore drilling; George Gascón, the newly appointed police chief of Mesa, Arizona; hate speech allegations against Dobbs; the population decrease, and the departure, of undocumented immigrants and possible causes (heightened immigration policy enforcement and the economic recession); targeting employers of undocumented immigrants as an immigration policy enforcement tactic.
<i>The Savage Nation</i>	
Medium:	Talk radio
Station:	KFMB 760 AM and syndicated by Talk Radio Network
Host:	Michael Savage
Air Date:	July 24, 2008
Guests:	None
Topics:	Barack Obama's 2008 presidential campaign and his Berlin address; critique by Media Matters and mainstream media outlets of Savage's remarks on previous shows regarding Iranian president Mahmud Ahmadinejad and the diagnosis of autism in children as a hoax; the June 22, 2008, murders of Tony, Matthew, and Michael Bologna and the suspected murder, Edwin Ramos; San Francisco mayor Gavin Newsom and his administration's response to the Bologna killings; corruption and abuse of power by Democratic Party leaders and some Republicans; public protests against Savage regarding his remarks about autism; Obama's links to communism and socialism; corruption and journalistic incompetence of the liberal media.

controversy surrounding San Francisco's status as a sanctuary city for undocumented immigrants. Not surprisingly, this issue is reflected in the transcripts; nevertheless, we analyzed speech targeting any vulnerable group (as defined by the 1993 NTIA report).

QUALITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS

In this study we employed conventional qualitative content analysis, also known as inductive category development, whereby we derived coding

categories directly from the textual data—in this case, transcripts of the program segments (Mayring 2000). This approach uses delineated and replicable methodologies that allow the generation of inferences from a given text without being bound to inflexible quantification. Conventional qualitative content analysis is ideal for areas of study supported by little theoretical or research literature (Kondracki and Wellman 2002), as is the case for empirical studies of hate speech.

Conventional qualitative content analysis follows an iterative process, beginning with the repeated reading of the data (transcripts) and the formation of the coding process. Category development involves the derivation of criteria from the data, based on background considerations and research objectives (Barrett 2007). Materials are analyzed for patterns, for which descriptive codes are developed; these patterns may indicate the presence of larger themes. As the analysis progresses, categories are either revised or removed based on their frequency and reliability. The inductive process of category development is followed by the deductive process of category application (Mayring 2000). This involves assigning category definitions within a coding agenda, in essence defining how texts should be coded with a category. Data findings and interpretations are related to pertinent research and literature and, as relevant, to common experience (Barrett 2007).

ESTABLISHMENT OF ANALYTIC CATEGORIES

Trained readers (undergraduate and graduate students), working in conjunction with the investigators, examined the transcripts for each of the three program segments. Emphasis was placed on identifying the relationship between speakers and targets—basically, who said what, about or to whom, and for what purpose. This allowed the research team to identify targets—vulnerable groups and/or their supporters—through implied and named (specific) references to them and through a speaker’s call for action against them (that is, suggesting or implying that listeners might do something that could affect the target). The research team then identified four types of statements that were made relative to these targets: unsubstantiated claims, flawed argumentation, divisive language (that is, “us-them” constructions), and dehumanizing metaphors.⁶

Utterances could be categorized, simultaneously, within two or more of these categories. The readers then developed a fifth analytical category for indexicality, wherein a word (or other sign) points to a context-dependent meaning. Given the labor-intensive nature of coding for indexicality, the readers focused on a ten-minute sample from one of the program segments (*The John & Ken Show*), adapting and using open source software (Transana) for both audio and transcript analysis.⁷ The readers focused on indexical terms, or code words, that pointed to a nativist attitude on the part of the speaker, then determined which indexical terms were used most frequently. Readers also identified patterns of rhythm, stress, and intonation (prosody) and discourse alignment among speakers. The four most recurrent indices in the ten-minute segment of *The John & Ken Show* were then used to analyze the three transcripts.

The preliminary findings provided data for all three programs in six categories: targeted statements, unsubstantiated claims, flawed argumentation (with a focus on fallacies), divisive language (deixis), dehumanizing metaphors, and selected indexical terms (indices for nativism). To ensure a robust methodology, we reexamined these six categories, first in relation to the transcripts and then in relation to one another. The first step yielded some corrections with respect to the coding process. In comparing the findings across categories, we noted a certain degree of overlap. In some instances this revealed how particular rhetorical strategies resonated with one another, but in other instances it merely produced redundant findings.

CATEGORY REFINEMENT

Two categories—dehumanizing metaphors and flawed argumentation—raised particular concerns given the redundancy of their findings with other approaches, the expertise

required for credible analysis, and the contention among scholars in each area with respect to methodology and interpretation. Our main concern had to do with whether these categories contributed to the project research objectives by generating reliable findings and a replicable methodology. The interdisciplinary nature of the project and the volatile nature of public debate over hate speech, not to mention practical considerations with respect to the limited resources for full-scale research, required a methodology that could be implemented or replicated by non-experts.

The inherent difficulty of reliably identifying formal arguments—that is, statements that make and present evidence for a claim—in natural-language contexts and the inability of formal logic to adequately evaluate natural-language argument—for example, identifying logical fallacies to invalidate a claim—led us to reconsider an approach in this direction (Hahn, Harris, and Conner 2009).⁸ As Trudy Govier (1982) cautions, “In practice it is often difficult to tell whether people are offering arguments or not, and whenever this interpretive issue is contestable, a comment to the effect that a fallacy has been committed will be similarly contestable” (6). Although the research team could identify and reach a consensus about “traditional fallacies” in the transcripts (particularly, *ad hominem* attacks), it proved much more difficult to connect them to a corresponding argument. Doing so depended on the charity of the interpreter, who might fill in premises needed to establish a formal argument (Finocchiaro 1981). We found that another analytical category used in our preliminary findings, unsubstantiated claims, provided a more productive approach, one in which speech targeted at vulnerable groups could be assessed through a standard fact-checking methodology.

Initially, metaphor analysis provided a compelling framework by which we could measure the extent to which the radio programs dehumanized vulnerable groups by establishing the sameness between two unrelated things or ideas. Phrases such as “love is a rose,” “the ship of state,” or “immigrants are a virus” are metaphors that facilitate an understanding of one thing (love, nation-states, immigrants) in the terms of another (flowers, ships on an ocean, disease). This type of analysis has already generated considerable insight into the media depiction of Latinos. In *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*, Otto Santa Ana (2002) provides an empirical analysis of the ways in which the mainstream (and ostensibly liberal) press uses metaphors to characterize immigrants in non-human terms as a dangerous threat, a virulent disease, an invasion, or an animal-like force. As Santa Ana notes, “These metaphors are not merely rhetorical flourishes, but are the key components with which the public’s concept of Latinos is edified, reinforced, and articulated” (xvi). Cognitive linguists emphasize that metaphors can also operate on a conceptual level. If a linguistic metaphor uses one thing or idea to understand another, a conceptual metaphor uses one “coherent organization of experience” to understand another, as with “life is a journey,” wherein the experience of life is understood through the metaphor of travel toward a destination (and, hence, a purpose) (Kövecses, Benczes, and Csábi 2010, 4). Thus, the study of linguistic and conceptual metaphors has the potential to reveal the rhetorical strategies and underlying conceptual systems by which vulnerable groups are understood and perhaps even acted against.

In the preliminary analysis for our study the readers used a consensus methodology to identify linguistic and conceptual metaphors directed against

vulnerable groups. These were then reviewed, and only those metaphors that dehumanized members of a vulnerable group were selected. The preliminary findings proved suggestive and resonated with Santa Ana’s findings (describing, for example, Latinos as threat, disease, or animals) while also revealing other metaphoric constructions used to describe not only vulnerable groups but also race (using terms such as *card game*, *nature*, *criminals*). Given the small sample, however, we identified only one significant and recurring pattern with respect to dehumanizing metaphors: the repeated use of the terms *illegal alien* or *illegal aliens* and *illegal* or *illegals* to describe immigrants.⁹ These terms were also identified in our examination of indices for nativism, wherein they code immigrants as antithetical to the nation. We found the latter approach more productive insofar as it provides a comparative framework with two sets of indices for an external enemy (*anarchist* and terms including *illegal*) and home country (terms referring to community and free speech).

III. FINDINGS

1. TARGETED STATEMENTS

Drawing from the 1993 NTIA report and the Hate Crimes Statistic Act (1990), this pilot study foregrounds two features that are crucial to the report’s definition of hate speech: a vulnerable group as the target and speech that threatens or fosters the commission of hate crimes against that group, as defined by law. In that context, vulnerable groups are defined as ethnic, racial, religious, and/or sexual minorities. We included undocumented immigrants insofar as they are associated with an ethnic group (Latinos) in the transcripts. We also gathered data on calls for action against those identified as supporters of vulnerable groups.

METHODOLOGY

Readers identified statements in the transcripts that were targeted at vulnerable groups, then distributed the statements into three categories: implied target, which does not explicitly identify a member of a vulnerable group, but the intent is clear; named target, which specifically identifies a member of a vulnerable group; and call for action, in which hosts suggest or imply that an action might be taken against the vulnerable group (see appendix charts 1a–1c, tables 2–3).

RESULTS

Readers identified 148 instances that met the study’s criteria for statements targeting a vulnerable group or their supporters. Seventy-nine percent of these instances (117) targeted vulnerable groups, and 21 percent (31) targeted their supporters. Across the three programs, readers identified 33 instances of call for action.

Just over two-thirds of targeted statements focused on undocumented immigrants and Latinos (73 of 117), including 4 of 28 instances related to people of color in public office. Averaged on a per program basis, Latinos (both citizen and undocumented) represented 91 percent (43 of 47, including those in public office) of the targeted vulnerable groups on *The Lou Dobbs Show*, 43 percent (15 of 35) on *The Savage Nation*, and 43 percent (15 of 35) on *The John & Ken Show*. The figure for *The John & Ken Show* is actually higher, since 34 percent (12 of 35) of the targeted statements in this broadcast segment focused on the residents of “South L.A.” (South Central Los Angeles), an area that is roughly 55 percent Latino and 41 percent African American.

Readers identified 2 calls for action against a vulnerable group: one was a general call related to immigration, and the other focused on people of color in public office who supported

Table 2. Summary of Targeted Statements by Statement Type

Program	Call for Action against Vulnerable Group	Call for Action against Supporter	Implied Target	Named Target	Total by Program
Lou Dobbs Show	1	6	10	36	53
Savage Nation	0	10	12	23	45
John & Ken Show	1	15	14	20	50
Totals	2	31	36	79	148

Table 3. Summary of Targeted Statements by Target

Program	Undocumented Immigrants	Latinos or Mexicans	People of Color in Public Office	Muslims	Sexual Minorities	South L.A. Residents	Total by Program
Lou Dobbs Show	36	3	8	0	0	0	47
Savage Nation	15	0	12	5	3	0	35
John & Ken Show	12	3	8	0	0	12	35
Totals	63	6	28	5	3	12	117

immigration reform. Insofar as both were oriented toward the political representation system, each might also have been identified as a call for action against supporters. The other 31 calls for action clearly focused on supporters: these were specific elected officials, advocacy groups (ANSWER Coalition, Media Matters for America), and employers of undocumented immigrants. This suggests a rhetorical strategy in which vulnerable groups are targeted and identified as a social problem or threat, but the call for action is directed against advocacy groups, public figures (and political administrations), or legal enforcement.

Of the 33 calls for action, most focused on Latinos and immigration. Seven related to a report by Media Matters for America that criticized the host's statements about autism, gays, and Democrats-as-fascists (*The Savage Nation*).¹⁰

2. UNSUBSTANTIATED CLAIMS

The assertion of false, unverifiable, and/or distorted claims emerged as a significant feature of all the segments we analyzed. This finding is important

insofar as news-talk programming is presented within a general journalistic framework that is associated with fact-based news commentary and expert-driven interviews on topical issues. The relevant professional organizations—Radio and Television News Directors Association (RTNDA), the International Federation of Journalists (IFJ), and the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ)—underscore the importance of both freedom of the press and ethical journalism. The SPJ Code of Ethics (1996) includes the following professional standards for journalists:

- Test the accuracy of information from all sources and exercise care to avoid inadvertent error. Deliberate distortion is never permissible.
- Tell the story of the diversity and magnitude of the human experience boldly, even when it is unpopular to do so.
- Examine their own cultural values and avoid imposing those values on others.
- Avoid stereotyping by race, gender, age, religion, ethnicity, geography, sexual orientation,

disability, physical appearance, or social status.

- Support the open exchange of views, even views they find repugnant.
- Distinguish between advocacy and news reporting. Analysis and commentary should be labeled and not misrepresent fact or context.
- Admit mistakes and correct them promptly.

The code is a set of guidelines, as the SPJ notes: “The code is intended not as a set of ‘rules’ but as a resource for ethical decision-making. It is not—nor can it be under the First Amendment—legally enforceable.”¹¹ As with other professional organizations, membership signals adoption of the standards and thereby also provides a basis for identifying noncompliance with widely held professional standards. In contrast to other professional organizations, however, the SPJ itself does not enforce its code. Instead, it “encourage[s] the exposure of unethical journalism” and notes that its code “is widely consulted and applied in newsrooms and classrooms as the definitive statement of our profession’s highest values and a helpful way to think about the specific and unique journalism quandaries we confront daily.”

While it is beyond the scope of this study to resolve the ongoing debate over the relationship of news-talk radio to journalism and professional codes of behavior, we do note that Lou Dobbs has served on the board of the Society of Professional Journalists. In addition, all three shows analyzed here adopt a fact-finding, truth-exposing stance with regard to their programming content. While often imbued with considerable emotion, opinion is nevertheless usually presented as based on fact.

METHODOLOGY

We employed a standard fact-checking methodology for analyzing claims in the transcripts. Each transcript was

Table 4. Summary of Unsubstantiated Claims by Type of Claim

Program	Speakers	False Claims	Unverifiable Claims	Distorted Claims	Subtotal	All Unsubstantiated Claims	All Substantiated Claims	All Claims
Lou Dobbs Show	Lou Dobbs	0	3	0	3	4	27	
	Peter Brimelow	0	1	0	1			
	Stephen Camarota	0	0	0	0			
Savage Nation	Michael Savage	1	8	8	17	17	19	
John & Ken Show	John Kobylt	3	2	2	7	21	26	
	Ken Chiampou	4	2	3	9			
	Jim Gilchrist	3	2	0	5			
Total		11	18	13		42	72	114

marked for explicit factual citations (figures, statistics, percentages) and for arguments or assertions with strong factual implications. We include fact-based claims made by guest speakers and interviewees in our analyses, alongside those of the shows' hosts, since their claims supported positions with which the host agreed. Each statement of fact was crosschecked with credible sources (published articles from academic and national media sources; official, non-commercial institutional websites). The claims listed in appendix charts 2a–2c, and summarized in table 4, are those that we were able to disprove or question with reliable evidence. The statements are organized into three degrees of unreliability: false claims, which were proved to be untrue; unverifiable claims, which were based on facts that could not be verified; and distorted claims, which were based on facts that were exaggerated or taken out of context. Each claim was then correlated to a target—a vulnerable group or a supporter—that would be impacted negatively if the unsubstantiated claim were accepted as true.

