Both aim at reaching a specific audience, both want to address a specific target group with appropriate arguments. Campaign commercials promote ideas, parties and politicians, whereas commercial advertisements want to sell products, goods and services. But the mechanisms and arguments that are applied are similar in both areas.

There are several ways in which political communication addresses its audience through racist discourses. Van Dijk (1992, 1997) identified four main strategies that are often used by politicians: positive self-presentation, negative representation of “the other”, denial of racism and false impartiality.

1) Positive self-presentation. It is the most frequent strategy chosen by politicians in order to be differentiated from “others” and takes the form of nationalism. For example, with regard to immigration and inter-ethnic relations, politicians often appeal to a “long national tradition of tolerance, equality and democracy”, as stated by a British parliamentarian: “I believe that we are a wonderfully fair country. We stick to the rules unlike some foreign governments”. Positive self-representation can also come forward with regard to one’s own political party or movement when they are depicted as models of tolerance, models of democracy, etc.

2) Negative representation of the “other”. When the objective is to legitimate restrictive policies on immigration or civil rights, in particular within conservative political parties, positive self-representation is used as a strategy with the following premise: “we are tolerant, welcoming, etc.” in order to conclude by representing ‘the other’ in a negative manner: “the others, on the contrary...” Immigration, multicultural society and equality are presented unfavourably only through the negative representation of the other. Subsequently, the migrant is defined as someone who is ‘illegal’ and even dangerous for the socio-economic well-being of the host country.

3) Denial of racism. When one creates a positive public image, denial of racism plays a key role in the political discourse. Even if all politicians (whatever their political orientation) can implement this strategy, it should be noted that it is usually adopted by those who share clearly racist opinions. Therefore, this is the classical method through which people deny being racists despite the racist opinions expressed: “I am not racist/we are not racists, but...” Or “we have nothing against immigrants or minorities, but...” Furthermore, by denying their racism, politicians tend to shift it onto others. Racism can therefore be considered as a phenomenon that characterises far-right politics or as the expression of a natural resentment that the lowest social classes experience against migrants.

4) False impartiality. Politicians tend to associate positive self-representation and/or denial of racism with the necessity to put restrictive measures in place with regard to minorities, by being opposed to politics that address the rights of migrants and minorities. An example of this strategy, which has been defined as “fair but firm move”, is well demonstrated by the following statement of another parliamentarian in Great Britain: “if we really want to fight for harmony, non-discrimination, equality of opportunities in our cities, it has to be done through a rigorous and correct control of immigration”. Being able to understand how political propaganda can vehiculate new forms of racism is already a first good step towards the raising of students’ awareness against discrimination. Engaging students in active processes of video production to challenge stereotypes and prejudices is even better. Indeed, if media analysis provides students with fundamental skills of decoding meanings, media production may improve their capacity of self-expression or, also, their capacity to act in the world: in a word their agency.