RESULTS

In the transcripts readers identified 114 fact-based claims. Of these, 37 percent (42 of 114) were unsubstantiated, with 11 proven false, 18 found to be unverifiable, and 13 found to be distorted. The reliability of fact-based claims varied according to program: claims

on *The Lou Dobbs Show* were 87 percent accurate; on *The Savage Nation*, 53 percent accurate; and on *The John & Ken Show*, 55 percent accurate. In the transcripts, Lou Dobbs made 3 unsubstantiated claims, with a guest making 1 in addition.¹² Michael Savage made 1 false claim, but a significant number of unverifiable and distorted claims (8 in each category). John Kobylt and Ken Chiampou made 7 false claims, 4 unverifiable claims, and 5 distorted claims; their guest made a similar number of false and unverifiable claims.

The targets of these unsubstantiated claims were congruent with the vulnerable groups and supporters that are identified in the targeted statements. In *The Lou Dobbs Show* and *The John & Ken Show*, the unsubstantiated claims related either entirely or predominantly to undocumented immigrants and governmental agencies or public officials that were characterized as supporting them or facilitating their negative impact on society. The unsubstantiated claims magnified the sense of an immigrant threat (attributed alternately to immigrants-as-criminals or public-officials-as-accomplices), overstated the effectiveness of the hosts' preferred immigration policies, and linked immigrant rights advocacy groups to terrorism. In addition to this focus on immigration, *The John & Ken Show* made 8 unsubstantiated claims related to an initiative to ban the construction

of new fast food outlets for one year in South Central Los Angeles, using these claims to discredit a local elected official (Jan Perry), disparage the “Mexican diet,” and portray economically disadvantaged blacks and Latinos as inherently violent and undeserving of the public's support. As with the two other programs, *The Savage Nation* made unsubstantiated claims related to immigration, but it also made unsubstantiated claims with respect to a wider range of targets, including liberals, Democrats, media, and advocacy groups. Other unsubstantiated claims focused on vulnerable groups identified by their race, religion, or sexual orientation.

3. DIVISIVE LANGUAGE (DEIXIS)

In examining media discourse, it is just as important to analyze word choice and how rhetorical effects are used to appeal to listeners as it is to analyze the factual accuracy of statements. For the pilot study we focused on one particular way that language establishes, maintains, or reinforces in-group status vis-à-vis a targeted out-group: deixis.

In linguistics, deixis refers to words or phrases that require contextual information in order for the reader or listener to grasp the denotational meaning—that is, to understand the referent (who speaks, to whom and of whom, and where and when the speech occurs) for the deictic term or terms (Lyons 1977; Rapaport et

al. 1994). For example, the sentence “And now we don’t like those people over there” includes four deictic terms that require contextual information: “now” (meaning at the present time), “we” (presumably, both the speaker and the addressee), “those people” (a third party previously mentioned), and “over there” (the spatial location of “those people”). In effect, deictic words “point” to specific persons, places, situations, values, ideologies, and/or group ascription in an often unconscious fashion. Deixis frequently occurs between speakers in the same speech community, where members share the same discussion topics, values, and worldviews and can therefore use deictic phrases within their community without being misunderstood.

Because of their capacity to attribute in-group and out-group status, collective pronouns carry a great deictic charge. In fact, they act as influential shapers of perception and social cognition at a very fundamental level, determining group belonging or lack thereof. Research has demonstrated that collective pronouns utilized to indicate in-group and out-group belonging play a powerful role in inter-group bias (Perdue et al. 1990). This is of great significance, as perceived members of an in-group are thought to have more positive attributes in comparison to those of an out-group (Brewer 1979). Collective pronouns pointing at in-group and out-group membership may establish evaluative predispositions toward both positive and negative targets, depending on group membership, in a kind of linguistic conditioning (Perdue et al. 1990). Hence, deixis provides an easy and effective tactic *at the level of language*, rather than at the level of factualness, for talk radio hosts to establish and maintain a cognitive and ideological bond with their audience.¹³

Table 5. Summary of Divisive Language (Deixis) by Targeted Group

Program	Vulnerable Group Supporters	Undocumented Immigrants	National Leaders	Sexual Minorities	South L.A. Residents ^a	High-Income Families	Total by Program
Lou Dobbs Show	5	5	3	0	0	0	13
Savage Nation	6	1	4	1	0	0	12
John & Ken Show	4	1		0	6	1	12
Totals	15	7	7	1	6	1	37

^aThese passages also referred, directly or indirectly, to Latinos (who make up a majority of the area’s residents) and blacks, and/or undocumented immigrants.

METHODOLOGY

Readers identified pronouns with a deictic function in the transcripts—those that indicated in-group or out-group status—such as *we*, *us*, *ours*, *they*, *them*, and *theirs*, and also *I*, *my*, *me*, *you*, *he*, and *his*, plus pronouns such as *these*, *this*, *those*, and *that* when they had a deictic role. Each transcript was marked for deictic phrases and words. Those that appeared to refer to a sociopolitical, economic, or cultural division were placed in charts for analysis. Most of these listed instances suggested an “us versus them” framework. Thus, each deictic occurrence was linked to an implied or stated in-group, an implied or stated out-group, or the targeted vulnerable group. An explication of the social function of the passages containing deixis provides context for the project as a whole (see appendix charts 3a–3c; the results are summarized in table 5).

RESULTS

Readers identified 37 passages that relied primarily or extensively on deictic phrases. The number of instances were similar across the three programs, with 13 passages identified for *The Lou Dobbs Show*, 12 for *The Savage Nation*, and 12 for *The John & Ken Show*. The deictic phrases used tended to posit an insurmountable sociopolitical, racial, or cultural divide between a show’s audience and targeted vulnerable groups. Fourteen passages focused on vulnerable groups: 7 on immigrants, 1 on sexual minorities, and 6 on the black

and Latino residents of South Central Los Angeles. In another 15 passages the target was supporters of vulnerable groups (elected officials, advocacy groups, and the media): *The Lou Dobbs Show* contained 5 of these passages, including 3 that were focused on Latino elected officials; *The Savage Nation*, 6; and *The John & Ken Show*, 4. In addition, 3 passages in *The Lou Dobbs Show* and 4 passages in *The Savage Nation* fashioned U.S. leaders (Barack Obama, Nancy Pelosi, the Bush administration) as out of touch with the values of the American public. One passage in *The John & Ken Show* established the wealthy as an out-group given their obsession with physical appearance and health, thereby situating its listeners somewhere between high-income families and low-income communities. The class positioning for appearance (“their slenderness” in wealthy families versus “everybody’s fat” in South Central Los Angeles) and health (“they take care of themselves” versus “they don’t care”) carries strong racial and ethnic overtones for the poor, which the program hosts describe as “that tribe” in “these areas.”

Michael Savage’s statement about a CNN report on gay Iraqis suggests how a speaker can use deictic phrases to aggregate multiple targets around an apparently simple us-versus-them statement. Savage dismissed the report, commenting, “If the first thing they did with their freedom—that’s what American men have died for so

they can be gay in Iraq?” In the contrast between “being gay in Iraq” and “American men,” the passage suggests that gay rights are in direct opposition to American values, as measured by military casualties. Savage’s use of “American men” rather than “American troops” emphasizes masculinity as a positive trait—but it also ignores the fact that American women served and died in the Iraq War. Savage’s rhetorical stance is to claim a dismissive lack of interest (“please leave me alone with that already”), but the effect of the passage is to align Iraqis, homosexuals, gay rights, and the liberal media against Savage and his articulation of “freedom” as defended by “American men.”

As a discursive tactic, deictic passages may even be more effective than explicit calls for action against vulnerable groups, as it requires audiences to accept or at least be constantly aware of the underlying context (the speaker’s set of beliefs) in order to understand the speaker’s comments.

4. INDEXICAL TERMS

Indexicality is a concept that emerges out of linguistics as well as the philosophy of language. Like deixis, it describes references whose meaning is dependent on context. An indexical includes any sign—a linguistic expression, a behavior, or a thing—that points to other concepts, objects, or sentiments. The classic example is smoke as an index of fire, insofar as we associate smoke as a sign that points to fire. In this context, smoke means fire, since we understand that fire produces smoke. The relationship between an indexical sign or code and what it signifies is not necessarily causal, however. As we saw in the discussion of *The John & Ken Show* in the previous section, the hosts established the word *appearance* as an indexical for wealth and *obesity* as an indexical for low-income black and Latino families in South Central Los Angeles. Analyses of indexicality offer insight into

interpretative processes and the role of language in constructing identity and societal attitudes (Inoue 2004; Ochs 1992). As Bucholtz and Hall note, “*Identity is the social positioning of self and other*” (2005, 586), wherein “indexical associations can also be imposed from the top down by cultural authorities such as intellectuals or the media. Such an imposed indexical tie may create ideological expectations among speakers and hence affect linguistic practice” (596).

METHODOLOGY

Given the large volume of data that would be generated from coding all three transcripts for indexicality, we focused on a sample drawn from one of the transcripts: ten minutes of dialogue from *The John & Ken Show* between hosts John Kobylt and Ken Chiampou and guest Jim Gilchrist, founder and director of the Minuteman Project. During this segment they discussed San Francisco’s sanctuary policy in the context of murder (and other crimes) and immigration (lines 45–267 of the transcript). This segment provides an example of identity construction as the “social positioning of self and other” by way of political nativism—the attitude or policy of favoring the native inhabitants of a country over its immigrants.

Analysis of the Sample

Readers found that the speakers used indexicality in four ways in the sample segment: 1) the use of codes words to establish Latinos, immigrants, and immigrant rights advocates as “other” to the nation; 2) the use of rhythm, stress, and intonation (prosody) to emphasize nativist attitudes; 3) the reinforcement of nativist attitudes through word repetition; and 4) alignment between the hosts and guest (appendix charts 1a–1e).¹⁴

Readers identified twenty passages in which indexical terms (code words) were used to identify certain groups as “other” to the nation. Terms

such as *illegal alien*, *gangbanger*, *killers*, *anarchists*, *calamity*, and *domestic terrorism* indexed Latinos, undocumented immigrants, and immigrant rights advocates, thereby associating these groups with crime, terror, and a foreign enemy. Heightening this message was the juxtaposition of these terms with indices for a vulnerable home nation: *community*, *civilized community*, *freedom of speech*, *founding fathers*, *city*, and *country*. In seventeen passages the speaker’s rhythm, stress, and intonation heightened the indexical associations. Rising pitch and syllabic emphasis on the indices for crime, terror, and the enemy added a sense of urgency. Stutters and pauses when uttering usually positive or neutral words (*advocates*, *endorsing*, *supporting*, *preference programs*) to describe immigrant rights proponents indexed ridicule, disgust, and condemnation. Four terms were repeated between three and six times each over the course of ten minutes: *illegal alien* (6), *anarchist* (3), *community* or *communities* (5), and *free speech* or *freedom of speech* (4). The first two index a foreign enemy, and the last two index the home nation.

Finally, readers identified lack of alignment among hosts and guests in the sample segment—passages where speakers did not use the same words and tried to advance different ideas. Prosodic and rhetorical elements such as interruption, talking over each other, and changing the subject also indicated a lack of alignment. In the ten-minute sample John Kobylt and Ken Chiampou frequently did not align: Chiampou characterized the protesters as advocating immorality, while Kobylt identified them as free speech suppressors; Chiampou wanted to talk about the specifics related to Newsom and type of gun, while Jim Gilchrist wants to implicate Newsom using generalities. Gilchrist also wanted to advance the idea that “safe” communities were now in danger. These differences were reinforced through

word frequency. In the nine instances where Kobylt, Chiampou, and Gilchrist seemed to engage and concur with one another, indexical analysis revealed that only in one instance did they all fully align. In seven instances, the hosts used differing words to refer to the same discussion topic, and in one instance they used the identical word but in reference to differing interpretations of it. This lack of alignment signals not so much disagreement (they are all anti-immigration) as an appeal to different audience segments and different approaches to the same end.

ANALYSIS OF THE TRANSCRIPTS

For the larger pilot study, we counted the occurrence of four indexical terms that had the highest number of repetitions in the ten-minute segment, either as a single word or in a phrase: *illegal* (including *illegals*, *illegal alien*, *illegal aliens*, *illegal immigrants*, *illegal immigration*), *anarchist*, *community* (including *communities*), and *free speech* (including *freedom of speech*, *free press*, *freedom of the press*). We then counted the occurrences of these terms in the transcript for each of the three programs, determining frequency by speaker and totals for each term (appendix charts 4a–4c, table 6).

FINDINGS

Program hosts and guests repeated the four indexical terms 101 times in the transcripts. Terms including the word *illegal* accounted for 68 percent (69 of 101) of these indexical utterances, with most of them occurring in *The Lou Dobbs Show* (44). Dobbs used terms with *illegal* 31 times, and his two guests used the code words a total of 13 times, in reference to deportation, statistical data about the decline of recent illegal immigration, employers of undocumented immigrants, and immigration reform. Dobbs most frequently used the phrase *illegal alien* (or *illegal aliens*), which dehumanizes undocumented immigrants and strips

Table 6. Summary of Selected Indexical Terms

Program	Illegal ^a	Community ^b	Free Speech ^c	Anarchist	Total by Program
Lou Dobbs Show	44	0	0	0	44
Savage Nation	16	2	12	6	36
John & Ken Show	9	5	4	3	21
Totals	69	7	16	9	101

^aCategory contains “illegal alien,” “illegal aliens,” “illegal immigration,” “illegal immigrants,” “illegal,” “illegals,” “illegal employers,” “illegal employees.”

^bCategory contains “community,” “communities.”

^cCategory contains “free speech,” “freedom of speech,” “free press,” “freedom of the press.”

away broader socioeconomic contexts and factors. Dobbs used one other code word, *community*, which was not tabulated because it was used outside a nativist framework (Dobbs spoke favorably of technological incentives within the “business community”).

Savage used the term *illegal alien* as a jumping-off point in a criticism of government, civil servants (Kamala Harris), and public policies (the sanctuary policy). But he also established “this illegal alien” as an index not only for the specific gruesome murder of a father and his two sons but also for “murderers, rapists, and pornographers” in general. Savage used the other three terms to establish an us-versus-them contrast between himself and socially liberal groups. He used *community* to attack liberal values and lifestyles with regard to the Middle East and to criticize San Francisco as a liberal community in connection to the sanctuary policy. In using the different iterations of *free speech*, Savage positioned himself as a victim of the censorship of the political left—specifically in regard to philanthropist George Soros and media watchdog Media Matters for America.¹⁵ In several instances Savage directly cited the activities of Media Matters as an impediment to his own freedom of speech and portrayed the organization as detrimental to personal freedom, national freedom, and public knowledge. Savage also called for

financial investigations of Media Matters. Finally, Savage used *anarchist* in the context of describing left-oriented politics. The term was used in combination with “socialists, communists, and anti-Americanism” to characterize crowds attending Obama’s campaign speeches in the United States and abroad. The term was also used twice to describe Media Matters as an organization that wants to censor Savage’s views.

In *The John & Ken Show*, *illegal alien* or some variation was used 9 times, largely as an index of immorality and criminality. Like Savage, Kobylt and Chiampou associated *illegal alien* with violent crime: “triple-murdering illegal alien.” They also used the phrase 4 times to qualify the terms *advocates*, *advocacy groups*, and *protesters*, thereby casting these groups in immoral and criminal terms as well. Guest Jim Gilchrist did not use *illegal aliens*, but he did use *these killers* in an indexical sense that generalizes a single murder suspect to imply that all undocumented immigrants are murderous: “They [San Franciscans] don’t want these killers up here.” In the discussion, however, Gilchrist focused more attention on the protests by immigrant rights advocates as suppressing free speech, a point he repeats four times. Gilchrist was the only speaker to use *community* (5 times), mostly as a reference point for fears about the dangers posed by

undocumented immigrants. Finally, both host and guest used *anarchist* as an index for immigrant rights advocates. For Gilchrist, *anarchists* becomes a code word by which the following associations are attached to immigrant rights advocates: “delusional,” “misinformed,” “let’s suppress everyone else’s freedom of speech,” and “domestic terrorists.” Interestingly, Chiampou used *anarchist* in a different sense, distinguishing between advocacy groups and “just anarchists who signed up for the mayhem that day.” Gilchrist responded by conflating both senses of the word around “domestic terrorism.”

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings are based on data generated from broadcast segments of thirty to forty minutes that were selected from three commercial talk radio programs. Even using this limited sample, the qualitative content analysis reveals a significant incidence of speech that incorporates targeted statements, unsubstantiated claims, divisive language, and indexical terms related to political nativism. Our analysis yielded no instances of the kind of hate speech that is defined in the 1993 NTIA report as calling for “immediate unlawful action” (U.S. Department of Commerce 1993). Whether such speech exists on talk radio would require a broader study.¹⁶ Based on the evidence we uncovered, the programs reveal a distinct and recurring rhetorical pattern for targeting specific vulnerable groups that relies on the systematic use of a combination of unsubstantiated claims, divisive language, and indexical terms that point to a nativist attitude. Through this rhetorical pattern, vulnerable groups were defined as antithetical to core American values, which were attributed by the hosts to themselves, their audience, and the nation. A significant and recurring indexical construct was

that of (Latino) immigrants as criminals and, by extension, as an imminent threat to the American public. Latino immigrants were also linked to social institutions that were presented as complicit with them. In effect, target groups were characterized as both powerful and a direct threat to the listeners’ way of life (in some measure because they were seen as having captured major social institutions such as the media).

What we find most troubling in our findings is the extent to which this pattern relies on unsubstantiated claims while the talk radio programs situate themselves within the journalistic context of “news” and “opinion” directed at public policy debate. Although our data included no explicit calls to criminal action, the programs systematically placed unsubstantiated claims in the context of divisive language and indexical associations that drew a sharp contrast between their targets (vulnerable groups and those depicted as in collusion with them) and their ideologically aligned listeners, whom they sought to mobilize. In this regard, it is notable that the program hosts often utilized specific situations and people to exemplify larger themes. Thus, while the targets may have been specific (a political figure, a news organization, undocumented immigrants), the discourse itself had bigger political or policy aims.

The primary goal of the pilot study was to establish a rigorous and replicable methodology for a full-scale study or series of ongoing studies. Although the limited size of our sample does not provide a basis for definitive conclusions, our findings nonetheless identify several distinct features of speech among the talk radio programs and raise useful questions for a full-scale study. These include broader studies into the extent and nature of:

- The discursive pattern whereby vulnerable groups are targeted, but

calls for action are directed against those identified as supporters of vulnerable groups.

- The use of dehumanizing metaphors, divisive language (deixis), and indexical terms (nativist code words) to establish targeted outgroups as outside the realm of legal protection or participation in public discourse.
- The use of unsubstantiated claims as a cornerstone of political opinion presented as an interpretation of fact. These unsubstantiated claims further serve as the basis for targeting vulnerable groups as an immediate and direct threat to the program audience (and nation).

Other studies could attempt to measure the impact of particular discursive patterns, figures of speech, linguistic expressions, and unsubstantiated claims that target vulnerable groups while also calling for action on the part of listeners.

The major challenge for a study of hate speech involves determining whether some speech on news-talk radio conforms to one of the two definitions for actionable hate speech—speech that threatens or fosters the commission of hate crimes. In this regard, it is important to note that there is no inherent statistical or numerical threshold for any of the analytical categories used in this study that could thereby provide unequivocal evidence for the existence of hate speech or a climate of hate or prejudice. Indeed, determining a causal relationship between media discourse and the commission of hate crimes against vulnerable groups would require other approaches that can measure impact. In this regard, the pilot study lays the groundwork for developing scientific studies that would provide evidence related to impact: for example, biomarkers for increased aggression (based on evidence that salivary biomarkers can measure aggression as demonstrated by Gordis et al. 2006),

social psychology surveys, and social network analysis (Wasserman and Faust 1994). We argue that qualitative content analysis provides a necessary component of any such analysis, since it provides verifiable, precise delineations of program content. But the question about the relationship between program content and hate crimes requires a multidisciplinary approach that can provide indicators for impact on different levels: physiological, psychological, and social. Together, these approaches would provide a more complete picture of the nature and impact of program content with respect to vulnerable groups.

This project has numerous implications for policy development. In the past, Latino groups have pushed for change on three fronts with respect to media advocacy and policy: improving on-screen and on-air portrayals, increasing employment (for both talent and executives), and facilitating media ownership. While our project does not explore the fine points of media policy or the public and political debate that surrounds them, we do bring renewed attention to content issues as they impact the Latino population. Our pilot study also highlights the issue of codes of professional conduct for journalists. Moreover, our pilot project

may generate questions about control over content production and distribution and how that control affects the representation of vulnerable groups. In this regard, the 1993 NTIA report's recommendation is more salient than ever: "To combat hate speech with more speech." But such a goal is also easier said than done. Indeed, one can reasonably ask, exactly how and where will this "more speech" be spoken?

In the United States, the issue of hate speech has been framed largely by First Amendment protections, focusing on freedom of speech and of the press.¹⁷ In some ways, the public discourse about free speech has become more about doctrine than process, presuming that free speech is absolute and fixed, rather than a freedom from *governmental* restrictions that must be defended and defined through specific instances and for which there have been notable exceptions (sedition, war protests, obscenity, and, more recently, free speech zones). In the United States the system of checks and balances inherent in the Constitution's separation of powers provides a necessary governance context for adjudicating among competing constitutional rights—for example, in the case of hate speech, freedom of speech (First Amendment) versus equal

protection (Fourteenth Amendment). Furthermore, in adjudicating among competing claims and claimants, the government also plays an indirect role in restricting speech—as in the case of libel suits. With respect to broadcast media, the government determines which corporate interests are allocated radio frequency (and, hence, access to speech within expansive media), defines a regulatory framework that has a direct impact on programming formats (and, hence, on content), and plays an explicit role in imposing fines and censorship around specific content. Our goal is not to question freedom of speech, but rather to acknowledge that it exists in the context of the entire U.S. Constitution and our corresponding governance system. In addressing the issue of hate speech and its relation to hate crimes, we need the "more speech" of sound research on the phenomenon itself, so that we have some basis other than unsubstantiated claims by which to understand who says what, about whom, and to what effect on the public airwaves.

NOTES

Student researchers included Hector Peña, Raul Lugo, Alex Lee, Addy Figueroa, Katherine Branson, Kristy Norindr, Melany Bertrand, Antonio Anfiteatro, and Clifford Hilo. We would like to recognize the exceptional contributions of

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Chon A. Noriega is a professor of cinema and media studies at UCLA and the director of the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center (CSRC)

Francisco Javier Iribarren is the assistant director of the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center (CSRC).

FUNDERS

This project is supported in part by a grant from the *Necessary Knowledge for a Democratic Public Sphere Program* of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) with funds provided by the Ford Foundation. The program supported collaborations between researchers and advocacy groups. This research project is a strategic partnership between the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center (CSRC) and the National Hispanic Media Coalition (NHMC). Additional support was provided by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, as well as by the UCLA Graduate Division, which funded a Summer Institute for the Study of Hate Speech at the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center in 2009.

Hector Peña and Clifford Hilo to this project. Our UCLA colleagues, Otto Santa Ana and Darnell Hunt, provided valuable consultation during the early development of the project.

1 For example, Butler 1997; Cortese 2006; Dharmapala and McAdams 2003; Kellow and Steeves 1998; Lendman 2006; Lewis 2007; 'Meddaugh and Kay 2009; Neiwert 2009; O'Connor 2008; Slagle 2009; and Tolmach Lakoff 2000.

2 Research in economics involves development of models with empirical support (Dharmapala and McAdams 2003). Media research has established scientific approaches for impact as it relates to advertising as well as to media violence (Bushman and Anderson 2001).

3 These findings were echoed in a Associated Press-Univision poll conducted in May 2010; see "Discrimination High Against Latinos, Poll Finds," *Los Angeles Times*, May 20, 2010. Different civil rights organizations serving the Hispanic community have mounted parallel efforts highlighting the role of the media on anti-immigrant hate speech; these programs include The National Council of La Raza's Take Hate Out of the Immigration Debate (<http://wecanstopthehate.org>) and The Mexican American Legal Defense Foundation's Campaign to Counter Anti-Immigrant and Anti-Latino Misinformation and Rhetoric (see Mexican American Legal Defense Foundation 2008). In January 2009, NHMC filed a petition for inquiry on hate speech in the media before the Federal Communications Commission (National Hispanic Media Coalition 2009).

4 Our study relies on the original target groups for hate speech put forward in the 1993 NTIA report: "'Hate speech' would therefore encompass words and images that 'manifest evidence of prejudice based on race, religion, sexual orientation, or ethnicity.'" That said, our use of "vulnerable group" as a generalized description for hate speech targets allows for the fact that the groups constituted as vulnerable may change over time or across different contexts.

5 Media Matters for America, a not-for-profit media monitoring organization, provided audio files and transcripts for *The Savage Nation* for July 21–31, 2008. More information about obtaining copies of the transcripts used in this study is available on request.

6 See Noriega and Iribarren 2009, which presents preliminary findings for these four types of statements.

7 Information about Transana is available on the company's website: www.transana.org/about/index.htm.

8 The study of informal logic—the attempt to assess and therefore improve reasoning in ordinary (natural) language—seems to be moving away from a focus on fallacies as a way to evaluate the validity of an informal argument (Groarke 2007). For our purposes, the central issues have to do with the limited ability of informal logic (and "traditional fallacies," in particular) to address natural language argument (Hahn, Harris, and Conner 2009). This approach also resonates with at least one attempt to redefine fallacy on the basis of the falsity or truth of the premises (Boone 1999).

9 A larger study has the potential to extend the type of research conducted by Santa Ana on print media.

10 Media Matters for America maintains a list of related documents; it is available at http://mediamatters.org/search/tag/michael_savage?page=11&tab=all&tags=michael_savage.

11 SPJ elides a crucial distinction here: the First Amendment protects journalists from governmental censorship, not necessarily from "decision-making" related to content made by media corporations, as evidenced with the recent firing of Juan Williams on NPR and the suspension of Keith Olbermann on MSNBC.

12 We do not include Dobbs's claim, "But, by God, I'm an anti-illegal employer as well" (lines 985–86), which has recently been proven untrue (*Nation*, October 25, 2010); that was not known at the time of the broadcast.

13 In a *Los Angeles Times* article on the National Tea Party Convention in February 2010, an attendee explained what she wanted from the movement: "Our way of life is under attack. I truly believe they are trying to destroy this country. It's just hard to say who 'they' is" (Hennessey 2010). The deictic phrasing reveals both the speaker's fears for "our way of life" in "this country" and her confusion about the "they" posing the threat. Mass media has the potential to provide contextual information that shapes these fears—and their us-versus-them configuration—by providing a clear referent for the deictic term *they*.

14 The excerpt was re-transcribed to capture pauses and non-verbal expressions, and therefore its appearance is different from the formal transcript used for the larger study.

15 Media Matters for America describes itself as a "progressive research and information center dedicated to comprehensively

monitoring, analyzing, and correcting conservative misinformation in the U.S. media"; see <http://mediamatters.org/press/releases/201010200018>.

16 In an opinion piece on August 1, 2010, a *Washington Post* writer outlined a suggestive correlation between program content targeting specific groups and violent acts; see Milbank 2010.

17 The First Amendment is actually broader in scope: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

REFERENCES

- Barrett, J. R. 2007. "The Researcher as Instrument: Learning to Conduct Qualitative Research through Analyzing and Interpreting a Choral Rehearsal." *Music Education Research* 9, no. 3: 417–33.
- Boone, Daniel N. 1999. "The Cogent Reasoning Model of Informal Fallacies." *Informal Logic* 19, no. 1: 1–39.
- Brewer, M. B. 1979. "In Group Bias in the Minimal Intergroup Situation: A Cognitive-Motivational Analysis." *Psychological Bulletin* 86: 307–24.
- Bucholtz, M., and K. Hall. 2005. "Identity and Interaction: A Sociocultural Linguistic Approach." *Discourse Studies* 7, nos. 4–5: 558–614.
- Bushman, B. J., and C. G. Anderson. 2001. "Media Violence and the American Public: Scientific Facts vs. Media Misinformation." *American Psychologist* 56, nos. 6–7, 477–89.
- Butler, Judith. 1997. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performance*. New York: Routledge.
- Cortese, Anthony. 2006. *Opposing Hate Speech*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Dharmapala, D., and R. H. McAdams. 2003. *Words that Kill: An Economic Perspective on Hate Speech and Hate Crimes*. University of Illinois Law and Economics Research Paper No. LE02-004. ssrn.com/abstract=300695
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2004. Hate Crime Statistics, 2004. www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/hate-crime/2004
- . 2008. Hate Crime Statistics, 2008. www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/hate-crime/2008

- Finocchiaro, Maurice F. 1981. "Fallacies and the Evaluation of Reasoning." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 18 (January): 13-22.
- Gordis, E. B., D. A. Granger, E. J. Susman, and P. K. Trickett. 2006. "Asymmetry between Salivary Cortisol and α -Amylase Reactivity to Stress: Relation to Aggressive Behavior in Adolescents." *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 31: 976-87.
- Govier, Trudy. 1982. "Who Says There Are No Fallacies?" *Informal Logic Newsletter* 5, no. 1: 2-10.
- Groarke, Leo. 2007. "Informal Logic." In the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University. plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic-informal/#Fal
- Hahn, Ulrike, Adam Harris, and Adam Corner. 2009. "Argument Content and Argument Source: An Exploration." *Informal Logic* 29, no. 4: 337-67.
- Halpin, J., J. Heidebreder, M. Lloyd, P. Woohull, B. Scott, J. Silver, and S. Derek Turner. 2007. *The Structural Imbalance of Political Talk Radio: A Joint Report by the Center for American Progress and Free Press*. www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/06/pdf/talk_radio.pdf
- Hennessey, Kathleen. 2010. "'Tea Party' Convention a Forum for Woes, Worries." *Los Angeles Times*, February 6, A11.
- Inoue, Miyako. 2004. "What Does Language Remember? Indexical Inversion and the Naturalized History of Japanese Women." *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 14, no. 1: 39-56.
- Kellow, Christine L., and H. Leslie Steeves. 1998. "The Role of Radio in the Rwandan Genocide." *Journal of Communication* 48: 107-28.
- Kövecses, Zoltán, Réka Benczes, and Szilvia Csábi. 2010. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Kondracki, N.L., and N.S. Wellman. 2002. "Content Analysis: Review of Methods and Their Applications in Nutrition Education." *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior* 34, no. 4: 224-30.
- Lendman, S. 2006. *CNN's Vice President of Racism and Associates*. Montreal: Centre for Research and Globalization. www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=3107
- Lewis, Anthony. 2007. *Freedom for the Thought That We Hate: A Biography of the First Amendment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lyons, J. 1977. *Semantics*, vol. 2. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayring, P. 2000. "Qualitative Content Analysis." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1, no. 2. www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2386
- Meddaugh, Priscilla Marie, and Jack Kay. 2009. "Hate Speech or 'Reasonable Racism?' The Other in Stormfront." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 24, no. 4: 251-68
- Mexican American Legal Defense Fund. 2008. "Maldef Unveils Campaign to Counter Anti-Immigrant and Anti-Latino Misinformation and Rhetoric." *The MALDEFian*, March 24. www.simpleend.com/simple/textlink.asp?NewsletterID=22649&SI=&E=&S=225&N=22649&Format=HTML
- Milbank, Dana. 2010. "Glenn Beck and the Oakland Shooter." *The Washington Post*, August 1. www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/30/AR2010073003254.html
- Neiwert, David. 2009. *The Eliminationists: How Hate Talk Radicalized the American Right*. Sausalito, CA: PoliPoint Press.
- Noriega, Chon A., and Francisco Javier Iribarren. 2009. *Hate Speech on Commercial Talk Radio: Preliminary Report on a Pilot Study*. Latino Policy and Issues Brief. No. 22. Los Angeles: UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Press.
- Ochs, E. 1992. "Indexing Gender." In *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*, ed. A. Duranti and C. Goodwin, 335-58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Connor, Rory. 2008. *Shock Jocks, Hate Speech, and Talk Radio*. San Francisco: Alter-Net Books.
- Perdue, C. W., J. F. Dovidio, M. B. Gurtman, and R. B. Tyler. 1990. "Us and Them: Social Categorization and the Process of Intergroup Bias." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59, no. 3: 475-86.
- Pew Hispanic Center. 2007. *2007 National Survey of Latinos: As Illegal Immigration Issue Heats Up, Hispanics Feel a Chill*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. pewhispanic.org/files/reports/84.pdf
- Rapaport, W. J., Erwin M. Segal, Stuart C. Shapiro, David A. Zubin, Gail A. Bruder, Judith Felson Duchan, Michael J. Almeida, Joyce H. Daniels, Mary Galbraith, Janyce M. Wiebe, and Albert Nanyong Yuhan. 1994. *Deictic Centers and the Cognitive Structure of Narrative Comprehension*. Buffalo, NY: Center for Cognitive Science, State University of New York at Buffalo. www.cse.buffalo.edu/~rapaport/
- Santa Ana, Otto. 2002. *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Slagle, Mark. 2009. "An Ethical Exploration of Free Expression and the Problem of Hate Speech." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 24, no. 4: 238-50.
- Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ). 1996. *Code of Ethics*. <http://www.spj.org/pdf/ethicscode.pdf>
- Tolmarch Lakoff, Robin. 2001. *The Language War*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2010. "State and County QuickFacts for 2009." <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/00000.html>.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA). 1993. *The Role of Telecommunications in Hate Crimes*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Wasserman, S. and K. Faust. 1994. *Social Network Analysis*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

Chart 1a. Statements Targeted at Vulnerable Groups or Their Supporters, *The Lou Dobbs Show*, July 31, 2008

I. Vulnerable Groups								
Group	Call for Action (Instances)	Number	Implied Target (Instances)	Number	Named Target (Instances)	Number	Total for Implied and Named Targets	Total for Vulnerable Groups
Undocumented immigrants (UI)		0	101, 209, 217, 255, 320–21, 900–1: illegal immigration (6) 194: illegal immigration crisis (1) 276: this immigrant inflow (1) 833: illegal immigration problem (1)	9	207–9: these people come from countries, like Mexico (1) 146, 150, 159–60, 168, 287–88, 834, 851, 901–2, 914, 951, 999 (2), 1022, 1045: illegal aliens (14) 167, 189, 956, 1029: illegals (4) 199: a million-and-a-half illegals (1) 211–12: illegal immigrants (1) 279: immigrants (1) 830–31, 832, 904–5, 1037: illegal alien population (4) 982: illegal employees (1)	27	36	36
Latinos (L)		0	544–46: And when people talk like that and think like that, what are they? (1)	1	521: La Raza (1) 506–7: elected Latino political people (1)	2	3	3
People of color in public office (PC)	482–88: We could put half of these senators in jail ... Dobbs: If we go under the basis of the fact that they are breaking their pledge to—and their oath of office. By gosh! Sandy: Let's do it! (1)	1		0	36-40: Barack Obama. (1) 66–70: I say you put a wig on him, you dust up a little of that hair, you know, he'd look like one of those early founding fathers, kind of. (1) 446: George Gascon (1) 460-461: Robert Menendez (1) 475-476: Robert Menendez (1) 478: Senator Menendez (1) 619-621: Barack Obama (1)	7	7	8
Total for Vulnerable Groups		1		10		36	46	47

Chart 1a. cont.

II. Supporters of Vulnerable Groups			
Supporter	VG	Call for Action (Instances)	
Employers of undocumented immigrants	UI	982–89: And why are we tolerating this kind of nonsense, that employers are allowed to do this to men and women that they're exploiting, through illegal immigration? (1)	6
		997–99: Let's make certain that we're just as tough on these—these ignorant fools who are hiring illegals aliens (1)	
		1002: Going after the employers is almost more important (1)	
		1018–27: let's make it really, really im—an important commitment, to must making certain these illegal employers are held up to the scorn to which they should. (1)	
		1043–44: business can be leaders, in this society of ours, or they can be the bad guys. (1)	
		1045–46: And these illegal employers or illegal aliens are the bad guys. (1)	
Total for Supporters of Vulnerable Groups			6
Total for Calls for Action			7

Note: The transcript contained one reference to "pro-illegal immigrant lobby"; this was not tabulated.

Chart 1b. Statements Targeted at Vulnerable Groups or Their Supporters, *The Savage Nation*, July 24, 2008

I. Vulnerable Groups								
Group	Call for Action (Instances)	Number	Implied Target (Instances)	Number	Named Target (Instances)	Number	Total for Implied and Named Targets	Total for Vulnerable Groups
Undocumented immigrants (UI)		0	112: illegal immigration (1) 194: this murderer (1) 196–97: the murderer (1) 115–16: immigrants (3)	6	107: illegal alien mobs (1) 161, 163, 166, 510: illegal alien (4) 844, 854, 859: an illegal alien (3) 848: this illegal alien (1)	9	15	15
People of color in public office (PC)		0		0	160, 168–69, 191–92, 846, 1856, 1864–65, 1887–88: district attorney (7) 163–64, 1859–60: the district attorney, Kamala Harris (2) 845, 863: the DA (2) 861–62: this DA here, Kamala Harris (1)	12	12	12
Muslims (M)		0	43: throat cutters from the Middle East (1) 235, 239: Al-Qaeda (2)	3	15–16: Turkish Muslims (1) 45–46: radical Islamic murderers (1)	2	5	5
Sexual minorities (G)		0	689–92: so they can be gay in Iraq? (1) 701–4: his daughter to be like the sluts of Sunset Boulevard (1) 693–97: it was a war to bring in the degeneracy of the United States and West Europe to Iraq (1)	3		0	3	3
Total for Vulnerable Groups		0		12		23	35	35

Chart 1b. *cont.*

II. Supporters of Vulnerable Groups			
Supporter	VG	Call for Action (Instances)	
San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom	UI	846–49: Frankly the mayor should be slapped with a subpoena (1)	1
San Francisco District Attorney Kamala Harris	UI	845–46: and the DA should be in prison: there should be a federal—immediate arrest of the district attorney. (1) 861–63: And this DA here, Kamala Harris, the DA would be in prison. (1)	2
Media Matters	UI, M	130–32: I want you to demand copies of Media Matters tax records (1) 139–42: So go and ask whoever you have to ask for copies of their tax records and then see if you can get one senator or one congressman to investigate the tax status of Media Matters in this country and find out where their money is coming from. (1) 412–20: I want to reiterate many of you are saying what can I do to help? I'll tell you what you can do to help. I want you to find out who Media Matters is: go on the Internet and then I want you as a citizen — an American citizen, a taxpayer — to demand that they send you their tax form — their latest tax form for the last few years. (1) 532–34: You can look up Media Matters on the Internet and find out where they are and write them a note and ask for their tax records going back five years. (1) 537–43: Somebody in this audience is going to pore over those tax records [...] and God's hand will move somebody listening to this show who will get the tax returns of Media Matters and an investigation will begin into the source of the funds (1) 673: I would you suggest you picket Media Matters (1) 832–33: don't forget look up Media Matters and ask for their tax returns. (1)	7
Total for Supporters of Vulnerable Groups			10
Total for Calls for Action			10

Chart 1c: Statements Targeted at Vulnerable Groups or Their Supporters, *The John & Ken Show*, July 30, 2008

I. Vulnerable Groups								
Group	Call for Action (Instances)	Number	Implied Target (Instances)	Number	Named Target (Instances)	Number	Total for Implied and Named Targets	Total for Vulnerable Groups
Undocumented immigrants (UI)	209–12: This is also a battle on every city street, every community, every port of entry in the United States, every political office. (1)	1	82: these killers' (1) 91–92: established gang member (1) 161–63: a five-time-arrested, 21-year-old gangbanging MS-13 member (1) 233: this alleged killer (1) 338: Honduran crack dealers (1) 417–18, 447: Mara Salvatrucha gang members (2)	7	52: that illegal immigrant gang member (1) 86: triple-murdering illegal alien (1) 830: illegal alien population (1) 925: illegal aliens (1)	4	11	12
People of color in public office (PC)		0		0	227: the DA, Kamala Harris (1) 297: the city's district attorney, Kamala Harris (1) 643–44, 660, 669–70, 883: Jan Perry (4) 464, 486: councilwoman Jan Perry (2)	8	8	8
Mexicans (M)		0	752–54: The Mexican diet (1) 754: And that's their culture (1)	2	747–50: the Mexicans (1)	1	3	3
South Los Angeles residents (SLA)		0	602–3: areas that are ridden with gangs. (1) 665, 806: eighty thousand gang members (2) 708–9: that tribe (1) gangs (1)	5	666–67: You can't control the crime, you can't control what people eat (1) 672–74: poor people. (1) 699–701: South L.A., poor people (1) 703–4: Because everybody's fat. Everybody's wandering around fat (1) 763–64: Or five of them, or whatever these people do (1) 782–85: people just sit there and keep stuffing one burger after another, one burrito after another (1) 740–43: you could offer them a veggie panini sandwich, and they're going to look at you like you dropped from Mars. They don't care. (1)	7	12	12
Total for Vulnerable Groups		1		14		20	34	35

Chart 1c. *cont.*

II. Supporters of Vulnerable Groups			
Supporter	VG	Call for Action (Instances)	
San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom	UI	<p>186–89: We want Gavin Newsom to resign, to let someone take over who believes in the actual execution of the rule of the law (1)</p> <p>213–19: San Francisco is the first city that we’re going to conquer, and we’re going to either drive these politicians out of office who have done this to this country, brought this calamity forward, and we’re going to replace them with people who truly reflect the concerns of our citizens (1)</p> <p>225: The mayor of...he’s got to go. (1)</p> <p>243–44: And we’re demanding that Mayor Newsom immediately resign. (1)</p> <p>250–51: But it’s not too late to start replacing these political governors (1)</p> <p>273–74: And they are calling on Gavin Newsom and others to resign (1)</p> <p>295–99: calling for Gavin Newsom along with the city’s district attorney, Kamala Harris, and the guy that runs the juvenile probation department, to all resign. (1)</p> <p>415–16: He ought to resign. (1)</p> <p>420–24: And there was a time when a guy would resign. He would be so ashamed by his judgment, so ashamed by what he wrought on that family, that he would walk away and hide. (1)</p>	9
San Francisco District Attorney Kamala Harris	UI	295–97: calling for Gavin Newsom along with the city’s district attorney, Kamala Harris, and the guy that runs the juvenile probation department, to all resign. (1)	1
San Francisco city administration	UI	<p>213–20: San Francisco is the first city that we’re going to conquer, and we’re going to either drive these politicians out of office who have done this to this country, brought this calamity forward, and we’re going to replace them with people who truly reflect the concerns of our citizens, including San Francisco citizens and Los Angeles citizens. (1)</p> <p>250–53: But it’s not too late to start replacing these political governors, and every public office will have brought this calamity forth upon the United States. (1)</p>	2
Community activists/protestors for undocumented immigrants		<p>119–22: And a domestic terrorism group called Answer Network, I believe—put the flyers out on the Internet calling on all their minions to show up and suppress free speech. (1)</p> <p>147–49: Well, were they really an illegal alien advocacy group, or were they just anarchists who signed up for the mayhem that day? (1)</p> <p>150–53: I think anarchists from the International Socialist Organization, the Answer Network, typical First Amendment suppressors—I call them domestic terrorists (1)</p>	3
Total for Supporters of Vulnerable Groups			15
Total for Calls for Action			16

Note: The transcript contained four references to “illegal alien” in regard to advocacy groups; these were not tabulated.

Chart 2a. Unsubstantiated Claims, *The Lou Dobbs Show*, July 31, 2008

I. False Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
Total of False Claims: 0							
II. Unverifiable Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
97–99	And it was halted in three or four months by the — the new Eisenhower administration. And they caused about a million-and-a-half illegals to — to leave.	Lou Dobbs	The Eisenhower administration caused 1.5 million undocumented immigrants to leave.	Dobbs refers to the Eisenhower administration's "Operation Wetback" (1954), under which Mexican workers were deported; this encouraged other undocumented nationals to return to Mexico. The U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service claimed that Operation Wetback prompted as many as 1,300,000 to leave the United States; the number that was officially apprehended was much lower. The actual number of undocumented immigrants who returned to their country of origin cannot be determined.	Fred Keastler, "Operation Wetback," in <i>The Handbook of Texas Online</i> (Denton: Texas State Historical Association, n.d.). http://www.tshaonline.org/handbook/online/articles/pqo01	Undocumented immigrants	Presents the Eisenhower administration's policies more effective than they may have been.
148–53	And talking with Steve, I said, you know, if — you know, one of the great discussions is how many illegal aliens actually are in this country. We always say, here at <i>The Loud Dobbs Show</i> , or <i>Lou Dobbs Tonight</i> , anywhere between 12 and 20 million.	Lou Dobbs	There are between 12 and 20 million undocumented immigrants currently in the U.S.	Because undocumented immigrants typically do not respond to polls and therefore are not represented in statistical records, and because estimates of the number of undocumented residents varies widely, Dobbs's statement cannot be verified. The Pew Research Center's estimate for 2008 was 11.9 million.	Jeffrey S. Passel and D'Vera Cohn, <i>U.S. Population Projections: 2005–2010</i> (Washington: Pew Research Center, 2008).	Undocumented immigrants	Suggests that the number of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. could be very large.
272–77	the debate among economists, among labor economists is over. And it's been over for more than 15 years. The — the consensus among mainstream labor economists is that this immigrant inflow is of no benefit to native-born, and on aggregate.	Peter Brimelow	The debate among economists on the impact of immigrants on the national economy is over and resolved.	The economic impact of the undocumented labor force on native-born residents of the United States cannot be conclusively determined. On the one hand, undocumented immigrants create jobs and contribute to the economy through, for example, their labor and the payment of sales and payroll taxes. On the other hand, many have lower incomes and rely heavily on public services; many also send their earnings to their home country rather than spending it where they reside.	Richard Nadler, <i>Immigration and the Wealth of States</i> (Americas Majority Foundation, 2008). www.amerimaj.com/ImmigrationandWealth.pdf Steven A. Camarota, <i>Immigrants in the United States, 2007: A Profile of America's Foreign-Born Populations</i> (Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies, 2007). www.cis.org/articles/2007/back1007.pdf Heather MacDonald, Victor Davis Hanson, and Steven Malanga, <i>The Immigration Solution: A Better Plan Than Today's</i> (Lanham, MD: Ivan R. Dee, 2007). Judith Gans, <i>A Primer on U.S. Immigration Policy in a Global Economy</i> (Tucson: Udall Center for Studies in Public Policy, University of Arizona, 2006). udallcenter.arizona.edu/immigration/publications/primer_on_u.s._immigration_j.gans_2006.pdf National Immigration Law Center: <i>Paying Their Way and Then Some: Facts about the Contributions of Immigrants to Economic Growth and Public Investment</i> (Los Angeles: NILC, 2006).	Undocumented immigrants	Presents the presence of undocumented immigrants as harmful to the economy.

Chart 2a. cont.

Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
441–42	He has a responsibility, as a law enforcement officer – a chief law enforcement officer, by the way, in Mesa, to be enforcing laws. And there is no reason for him to be creating any division between responsibilities. He’s enforcing drug laws that are federal. He is enforcing all sorts of laws that are federal. He is ethnocentrically invested, it appears.	Lou Dobbs	George Gascón, chief of police in Mesa, Arizona, is not fully enforcing federal immigration laws because he is committed to, or biased toward, Latinos.	The enactment of new policies by Gascón in early July 2008 weakens Dobbs’s claim that Gascón is biased toward Latinos. These policies allow Mesa police to question people who are arrested on misdemeanor or felony charges about their immigration status and require police to notify U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement if they believe any one to the country illegally. A commentator points out that, as a result, some suspected illegal immigrants that would previously have been arrested for misdemeanors and then released will face longer sentences and possible deportation.	Eduardo Barraza, “Interview with George Gascón, City of Mesa Police Department Chief,” <i>Barriozone</i> , July 28, 2008. http://www.barriozone.com/george_gascon_mesa_police_chief_interview.html Ray Stern, “Mesa Police Chief George Gascón Stares Down Sheriff Joe Arpaio,” <i>Phoenix New Times</i> , July 10, 2008. www.phoenixnewtimes.com/2008-07-10/news/mesa-police-chief-george-gasc-n-stares-down-sheriff-joe-arpaio	George Gascón	Discredits Gascón; implies that he does not fulfill his responsibilities to uphold immigration laws because his policies observe undocumented immigrants’ Fourteenth Amendment protections.
Total of Unverifiable Claims: 4							
III. Distorted Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
Total of Distorted Claims: 0							
Total of All Unsubstantiated Claims: 4							

Note: Assertions of fact, cited statistics/research, and, in general, statements that cannot be construed as opinion were cross-checked for accuracy.

Chart 2b. Unsubstantiated Claims, *The Savage Nation*, July 24, 2008

I. False Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
158–66	Now what's interesting to me is that I'm being attacked in my own hometown by this failed newspaper that's losing a million dollars a day while the district attorney and mayor, who released an illegal alien who gunned down a father and his two sons who were just driving down the wrong alley at the wrong time – this illegal alien was released two months before by the district attorney, Kamala Harris, handpicked by Willie Brown when he was mayor; handpicked by – what's his name – Gavin Newsome –	Michael Savage	District Attorney Kamala Harris and/or Mayor Gavin Newsom released or was directly responsible for releasing suspect Edwin Ramos when he was jailed as a juvenile.	Ramos was released because no charges were filed against him after he had been jailed for three days; neither Harris nor Newsom was directly responsible.	Jaxon Van Derbeken, "Officials Try to Explain Murder Suspect's Release," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , July 22, 2008. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/07/22/BA5C11SK2S.DTL	Gavin Newsom, Kamala Harris; Edwin Ramos and, by extension, undocumented immigrants	Portrays San Francisco's sanctuary policy and its political supporters as negligent; equates politicians who support the policy with the murder of innocent citizens.
Total of False Claims: 1							
II. Unverifiable Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
12–16	At least now we know why Obama picked Germany to give his first speech in Europe. It is certainly because of Germany's deeply entrenched socialist-communist establishment. It is also due to the massive number of Turkish Muslims who live there who made up a majority of the crowd.	Michael Savage	Obama chose to give his first speech in Europe in Germany because he knew he would receive support from Germany's socialist-communists and its large Turkish Muslim bloc.	The reason for choosing Berlin cannot be verified. <i>Der Spiegel</i> reported that the German ambassador to Washington worked to convince the campaign that Obama's major appearance should be in Berlin. Media commentators speculated that Berlin was chosen by the campaign because it would evoke the speeches of Presidents Ronald Regan and John F. Kennedy.	"Obama Refines Plans for Germany Trip," <i>Der Spiegel</i> , July 5, 2008. www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,564083,00.html Carlotta Gall and Jeff Zeleny, "Obama Opens a Foreign Tour in Afghanistan," <i>The New York Times</i> , July 20, 2008. www.nytimes.com/2008/07/20/us/politics/200BAMA.html Dan Balz, "Embraced Overseas, But to What Effect?," <i>Washington Post</i> , July 27, 2008 www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/story/2008/07/26/ST2008072602016.html?sid=ST2008072602016 Jennifer Parker, "Obama Echoes Reagan in Call for Global Unity," <i>ABC News</i> , July 24, 2008. abcnews.go.com/Politics/Vote2008/story?id=5442448&page=1	Obama, Obama supporters	Portrays Obama and his supporters as radical extremists.

Chart 2b. *cont.*

Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
17–22	When I say majority of the crowd, you mark my words, the majority of that crowd were the communist-socialist bloc in Germany. Now you say, how do you know that? This is the same group of anti-Americans in Germany that torched McDonalds during G8 meetings; that burns effigies of our presidents over the last number of administrations	Michael Savage	The Germans who attended Obama's speech comprised primarily socialist-communists and anti-American terrorists.	Demographic makeup of the crowd cannot be verified. Stories in major European and American media outlets reported estimates of the crowd's size, but nothing about its race or ethnicity. Factchecker.org addressed claims by some conservative commentators that the crowd was far smaller than the estimates reported, but no mention was made of the crowd's makeup.	<p>"Obama Tells World We Must Unite," <i>Washington Times</i>, July 25, 2008. www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/jul/25/obama-tells-world-we-must-unite/</p> <p>"Crowds Gather in Berlin to Hear Obama's Foreign Policy Speech," <i>The Guardian</i>, July 25, 2008. www.guardian.co.uk/world/2008/jul/24/uselections2008.barackobama</p> <p>Christian Retzlaff, "Speech Appears to Resonate with Germans," <i>Los Angeles Times</i>, July 25, 2008. articles.latimes.com/2008/jul/25/nation/na-berlin25</p> <p>Gregor Peter Schmitz, "People of the World, Look at Me," <i>Der Spiegel</i>, July 25, 2008. www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,567932,00.html</p> <p>Jeff Zeleny and Nicholas Kulish, "Obama, in Berlin, Calls for Renewal of Ties With Allies," <i>The New York Times</i>, July 25, 2008. www.nytimes.com/2008/07/25/us/politics/25obama.html?ref=politics</p> <p>"Did 200,000 People Show Up in Berlin ... ?" Factchecker.org, August 15, 2008. www.factcheck.org/askfactcheck/did_200000_people_show_up_in_berlin.html</p> <p>David Osborne, "Will Obama's Rock-Star Moment in Berlin Backfire?" <i>The Independent</i>, July 26, 2008. www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/will-obamas-rockstar-moment-in-berlin-backfire-877802.html</p>	Obama supporters	Portrays Obama's supporters as radical extremists.
22–25	it's the home of the Baader-Manhoff crowd who are the cousins to Obama's philosophy, incidentally;	Michael Savage	Obama's philosophy is similar to that of German domestic terrorists.	There is no verifiable resemblance between Baader-Meinhof's commitment to domestic terror and Obama's campaign platform or any statements he has made.	<p>Clare Murphy, "Who Were the Baader-Meinhof Gang?" <i>BBC News</i>, September 5, 1977. news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/6314559.stm</p> <p>"It's Your Choice: How the Candidates Stand on the Issues that Matter to You," Organizing for America (Obama campaign website), n.d. www.barackobama.com/issues/index_campaign.php</p> <p>"Post Endorses John McCain," <i>New York Post</i>, September 8, 2008. www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/editorials/item_56iXH45stH6gujTk5rptKP;jsessionid=0810CCOD73494D10910B9FA570CFE3C</p> <p>"Barack Obama for President," <i>The Washington Times</i>, October 17, 2008. www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/10/16/AR2008101603436.html?ref=www.americanpresidency.org</p>	Obama	Links Obama to terrorists.

Chart 2b. *cont.*

Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
33–36	I've devoted over 40 years of my life to defending defenseless children and these rats – dedicated to hating families, they're dedicating (inaudible) – and how you people can be taken in by these...villains is not of course a mystery to me.	Michael Savage	Media Matters is dedicated to hating families.	Media Matters for America, a liberal media watchdog organization, was one of many critics denouncing Savage's comments on autism; whether the group "hates families" cannot be verified.	Jacques Steinberg, "Savage Stands by Autism Remarks," <i>The New York Times</i> , July 22, 2008. www.nytimes.com/2008/07/22/business/media/22sava.html?_r=1&scp=1&sq=%22media+matters%22+autism&st=nyt John J. Pitney Jr., "A Savage Attack," <i>The National Review Online</i> , July 24, 2008. www.nationalreview.com/articles/225112/savage-attack/john-j-pitney-jr	Media Matters	Portrays Media Matters as scoundrels.
97–100	Ahmadinejad is on record as saying he would gladly wipe out the entire state of Israel with everyone in it and gladly lose half of the Iranian population to do so; that's a fact, he said so.	Michael Savage	Ahmadinejad stated that he would gladly wipe out of the entire state of Israel.	Ahmadinejad's meaning cannot be verified. English translations and interpretations of Ahmadinejad's statement in Farsi conflict; some have less violent or extremist overtones.	Juan Cole, "Hitchens Hacker and Hitchens," <i>Informed Comment</i> , May 3, 2006. http://www.juancole.com/2006/05/hitchens-hacker-and-hitchens.html Ethan Broner, "Just How Far Did They Go, Those Words Against Israel?," <i>The New York Times</i> , June 11, 2006. http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/11/weekinreview/11broner.html?ex=1307678400&en=ef2bd266224e880&ei=5088&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss	Ahmadinejad	Emphasizes the most bellicose interpretation of Ahmadinejad's statement; encourages Iranians to be seen in a highly negative way.
162–70	to let this illegal alien on the streets through the so-called sanctuary policies of this sick city that I live in; here's a man who killed a father and two sons	Michael Savage	Edwin Ramos is an undocumented immigrant and a murderer.	Investigation of the case was ongoing at the time of the broadcast; Ramos's undocumented status had not been verified and his guilt not determined.	Jaxon Van Derbeken, "Suspect Pleads Not Guilty to Killing Dad, Sons," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , July 24, 2008. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/07/24/BAGF11TF78.DTL	Edwin Ramos and, by extension, undocumented immigrants,	Portrays Ramos as an undocumented immigrant and a murderer; associates undocumented immigrants with violent crime.
370–74	Well, you know, the left wants the fairness doctrine introduced so they can control the dialogue and have a monologue which they control	Michael Savage	The left wants to control free speech through the Fairness Doctrine.	The Fairness Doctrine, if reinstated, would require broadcast license holders to present both sides of any controversial issue and provide equal time to dissenting political figures. Because the FCC would rule on a case-by-case basis, rulings could reflect the politics of the party in power. That the left would use it to control free speech is an assertion that cannot be verified.	James Rainey, "A False Alarm on a New 'Fairness Doctrine,'" <i>The New York Times</i> , November 14, 2008. articles.latimes.com/2008/nov/14/nation/na-onthemedial14 George F. Will, "Broadcast 'Fairness' Fouls Out," <i>The Washington Post</i> , December 7, 2008. www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/05/AR2008120503194.html	Democrats, liberal media	Presents the left as conspiring to suppress free speech.
377–82	then everyone will worship Obama; when Obama appears anyone who doesn't worship him perhaps will be interrogated and reeducated. ... That's where we're headed. That's correct; this is the road to tyranny that we are on	Michael Savage	An Obama presidency will result in political tyranny.	An Obama presidency would lead to a shift in political policy; that it would lead to a dissolution of democracy is an assertion that cannot be verified.	James Rainey, "A False Alarm on a New 'Fairness Doctrine,'" <i>The New York Times</i> , November 14, 2008. articles.latimes.com/2008/nov/14/nation/na-onthemedial14 George F. Will, "Broadcast 'Fairness' Fouls Out," <i>The Washington Post</i> , December 7, 2008. www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/12/05/AR2008120503194.html	Obama, his supporters	Suggests that Obama and the his supporters are committed to undermining democracy.
Total of Unverifiable Claims: 8							

Chart 2b. *cont.*

III. Distorted Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
58–60	Add up one and one on the attack at Michael Savage, you know what you're going to get? The Democrat Party. They want me out of the way before the election.	Michael Savage	The Democratic Party is behind media criticism of Savage.	Critics of Savage are not confined to members of the Democratic Party; for example, conservative media outlets and supporters have not supported his comments regarding autism.	John J. Pitney Jr., "A Savage Attack," <i>National Review Online</i> , July 24, 2008. www.nationalreview.com/articles/225112/savage-attack/john-j-pitney-jr Jacques Steinberg, "Savage Stands by Autism Remarks," <i>The New York Times</i> , July 22, 2008. www.nytimes.com/2008/07/22/business/media/22sava.html?_r=1&sq=%22media%20matters%22%20autism&st=nyt&adxnml=1&scp=1&adxnmlx=1296155388-xdDcsnEiYRr+E0A4Ggaccg Jacques Steinberg, "Savage Loses Advertisers," <i>The New York Times</i> , July 23, 2008. www.nytimes.com/2008/07/23/arts/23arts-SAVAGELOSESA_BRF.html	Democratic Party	Portrays Democrats as fomenting Communist revolution.
61–64	They're going to go after every conservative who is going to expose the communist-socialist roots of Obama in order to make sure that they finally have the communist revolution that they've wanted in this country for so many years.	Michael Savage	The Democratic Party's goal is a Communist revolution in the United States.	The policies of the Democratic Party and the Communist Party USA have distinct differences that relate to capitalism; neither promotes revolution.	"What We Stand For," Democratic Party website. www.democrats.org "FAQ," Communist Party USA website. www.cpusa.org/faq	Democratic Party	Discredits the Democratic Party by linking it to communism and revolution.
80–86	The next target might be Hannity, or it might be Rush, or it might be "The Leprechaun," or it might be somebody else in the top five of radio; anyone who stands up to the liberal-socialist juggernaut; anyone who exposes the corruption in the Democrat Party, and for that matter in the Republican Party, moreover in the government itself, will be targeted.	Michael Savage	Media Matters is a powerful socialist organization.	Media Matters for America is identified by conservative and liberal media sources as a partisan, liberal media watchdog; none surveyed associates the organization with communist-socialists or anarchists.	"Editorial: Obama's Elusive 'Safe Schools' Czar," <i>The Washington Times</i> , October 8, 2009. www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/oct/8/obamas-elusive-safe-schools-czar Jacques Steinberg. "An All-Out Attack on Conservative Misinformation," <i>The New York Times</i> , November 8, 2008. www.nytimes.com/2008/11/01/washington/01media.html	Media Matters	Suggests that Media Matters is an anti-American, undemocratic organization.
90–93	It's happened at least three or four times before and the very same group of communist-socialist anarchists in Media Matters, along with the very same deviant forces, have tried to drive me off the air.	Michael Savage	Media Matters is composed of communist-socialists and anarchists.	Media Matters for America is identified by conservative and liberal media sources as a partisan, liberal media watchdog; none surveyed associates the organization with communist-socialists or anarchists.	"Editorial: Obama's Elusive 'Safe Schools' Czar," <i>The Washington Times</i> , October 8, 2009. www.washingtontimes.com/news/2009/oct/8/obamas-elusive-safe-schools-czar Jacques Steinberg. "An All-Out Attack on Conservative Misinformation," <i>The New York Times</i> , November 8, 2008. www.nytimes.com/2008/11/01/washington/01media.html	Media Matters	Suggests that Media Matters is an anti-American, undemocratic organization.
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function

Chart 2b. *cont.*

502–13	They never really put out a story that supports borders, language and culture; they're always on the side of the illegal alien or on the murderer or on the side of the rapist or the pornographer -- so the demographic --the natural demographic for the newspapers says you know what, I'm not buying that rag anymore.	Michael Savage	Newspapers that are not conservative (specifically, <i>The New York Times</i> and the <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i>) have an anti-American, anti-family, pro-criminal bias.	The fact that a media outlet does not support conservative positions does not mean that, as a consequence, it supports murder, rape, or pornography.	"Bad Neighbors," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , February 1, 2007. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2007/02/01/EDGC7N76811.DTL	Newspapers identified as liberal, including those that, by extension, support immigrant rights.	Discredits liberal newspapers; dehumanizes undocumented immigrants and identifies them with criminals.
228–30	the progressives of today are very close to the Communist Party USA; CPUSA, socialist party workers, et cetera are very close to the progressive parties of today	Michael Savage	Current-day progressives are associated with the Communist Party USA and Socialist Party.	Progressives represent a range of political thought and can be associated with a range of political organizations.	Michael Lind, "Is It OK to Be Liberal Again, Instead of Progressive?," <i>Salon.com</i> , November 2, 2008. www.salon.com/news/opinion/feature/2008/11/21/liberals Jonathan Chait, "McCain Buries His Progressive Past," <i>CBS News</i> , February 11, 2008. www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/02/11/opinion/main3817077.shtml		
689–97	CNN report on being gay in Iraq; please leave me alone with that already, I'm not interested -- again if the first thing they did with their freedom -- that's what American men have died for so they can be gay in Iraq? That's wonderful. That's amazing. So it wasn't a war to liberate Iraqis; it was a war to being [bring] in the degeneracy of the United States and West Europe to Iraq; that's great, now you understand why they're willing to put themselves under a truck and kill themselves rather than see their country become like ours.	Michael Savage	Iraqis would rather kill themselves than see homosexuality become widely accepted.	The CNN story dated July 24, 2008, quotes a gay Iraqi, who states that, because of the intolerance and violence that Iraqi gays and their families face, killing himself would be preferable to his family finding out that he is gay.	Frederik Pleitgen, Mohammed Tawfeeq and Wayne Drash, "Gays in Iraq Terrorized by Threats, Rape, Murder," <i>CNN World</i> , July 24, 2008. articles.cnn.com/2008-07-24/world/gay.iraqis_1_gay-men-gays-and-lesbians-homosexuals?_s=PM:WORLD	Iraqi, U.S., and Western European gays	Uses the CNN story to discredit gay men.
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function

Chart 2b. cont.

697-704	If you think that a Bedouin – a proud Bedouin – wants his daughter to be like the sluts of Sunset Boulevard or wants his son to put on his wife’s high heels and go to a nightclub, you’re mistaken; he’d rather die.	Michael Savage	Arab men would rather die than have a gay son.	The CNN story dated July 24, 2008, quotes a gay Iraqi, who states that, because of the intolerance and violence that Iraqi gays and their families face, killing himself would be preferable to his family finding out that he is gay. Neither this report nor others detailing violence against and persecution of gay men and women in the Middle East do not mention suicide by a father. If such cases exist they cannot be easily verified.	<p>Frederik Pleitgen, Mohammed Tawfeeq, and Wayne Drash, “Gays in Iraq Terrorized by Threats, Rape, Murder,” <i>CNN World</i>, July 24, 2008. articles.cnn.com/2008-07-24/world/gay.iraqis_1_gay-men-gays-and-lesbians-homosexuals?_s=PM:WORLD</p> <p>Scott Long, “Netherlands: No Deportations of LGBT Iranians to Torture,” <i>Human Rights Watch</i>, October 8, 2006. www.hrw.org/en/news/2006/10/08/netherlands-no-deportations-lgbt-iranians-torture</p> <p>U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, <i>2006 Human Rights Report: Iraq</i>, 2007. http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2006/78853.htm</p>	Gays	Casts having a gay son as unbearably humiliating.
Total of Distorted Claims: 8							
Total of All Unsubstantiated Claims: 17							

Note: Assertions of fact, cited statistics/research, and, in general, statements that cannot be construed as opinion were cross-checked for accuracy.

Chart 2c. Unsubstantiated Claims, *The John & Ken Show*, July 30, 2008

I. False Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
42–44	OK, coming up later on, the L.A. council makes good on banning new fast food outlets in South L.A.	Ken Chiampou	The ordinance banned new fast food outlets in South L.A.	The ordinance was not an outright ban. Rather, it states that its intent is “to prohibit the establishment of new fast food restaurants in South Los Angeles for 365 days, or until the adoption of appropriate regulatory controls.”	Council File Number 07-1658, Office of the City Clerk, City of Los Angeles, Ordinance No. 180103. cityplanning.lacity.org/Code_Studies/Misc/FastFoodInterim.pdf	L.A. City Council	Implies that Los Angeles’s fast food ordinance is irrational or extreme by exaggerating its provisions; attempts to discredit the L.A. City Council and, by extension, Councilmember Jan Perry (the ordinance’s sponsor).
77–80	San Francisco — seriously, San Francisco is essentially a conservative-leaning city that wants a civilized community to be preserved	Jim Gilchrist	San Francisco is primarily a politically conservative city.	Data provided by the State of California indicate that of all registered voters in San Francisco in May 2009, 9.36% are Republican, the primary right-leaning political party in the U.S.; 56.67% are registered as Democratic, 1.68% as American Independent, and 1.97% as Green. Data also show that of all cities in California, San Francisco has the second highest percentage of Democratic Party members.	California Secretary of State Debra Bowen, “May 4, 2009— Report of Registration.” www.sos.ca.gov/elections/ror/ror-pages/15day-stwdsp-09/ror-050409.htm	San Franciscan non-conservatives	Implies that immigration reform advocates such as ANSWER Coalition have little support in San Francisco; justifies the mission of Gilchrist’s Minuteman Project.
119–22	And a domestic terrorism group called ANSWER Network, I believe — put the flyers out on the Internet calling on all their minions to show up and suppress free speech.	Jim Gilchrist	ANSWER Coalition is an organization that attempts to suppress free speech through terrorist methods	Media sources identifies ANSWER (Act Now to Stop War and End Racism) Coalition as an antiwar group immigrant rights group, not a domestic terrorism group; ANSWER is not identified as a terrorist organization by online sources that track terrorist acts.	Frances Romero, “Antiwar Movements in the U.S.,” <i>Time</i> , October 7, 2009. www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1928823,00.html Global Terrorism Database. www.start.umd.edu/gtd/search/Results.aspx?expanded=no&casualties_type=&casualties_max=&country=217&ob=GTDid&od=desc&page=1&count=100 San Francisco Bay Independent Media Center, “Immigrant Demonstrators Call for Affirmation of SF Sanctuary Status,” July 31, 2008. www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/07/31/18521239.php National Counterterrorism Center Worldwide Incidents Tracking System. wits.nctc.gov/FederalDiscoverWITS/index.do?N=0	ANSWER Coalition	Discredits ANSWER Coalition—and by extension, other immigrant rights advocates—as a violent, anti-American organization that opposes free speech.

Chart 2c. *cont.*

Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
150–54	I think anarchists from the International Socialist Organization, the ANSWER Network, typical First Amendment suppressors — I call them domestic terrorists.	Jim Gilchrist	International Socialist Organization (ISO) and ANSWER Coalition members are anarchists who attempt to suppress free speech through terrorist methods.	Media sources identify ANSWER Coalition as an antiwar and immigrant rights group and the International Socialist Organization as a pro-immigration group. They are not identified as anarchists.	Frances Romero, “Antiwar Movements in the U.S.,” <i>Time</i> , October 7, 2009. http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1928823,00.html Carolyn Lochhead, “Anti-immigration Caravan Makes It to Washington: Minuteman Project Holds Rally as Senate Ready to Debate Bill,” <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , May 13, 2006. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2006/05/13/MNGBTIR6CO1.DTL San Francisco Bay Independent Media Center, “Immigrant Demonstrators Call for Affirmation of SF Sanctuary Status,” July 31, 2008. www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/07/31/18521239.php	International Socialist Organization, ANSWER Coalition	Links the International Socialist Organization and the ANSWER Coalition — and, by extension, other immigrant rights advocates — to terrorism; discredits them as an organization that wants to limit free speech.
225–32	JIM: The mayor of [<i>inaudible</i>], he’s got to go. KEN: You had signs asking that Gavin Newsom resign, the D.A., Kamala Harris, to resign, and William Siffermann, the head of the juvenile probation department. And I imagine it was his responsibility to have this guy turned over to the feds long ago, when he was getting arrested as a juvenile.	Ken Chiampou	It was the responsibility of William Siffermann, head of the juvenile probation department to report and deliver Ramos to federal police for deportation when he was arrested as a juvenile.	All city employees (in their official capacity) are prohibited by city law from cooperating with INS to detain, arrest, or investigate suspected undocumented immigrants; requesting information on individual immigration status; or withholding or restricting provision of public services/benefits upon immigration status, unless required by federal or state laws, or court decision, or if the suspected undocumented immigrant has been convicted of/is arrested for a California state felony.	San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 12H: “Immigration Status.” sfgsa.org/index.aspx?page=1069	Gavin Newsom, Kamala Harris, William Siffermann	Discredits San Francisco city government officials and local law enforcement; implies that they had neglected their duties and were not protecting the community.
416–20	Any mayor that chooses a policy that leads to Mara Salvatrucha gang members killing family members in cold blood on a city street in San Francisco ought to resign.	John Kobylt	Mayor Gavin Newsom made the decision that instated San Francisco’s sanctuary ordinance toward undocumented immigrants.	The sanctuary ordinance was adopted in 1989, before Mayor Newsom took office in 2004.	City and County of San Francisco, “Sanctuary Ordinance.” www.sfgov.org/site/sanctuary_page.asp?id=81004	Gavin Newsome; local gangs and, by extension, undocumented immigrants	Portrays the mayor of San Francisco as being unwilling to protect the city from criminal gangs; links the city’s amnesty policy — and, by extension, undocumented immigrants — to gang violence.

Chart 2c. *cont.*

Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
461–63	OK, the L.A. city council made it official yesterday: they have banned the opening of any new fast food outlets in in South L.A.	Ken Chiampou	The ordinance banned new fast food outlets in South L.A.	The ordinance was not an outright ban. Rather, it states that its intent is “to prohibit the establishment of new fast food restaurants in South Los Angeles for 365 days, or until the adoption of appropriate regulatory controls.”	Council File Number 07-1658, Office of the City Clerk, City of Los Angeles, Ordinance No. 180103. http://cityplanning.lacity.org/Code_Studies/Misc/FastFoodInterim.pdf	L.A. City Council	Implies that Los Angeles’s fast food ordinance is absurd, irrational, or extreme by exaggerating its provisions; by extension, discredits the L.A. City Council and Councilmember Jan Perry (the law’s sponsor).
652–53	KEN: Well, yeah, because 20 percent of the restaurants on the West Side are fast food. JOHN: Just go down on Santa Monica Boulevard. You’ll run into plenty of them.	Ken Chiampou	20 percent of restaurants on the West Side are fast food restaurants.	A media survey found that about 45% of the 900 restaurants in South L.A. are fast food chains or restaurants with minimal seating, compared with 16% of 2,200 restaurants in West L.A.	Tami Abdollah, “A Strict Order for Fast Food,” <i>Los Angeles Times</i> , September 10, 2007. http://articles.latimes.com/2007/sep/10/local/me-fastfood10/3	Fast food restaurants on Los Angeles’s west side.	Misstates the percentage of fast food restaurants on Los Angeles’s west side.
699–701	South L.A., poor people, they don’t care what they look like.	John Kobylt	Impoverished residents of South L.A. are obese by choice, because they don’t care about their physical appearance.	Obesity in South L.A. is not caused by personal indifference toward appearance. Research shows that factors such as the food environment and lack of exercise influence obesity.	California Center for Public Health Advocacy (CCPHA), “Searching for Healthy Food: The Food Landscape in California Cities and Counties,” January 2007. www.publichealthadvocacy.org/RFEI/policybrief_final.pdf California Center for Public Health Advocacy (CCPHA), “Dropping the Ball... California Schools Fail to Meet Physical Education Mandates,” June 2006. www.publichealthadvocacy.org/droppingtheball.html	Residents of South L.A.	Perpetuates negative stereotypes about South L.A.
752–53	The Mexican diet is what’s shot up the obesity rates in Los Angeles.	John Kobylt	Mexican food has caused obesity rates to increase in Los Angeles.	Mexican cuisine is not the sole cause of the obesity epidemic; research shows that other factors such as the food environment and lack of exercise influence obesity.	California Center for Public Health Advocacy (CCPHA) “Searching for Healthy Food: The Food Landscape in California Cities and Counties,” January 2007. www.publichealthadvocacy.org/RFEI/policybrief_final.pdf California Center for Public Health Advocacy (CCPHA), “Dropping the Ball... California Schools Fail to Meet Physical Education Mandates,” June 2006. www.publichealthadvocacy.org/droppingtheball.html	Mexican diet, and, by extension, Mexicans and Mexican Americans.	Implicates Mexicans as the cause for a complex public health issue.

Total of False Claims: 10

Chart 2c. *cont.*

II. Unverifiable Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
49–53	And, of course, the big story is the reason that the protest was held, is because of the deaths of the Bologna family at the hands of that illegal immigrant gang member who got sanctuary from San Francisco for years.	Ken Chiampou	Edwin Ramos is an undocumented immigrant and a gang member who avoided jail because of San Francisco's amnesty policy	Investigation of the case was ongoing when the show was broadcast; Ramos's immigration status and his status as a gang member had not been verified.	Jason Van Derbeken, "Suspect Pleads Not Guilty to Killing Dad, Sons," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , July 24, 2008. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/07/24/BAGF11TF78.DTL	Edwin Ramos (and, by extension), undocumented immigrants, City of San Francisco officials	Portrays Ramos as a murderer who exploited San Francisco's sanctuary policy; associates undocumented immigrants with gangs and violent crime.
90–95	when you have a [inaudible] established gang member who kills three family members in the middle of a day on a city street,	Ken Chiampou	Edwin Ramos is a gang member and a murderer who killed three members of the Bologna family.	Investigation of the case was ongoing when the show was broadcast; Ramos's guilt not been proven and his status as a gang member had not been verified.	Jason Van Derbeken, "Suspect Pleads Not Guilty to Killing Dad, Sons," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , July 24, 2008. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/07/24/BAGF11TF78.DTL	Edwin Ramos and, by extension, undocumented immigrants	Portrays Edwin Ramos as a murderer; associates undocumented immigrants with gangs and violent crime.
160–74	And this dispute is about the lack of immigration law enforcement that left a five-time-arrested, 21-year-old gangbanging MS-13 member with a full magazine of 30 rounds and an AK-47 — KEN: Was it an AK-47? JIM: — literally slaughtered. Yeah -- KEN: What — JIM: He slaughtered. KEN: [overlapping dialogue, inaudible] JIM: He slaughtered three family members. Shot them all to death in one car. KEN: Was it an AK-47? Do we know that for sure? JIM: That's the reports I've been getting repeatedly.	Jim Gilchrist	Edwin Ramos is an MS-13 gang member, and he used an AK-47 to kill three members of the Bologna family.	Investigation of the case was ongoing when the show was broadcast; Ken acknowledges that he is unsure whether the murder weapon was an AK-47.	Jason Van Derbeken, "Suspect Pleads Not Guilty to Killing Dad, Sons," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , July 24, 2008. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/07/24/BAGF11TF78.DTL	Edwin Ramos and, by extension, undocumented immigrants	Portrays Edwin Ramos as a murderer; associates undocumented immigrants with gangs and violent crime.

Chart 2c. cont.

Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
235–39	He has an arrest record as long as his arm, and what happened to the Bologna family is not an isolated incident, gentlemen. This happens daily in every city across the United States.	Jim Gilchrist	Undocumented immigrants like Edwin Ramos routinely commit murder in cities throughout the U.S.	No evidence supports the claim that undocumented immigrants regularly commit murder in U.S. cities; research shows that overall, immigrants have a far lower crime rate than U.S. citizens.	Ruben Rumbaut and Walter Ewing, <i>The Myth of Immigrant Criminality and the Paradox of Assimilation: Incarceration Rates among Native and Foreign-Born Men</i> (Washington, DC: Immigration Policy Center, 2007). nicic.gov/Library/022189	Edwin Ramos and, by extension, undocumented immigrants	Suggests that no U.S. city is safe from gang-related murder; associates undocumented immigrants with gangs and violent crime.
407–14	He knows that a lot of people can reasonably connect his policy to those three murders. That he is an accomplice to those murders. That he started the chain of action that led to those murders. He knows this, and so he's trying to defuse and make nice to the Minutemen, because their case is correct.	John Kobylt	Gavin Newsom acknowledges the accuracy of the Minutemen's claim that he originated the San Francisco sanctuary policy, which led to the Bologna murders; Newsom made conciliatory remarks to the Minutemen out of guilt.	Newsom did not enact or introduce San Francisco's sanctuary policy; it was established on November 27, 1989, prior to Newsom's taking office.	City and County of San Francisco, "Sanctuary Ordinance." www.sfgov.org/site/sanctuary_page.asp?id=81004	Gavin Newsom	Discredits Gavin Newsom by suggesting that he was responsible for the Bologna murders; validates the policies of the Minuteman Project.
663–71	You can't control the crime, you can't control what people eat, you can't control fathers who father children and run off -- you can't control any of this.	John Kobylt	South L.A. is ungovernable.	Since 1998, new policies and programs in various sectors, including law enforcement and education, have improved the welfare (including a decrease in crime) of South L.A. communities.	Paul Ong, Theresa Firestone, Deirdre Pfeiffer, Oiyun Poon, and Linda Tran, <i>The State of South L.A.</i> (Los Angeles: UCLA School of Public Affairs, 2008). la.ucla.edu/downloads/ong/StateofSouthLA-FinalReport1.pdf	Residents of South L.A., Jan Perry	Portrays South L.A. residents as negligent and their community as ungovernable; suggests the community is immune to improvement.
Total of Unverifiable Claims: 6							

Chart 2c. cont.

III. Distorted Claims							
Lines	Excerpt	Speaker	Claim	Counterevidence	Source	Target of Speech	Social Function
84–86	are they the only 140 people who would dare protest basically in support of a triple murdering illegal alien?	Ken Chiampou	Ramos is a triple murdering undocumented immigrant;	Edwin Ramos had not been convicted of the murders and had not been proven to be undocumented at the time of the broadcast.	Jason Van Derbeken, "Suspect Pleads Not Guilty to Killing Dad, Sons," <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , July 24, 2008. www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2008/07/24/BAGF11TF78.DTL	ANSWER Coalition	Portrays Ramos as a murderer; dehumanizes undocumented immigrants and associates them with violent crime.
90–95	how could you come out and support that act?	Ken Chiampou	ANSWER Coalition members at the Minuteman Project rally were supporting Ramos, an alleged murderer.	News accounts and photos identify the protestors as immigrant rights activists and advocates, not supporters of Ramos; a photo of the event shows protestors holding ANSWER Coalition signs with "Stop Racism Against Immigrants."	Richard Gonzalez, "San Francisco Under Fire for Immigrant 'Sanctuary,'" <i>Morning Edition</i> , National Public Radio, July 31, 2008. www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=93111065 San Francisco Bay Independent Media Center, "Immigrant Demonstrators Call for Affirmation of SF Sanctuary Status," July 31, 2008. www.indybay.org/newsitems/2008/07/31/18521239.php	ANSWER Coalition and, by extension, all immigrant rights advocates	Links immigrant rights advocates to gang violence.
97–100	Which kind of fits their typical mentality — let's suppress everyone else's freedom of speech, but we want everyone else to listen to us.	Ken Chiampou	ANSWER Coalition supports criminals and intended to suppress free speech.	There is no evidence in media reports that ANSWER Coalition suppresses the free speech of those with opposing views.	Richard Gonzalez, "San Francisco Under Fire for Immigrant 'Sanctuary,'" <i>Morning Edition</i> , National Public Radio, July 31, 2008. www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=93111065	ANSWER Coalition	Distorts the character of the July 30 demonstration; links ANSWER Coalition — and by extension, other immigrant rights advocates — to violence and suggests that it wants to limit free speech.
603–7	JOHN: Yeah, they're lucky anything opens. KEN: I'm —they should be happy that they've got fast food available.	John Kobylt	South L.A. is so dangerous that restaurants other than fast food restaurants cannot operate there	Research found that fast food restaurants made up 45 percent of restaurants in South L.A. .	Karl Vick, L.A. Official Wants a Change of Menu," <i>Washington Post</i> , July 13, 2008. www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/07/12/AR2008071201557.html	Residents of South L.A.	Perpetuates negative stereotypes about South L.A. residents and their community.
664–66	You've got like eighty thousand gang members running amok.	John Kobylt	Eighty thousand gang members occupy South Los Angeles.	The California Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy data for 2007–08 estimates 39,000 as the number of gang members in the City of Los Angeles.	Governor's Office of Gang and Youth Violence Policy, "CalEMA Funded Projects." www.calgrip.ca.gov/?navid=68	South L.A.	Perpetuates negative stereotypes about South L.A.
Total of Distorted Claims: 5							
Total of All Unsubstantiated Claims: 21							

Note: Assertions of fact, cited statistics/research, and, in general, statements that cannot be construed as opinion were cross-checked for accuracy.

Chart 3a. Divisive Language (Deixis), *The Lou Dobbs Show*, July 31, 2008

Lines	Excerpt	In-group (Us)	Out-group (Them)	Social Function
28–34	Now if you could imagine the idea that Senator Harry Reid, the Senate majority leader, and Speaker of the House, Nancy Pelosi, have reached a point of delirium and self-delusion in which they think (laughs) they're smarter than all the rest of us –?	You: radio audience Us: Dobbs, radio audience, Americans generally	They: Reid and Pelosi	Casts Reid and Pelosi as disconnected and contemptuous of the American public; suggests they are irrational.
174–92	BRIMELOW: There's many other ways of getting people out than – DOBBS: Right. BRIMELOW: – than physically removing them . DOBBS: Yeah. One of the ways, a pilot program announced by Immigration and Customs Enforcement, is voluntary deportation, if you will, a – what I would – what I'd style as a – as an exit amnesty – BRIMELOW: Right. DOBBS: – in which people, for a three-week period, will be able to – to get their affairs in order, be given a period of time to do so, and then be leaving the country. What do you think the – the response will be to that program? BRIMELOW: You know, the – it seems to me that most illegals can just leave anyway, if they want to. But it – it is a way of – of getting themselves square with the law. And that clearly does bother them enormously.	I: Dobbs	Them, their, they, themselves: undocumented immigrants That: voluntary deportation That: undocumented status	Implies that undocumented immigrants have only transitory ties in the United States; by disregarding the difficulties undocumented immigrants would face, suggests that it would be easy for them to return to their home country.
201–14	BRIMELOW: But only about 100,000 of them were actually – actually physically deported. Most of them , when they realized that these raids were going on and that this government was serious, just left. And that's what would happen now. It would trigger an avalanche of people leaving. Because they know the – the situation is absurd. I mean, most of these people come from countries, like Mexico, which don't allow illegal immigration themselves . DOBBS: Exact– BRIMELOW: They know – they know what happens to illegal immigrants in Mexico. You know, they're raped and beaten up and thrown back over the border, if they're lucky.	I: Brimelow	Them, they: undocumented immigrants, Mexicans These: deportation raids This: U.S. government Themselves: other countries They: illegal immigrants in Mexico	Implies that undocumented immigrants have only transitory ties in the United States.
228–38	BRIMELOW: – the American elite, the Bush administration has clearly decided they're going to have some kind of a hemispheric Common Market, and they're just going to put it through regardless of anything – unless, of course, people get the message.		They: Bush administration	Casts Bush administration American and international leadership as disconnected from, indifferent to, and in collusion against the interests of most Americans. common citizens.
370–82	She's going to save the planet. You and I and our fellow citizens are just such idiots that we don't merit her consideration or that of the Senate majority leader, Harry Reid, or, of course, Barack Obama, the presumptive, presumptuous nominee of the Democratic Party for president. In other words, despite the fact that, according to a CNN poll, that 79% of all Americans support offshore drilling for oil and natural gas as a bridge to alternate sources, these arrogant national leaders that we put in place to represent us have decided we are too big a fools, we are the great unwashed and unworthy of their concern.	You, we, our, us: radio audience, Americans generally I: Dobbs	She, her: Pelosi These, their: American political leaders	Casts Pelosi and other national leaders as disconnected elitists who have no regard for the interests of most Americans.
472–87	SANDY: And, you know, when we're losing jobs right and left, it just seems like – I don't know who they're representing. But there was – DOBBS: Well, you know who Robert Menendez is representing. SANDY: (laughs) DOBBS: Senator Menendez has made it very clear. SANDY: Yeah, he is. He can't get past [this?] (inaudible). But he did, you know, swear to protect our constitution and America. DOBBS: Well, you know, we could put half of these senators in jail – SANDY: (laughs) DOBBS: – if we were to – you know, if we go under the basis of the fact that they are breaking their pledge to – and their oath of office. By gosh!	We, our: Americans generally I: Sandy (call-in speaker) You: Sandy, radio audience	They, these, their: legislators who support immigrant rights He: Senator Menendez	Casts Menendez and like-minded senators as disconnected from voters remiss in their constitutional duties.
514–26	DOBBS: That was their approach to, you know, try to muzzle me – SANDY: [I know?]. DOBBS: – by describing rationality and – and facts as hate speech. Let me tell you , we're not going to be politically correct here. SANDY: [OK?]. DOBBS: And the only way you can satisfy La Raza is to open borders and to embrace amnesty. And I will not do that . I will not sell out citizenship in this country. I will not sell out this nation's interest for any reason, to anyone, at any time, ever. And they can stick it.	You: Sandy, radio audience, Americans generally We: Dobbs, his producers I: Dobbs	That: criticism of Dobbs Their, they: Latino politicians critical of Dobbs That: open borders, amnesty This: United States	Casts Latino politicians as unreasonably critical of Dobbs; promotes Dobbs as a champion of American values.

Chart 3a. *cont.*

Lines	Excerpt	In-group (Us)	Out-group (Them)	Social Function
542–52	SANDY: Yes. Their motto is, “For the race, everything. For others, nothing.” DOBBS: There you go. And when people talk like that and think like that , what are they ? You don’t have to answer that. Everybody listening to – SANDY: [Right?]. DOBBS: – your voice can answer that for themselves. It – it’s a shame. It is an absolute shame that we put up with that kind of nonsense. But that’s also part of being Americans. We have a right to say what we mean and what we want.	We: Dobbs, radio audience You, your: Sandy, radio audience, Americans generally	Their, they: Latino politicians That: Latino views on immigration That: First Amendment rights	Casts Latino politicians as narrow-minded and implies they are un-American and nonsensical; promotes Dobbs as a champion of First Amendment rights.
862–70	But let’s consider 11 million as our baseline. And what we found – DOBBS: All right. CAMAROTA: – is the ones in the census, at least, there’s been a very significant drop-off in their numbers. You’re certainly right to ask me how many get missed. Most researchers assume 10%. But let’s – let’s just put that aside for a second. But of the ones we can track, they’ve declined 11%.	Us [’s]: Camarota, Dobbs, radio audience Our, we: CIS You: Dobbs	Their, they: undocumented immigrants That: census shortfall	Casts staff of CIS as impartial researchers; tends to dehumanize undocumented immigrants by presenting them as subjects for study.
882–98	CAMAROTA: Well, here’s the thing. Here’s what we found. We [tracked?] carefully their unemployment rate over the last year, actually over a number of years. And what we found was that this drop-off began several months before there was any noticeable increase in their unemployment rate, suggesting that something other than the economy caused their – them – a large share of them , or at least a significant share – DOBBS: Right. CAMAROTA: – to go home. Now, their unemployment rate is up, so it’s very likely that increased enforcement, coupled with the economy, are now working in concert and – DOBBS: Yeah. CAMAROTA: – and reducing the number here, by discouraging people from coming, but also, apparently, increasing the number going home on their own.	We: CIS	Their, them: undocumented immigrants This: decrease in number of Latinos That: higher unemployment rate	Casts staff of CIS as impartial researchers; tends to dehumanize undocumented immigrants by presenting them as subjects for study.
954–64	One of the interesting things is there is evidence in the data that the number of illegals in the country actually ticked up, from about April to July, and then after that – that was when we were debating the amnesty – when legalization seemed like a real possibility, it seems that many fewer people didn’t go home that would have otherwise gone. And so – because, remember, there’s a lot of churn in this population. They took a wait-and-see approach. And the numbers actually ticked up.	We: Americans generally	That: increase in number of undocumented immigrants This, they: undocumented immigrants	Tends to dehumanize undocumented immigrants by presenting them as subjects for study.
995–1000	DOBBS: Why don’t you and I – you’re the Center for Immigration Studies. You’re – you’re in this – this debate. Let’s make certain that we’re just as tough on these – these ignorant fools who are hiring illegal aliens as we are on the illegal aliens who are breaking our – our laws.	You: Camarota, CIS I: Dobbs We, us [’s], our: Dobbs, Camarota, Americans generally	These: employers of undocumented immigrants	Portrays Dobbs and Camarota as guardians of the law; casts employers who hire immigrants as unknowledable and unintelligent.
1018–32	DOBBS: Well, let – let’s make it – I mean, let’s make it really, really im– an important commitment, to must making certain these illegal employers are held up to the scorn to which they should. Because they – they’re not only exploiting illegal aliens. They’re not only depressing wages. But, I mean, they’re breaking the law and they’re doing so with the full force and power of their political weight, their economic power. These are – these are scumbags. That’s all there is to it. CAMAROTA: Well, I mean, the bottom line is this. If we go after illegals, it shows that they start complying with the law and leave the country. If we went after employers more, th– many of them would stop doing what they’re doing or at least not start.	We, us [’s]: U.S. government, Americans generally	They, their, these, them: employers of undocumented immigrants They: undocumented immigrants	Portrays employers of undocumented immigrants as people who misuse political and economic power to break the law; casts Dobbs, Camarota, and the radio audience as guardians of the law.

Note: Deictic words—demonstrative, collective, and other pronouns—are shown in bold.

Chart 3b. Divisive Language (Deixis), *The Savage Nation*, July 24, 2008

Line	Excerpt	In-group (Us)	Out-group (Them)	Social Function
12–22	At least now we know why Obama picked Germany to give his first speech in Europe. It is certainly because of Germany's deeply entrenched socialist-communist establishment. It is also due to the massive number of Turkish Muslims who live there who made up a majority of the crowd. When I say majority of the crowd, you mark my words, the majority of that crowd were the communist-socialist bloc in Germany. Now you say, how do you know that? This is the same group of anti-Americans in Germany that torched McDonalds during G8 meetings; that burns effigies of our presidents over the last number of administrations.	I, my: Savage We, you, our: Savage, radio audience, Americans generally	His: Obama That, this: Obama supporters	Suggests that Obama's German supporters are mostly socialist-communists or terrorists.
25–28	if you actually look at Obama's mentors, all of them – each and every one of them , and I can name them , and I will name them , and I'm not going to be intimidated out of the political arena because of these degenerates in media matters.	I: Savage You: radio audience	Them: Obama supporters These: Media Matters	Casts Obama's supporters and Media Matters as immoral; portrays Savage as a courageous whistle-blower.
28–31	I will expose them for who they are and at the end of the day, I'll be here and they won't be here and I've said that before about others who've come after me on false charges.	I, me: Savage	Them, they: Media Matters	Casts Media Matters as dishonest; portrays Savage as a persistent whistle-blower.
31–33	I will be standing long after they're gone because I am right and they are wrong. I'm on the right side; they're on the wrong side.	I: Savage	They: Media Matters	Casts Media Matters as immoral; portrays Savage as a moral champion.
33–36	I've devoted over 40 years of my life to defending defenseless children and these rats – dedicated to hating families, they're dedicating (inaudible) – and how you people can be taken in by these ...villains is not of course a mystery to me .	I, my, me: Savage You: radio audience, Americans generally	They, these: Media Matters	Casts Media Matters as dishonest; portrays Savage as a protector of children.
61–64	They're going to go after every conservative who is going to expose the communist-socialist roots of Obama in order to make sure that they finally have the communist revolution that they've wanted in this country for so many years.	This: the United States	They: Democrats, Democratic leaders	Portrays Democrats and Democratic leaders as communists and traitors.
108–11	– the lifeboat is full; we cannot simply permit anyone to waltz across the border and cash in on our welfare system and I said I believe in immigration because I'm the son of an immigrant – I, Michael Savage, am a first-generation American;	I: Savage We, our: Savage, radio audience, Americans generally	Anyone: undocumented immigrants	Suggests that undocumented immigrants exploit U.S. resources that should be reserved for citizens.
119–21	Tomorrow they will come for the liberals; anybody who has the nerve to stand up to these rats – these left-wing rats – is going to be targeted.		They, these: Media Matters Anybody: any commentator	Presents Media Matters as persecutors of anyone who challenges its point of view.
508–13	They never really put out a story that supports borders, language and culture; they're always on the side of the illegal alien or on the murderer or on the side of the rapist or the pornographer – so the demographic –the natural demographic for the newspapers says you know what, I'm not buying that rag anymore.	I: any American generally	They, that: <i>The New York Times</i> and <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> , liberal media generally	Casts <i>The New York Times</i> and <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> —and, by extension, the liberal media—as biased and supporters of criminals.
592–98	The communist movement is very powerful in Germany and as you well know Germany is a socialist nation; it was the home of the Beider Manhoff terrorists and that mentality still exists in Germany; these are the same rabble – this is the same rabble that built McDonalds down; that trashed the streets during previous G8 meetings.	You: radio audience, Americans generally	That: terrorism These, this: German radicals	Suggests that Obama's German supporters are communist-socialists and terrorists.
689–92	CNN report on being gay in Iraq; please leave me alone with that already, I'm not interested – again if the first thing they did with their freedom – that's what American men have died for so they can be gay in Iraq?	Me, I: Savage	They, their: gay Iraqis That: homosexuality	Suggests that homosexuality, and its acceptance, is not in accord with American values.
719–23	MICHAEL SAVAGE: Uh-oh. Uh-oh, we don't like "citizen of the world" around these parts. We prefer "citizen of the United States of America" if they're going to run for the presidency. We really don't want a world president; we don't trust the world court very much.	We, these: Savage, radio audience, Americans generally	They: Obama, candidates with global perspectives generally	Implies that Obama lacks patriotism and is therefore unfit for the presidency.

Note: Deictic words—demonstrative, collective, and other pronouns—are shown in bold.

Chart 3c: Divisive Language (Deixis), *The John & Ken Show*, July 30, 2008

Line	Excerpt	In-group (Us)	Out-group (Them)	Social Function
77–82	San Francisco — seriously, San Francisco is essentially a conservative-leaning city that wants a civilized community to be preserved — KEN: This is — JIM: They don't want these killers up here.	They: San Franciscans	These: gang members, undocumented immigrants generally	Portrays San Franciscan residents as uniformly conservative; implies that all undocumented immigrants are criminals.
131–37	We have on the link on our website a link to the <i>San Francisco Chronicle</i> story with pictures of them holding signs like, "Who's the illegal alien? Pilgrim?" Question mark. "Full rights for all immigrants." And they came prepared, calling you guys "border thugs."	We, our: John and Ken, their producers You: Minutemen	Them, they: immigrant rights advocates	Tends to discredit position of immigrant rights advocates.
147–60	KEN: Well, were they really an illegal alien advocacy group, or were they just anarchists who signed up for the mayhem that day? JIM: I think anarchists from the International Socialist Organization, the Answer Network, typical First Amendment suppressors — I call them domestic terrorists. Certainly I have nothing complimentary to say about them, because they do nothing to complement the vision of our Founding Fathers, which is free speech, and bring the grievance forward so that we can settle these disputes that we're having in our communities and in our country.	Our, we: Gilchrist and Minutemen, radio audience, Americans generally	They, them: immigrant rights advocates, ANSWER Coalition That: protest against Minutemen	Identifies and immigrants rights advocates and members of ANSWER Coalition as anarchists and terrorists who do not acknowledge constitutional rights.
213–22	San Francisco is the first city that we're going to conquer, and we're going to either drive these politicians out of office who have done this to this country, brought this calamity forward, and we're going to replace them with people who truly reflect the concerns of our citizens, including San Francisco citizens and Los Angeles citizens. I think L.A. will be our second target. We're getting ready for Los Angeles.	We, our: Gilchrist and Minutemen, radio audience, Americans generally I: Jim	These, this, them: politicians and public officials who support immigrant rights	Portrays elected leaders who support immigrant rights as injurious to society and unresponsive to most American citizens; encourages the radio audience to vote them out of office.
250–63	But it's not too late to start replacing these political governors, and every public office will have brought this calamity forth upon the United States. And he'll keep endorsing and supporting these ridiculous special-order 40s and these ridiculous sanctuary city preference programs, because it's just simply convenient to pass on enforcing these laws. And I guess they're carrying out their own personal agendas for whatever reason. They're certainly not reflecting the interests of the people who put them in office.	I: Jim	These, them, they, their: public officials who support immigrant rights This: murder attributed to Ramos These: statutes that protect immigrant rights	Portrays elected leaders who support immigrant rights as injurious to society and unresponsive to American voters; encourages radio audience to vote them out of office.
534–39	We know we should be prepared. We know there should be a limit to how much fast food you ingest. But people know about it, and they don't care. And they're making that choice themselves for themselves and their children.	We, you: radio audience, Americans generally	They, their: South L.A. residents That: eating high-calorie food	Implies that South L.A. residents are negligent, putting themselves and their children at risk.
605–6	JOHN: Yeah, they're lucky anything opens. KEN: I'm — they should be happy that they've got fast food available.	I: Ken	They: South L.A. residents	Implies that South L.A. is so dangerous that only fast food restaurants will risk doing business there.
672–74	Here's the sad truth. Two things are true about poor people. They tend to have more kids and they tend to be fatter.		They: poor people, South L.A. residents (implied)	Portrays poor people—and, by extension, South L.A. residents and undocumented immigrants—as having little self-discipline.
687–99	Because their life is successful, they want to make sure they look good so other people are impressed by their physical appearance. So they take care of themselves and they look over their diets and their children's diets. KEN: And they want their children to look good so that other families are impressed by their slenderness of their children. JOHN: Yeah. I'm not saying that all of this is a wonderful attribute. I'm just saying that's the way it is. They become more obsessed with their image.	I: John	Their, they: residents of well-to-do neighborhoods This: child-rearing practices of residents of well-to-do neighborhoods	Presents members of well-to-do communities as image conscious and, therefore, careful about their diet.
700–11	Whereas South L.A., poor people — KEN: They don't care what they look like. JOHN: So what? Yeah. KEN: Because everybody's fat. Everybody's wandering around fat, and nobody gets compliments for being thin. JOHN: You know, and that is their choice that they have made — the culture has made. The collective wisdom of that tribe has made a choice that it's OK to be fat and to eat fast food and to feed their kids such as that.		They, their, that: South L.A. residents, poor people That: eating high-calorie food	Presents residents of South L.A. and other low-income communities—and, by extension, undocumented immigrants—as having low regard for self-image; portrays them as fat. Suggests they are negligent because they and their children eat fast food.

Chart 3c. *cont.*

Line	Excerpt	In-group (Us)	Out-group (Them)	Social Function
740–50	You know, you could offer them a veggie panini sandwich, and they're going to look at you like you dropped from Mars. They don't care. You know, what are they eating? There's a lot of chicken joints down there, there's a lot of burger joints, there's a lot of taco joints. I mean, especially – I don't know how much of these areas are now taken over by the Mexicans, but, you know, good luck changing the Mexican diet.	You: radio audience I: John	They, them: South L.A. residents, Mexicans These: poor communities	Suggests that residents of South L.A. and Mexicans—and, by extension, undocumented immigrants—are indifferent to their health.
752–56	The Mexican diet is what's shot up the obesity rates in Los Angeles. And that's their culture.		Their, they: Mexicans, Mexican residents of South L.A. That: eating high-calorie food	Suggests that residents of Mexican heritage—and, by extension, undocumented immigrants—are the reason for high obesity rates in Los Angeles.

Note: Deictic words—demonstrative, collective, and other pronouns—are shown in bold.

Chart 4a. Selected Indexical Terms, *The Lou Dobbs Show, July 31, 2008*

Word or Phrase	Lines	Frequency by Speaker	Total
illegal alien or illegal aliens	Dobbs: 146, 150, 159–60, 287–88, 830, 832, 834, 851, 901–2, 904, 951, 999 (2), 1022, 1045 Brimelow: 168 Camarota: 843, 914, 924, 1037	Lou Dobbs: 31 Peter Brimelow: 7 Steven Camarota: 6	44
illegal immigration or illegal immigrants	Dobbs: 101, 217, 255, 320–21, 761–62, 828, 833, 900–1, 984–85, 989 Brimelow: 194, 209, 211–12		
illegal or illegals	Brimelow: 167, 189, 199 Camarota: 956, 1029		
illegal employers or illegal employees	Dobbs: 287, 982 (2), 985–86, 1020, 1045		
community or communities	none		0
free speech, or freedom of speech	none		0
free press, or freedom of the press	none		0
anarchist	none		0

Note: This chart tabulates the occurrence of code words indicating nativism on the part of the speaker; occurrences outside this context are not included.

Chart 4b. Selected Indexical Terms, *The Savage Nation*, July 24, 2008

Word or Phrase	Lines	Frequency by Speaker	Total
illegal alien or illegal aliens	Savage: 107, 161, 163, 166, 510, 844, 848, 854, 859, 1803, 1857, 1859, 1862, 2206	Michael Savage: 16	16
illegal immigration or illegal immigrants	Savage: 112, 1809		
community or communities	Savage: 715, 852	Michael Savage: 2	2
free speech or freedom of speech	Savage: 67, 126, 675, 676, 939, 1678–79, 1683, 1761, 1823	Michael Savage: 12	12
free press or freedom of the press	Savage: 218, 940, 1914		
anarchist	Savage: 91, 589, 796 (2), 1156, 1788	Michael Savage: 6	6

Note: This chart tabulates the occurrence of code words indicating nativism on the part of the speaker; occurrences outside this context are not included.

Chart 4c. Selected Indexical Terms, *The John & Ken Show*, July 30, 2008

Word or Phrase	Lines	Frequency by Speaker	Total
illegal alien or illegal aliens	Ken: 68, 86, 134, 139, 147, 830, 925 John: 398	Ken Chiampou: 8 John Kobylt: 1	9
illegal immigration or illegal immigrants	Ken: 52		
community or communities	Jim: 79, 159, 190, 210, 241	Jim Gilcrest: 5	5
free speech or freedom of speech	Jim: 99, 122, 157, 124–25	Jim Gilcrest: 4	4
free press, or freedom of the press	none		
anarchist	Jim: 97, 150 Ken: 148	Jim Gilcrest: 2 Ken Chiampou: 1	3

Note: This chart tabulates the occurrence of code words indicating nativism on the part of the speaker; occurrences outside this context are not included.



UCLA CHICANO STUDIES RESEARCH CENTER

193 Haines Hall
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1544

Copyright 2011 by the Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved.

Phone: 310-825-2642 • Fax: 310-206-1784 • E-Mail: press@chicano.ucla.edu

Director: Chon A. Noriega • Senior Editor: Rebecca Frazier • Designer: William Morosi

Mission Statement: The UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center supports interdisciplinary, collaborative, and policy-oriented research on issues critical to the Chicano community. The center's press produces books, reports, briefs, media, newsletters, and the leading journal in its field, *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies*.

WWW.CHICANO.UCLA.EDU