

# When in Britain, do as the British do?

The Impact of British Political Discourse on the Decline of Multiculturalism



# When in Britain, do as the British do?

The Impact of British Political Discourse on the Decline of Multiculturalism

by Sophie Boisen

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Candidata magisterii in Culture, Communication and Globalization with a  
specialization in International Migration and Ethnic Relations

Aalborg University

2011

## **Abstract**

*This thesis examines the impact of political discourse on the alleged retreat from multiculturalism in Britain today. Although Britain has not officially had multiculturalism as a state practice, the country has implemented various policies supporting multiculturalism and has thus often been seen as a multicultural country due to its policies and ethnically diverse population. Britain is an interesting case because the country has a long history of immigration to the country due, among others, to its colonial past and its former status as an empire. Thus, there is a rich cultural diversity in Britain. However, in recent years, the stance towards multiculturalism has toughened, and the current British Prime Minister, David Cameron, has dismissed multiculturalism as a state practice altogether. The literature suggests that there has in fact been a retreat from multiculturalism, and that 9/11 and the London Bombings of 7/7 were significant catalysts for this change. Therefore, these two dates are central focus points in this thesis. Through a Critical Discourse Analysis of speeches from both the Labour Party and the Conservative Party from 2000-2011, this thesis analyzes the role of political discourse in the decline of multiculturalism in Britain.*

*The theoretical backdrop of this thesis is the ideas of Michel Foucault and Norman Fairclough who both view language and society as closely connected. Therefore, this thesis will also analyze the social surroundings in which the speeches occur, in order to conclude on the dialectic relationship between discourse and society, which results in certain discourses gaining more prominence than others. This will also lead to a brief comparison to Western Europe in general, in order to determine whether Britain is part of a wider European trend.*

*Subsequently, this thesis concludes that there has in fact been a turn away from multiculturalism in Britain which manifests itself in an increased focus on national cohesion and national identity as well as on stricter demands for immigrants. Furthermore, although 9/11 and 7/7 were in fact crucial for the change in attitudes, a general shift in attitudes was also seen in several other Western European countries, thus signaling a general shift in attitudes in today's Western Europe.*

# Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	1
1.1. Reserach Questions.....	2
1.2. Structure of the Thesis.....	2
<b>2. Litterature review</b> .....	4
2.1. Multiculturalism.....	4
2.2. The Era of post-Multiculturalism.....	6
<i>The Multiculturalist Backlash</i> .....	6
<i>Rejection of the Multiculturalist Backlash</i> .....	10
2.3. Studies Comparable to this Thesis.....	12
2.4. Chapter Conclusion.....	13
<b>3. Methodology</b> .....	15
3.1. Research Strategy.....	15
3.2. Data.....	17
3.3. Reliability/Validity.....	21
3.4. Concepts.....	22
<b>4. Theory</b> .....	23
4.1. Foucauldian Discourse Analysis.....	23
<i>Knowledge and Language</i> .....	23
<i>Discourse</i> .....	24
<i>Discourse and Power</i> .....	25
<i>Discourse and History</i> .....	27
<i>Critique of Foucault</i> .....	27

<i>Strength of Foucault's Ideas</i> .....	28
4.2. Norman Fairclough.....	29
<i>Key Concepts</i> .....	29
<i>Description</i> .....	31
<i>Interpretation</i> .....	32
<i>Explanation</i> .....	33
<b>5. Analysis of the Labour Party Discourse</b> .....	<b>34</b>
5.1. Description and Interpretation.....	34
<i>Before 9/11</i> .....	34
<i>Between 9/11 2001 and 7/7 2005</i> .....	35
<i>After 7/7 2005</i> .....	40
<i>Today</i> .....	42
5.2. Summary of Description and Interpretation.....	43
<b>6. Analysis of the Conservative Party Discourse</b> .....	<b>44</b>
6.1. Description and Interpretation .....	44
<i>Before 9/11</i> .....	44
<i>9/11 2001 – 7/7 2005</i> .....	47
<i>After 7/7 2005</i> .....	49
<i>Today</i> .....	54
6.2. Summary of Description and Interpretation.....	55
<b>7. Explanation</b> .....	<b>56</b>

**8. Discussion.....64**  
8.1. Where is Britain Headed?.....64  
8.2. European Trend?.....67

**9. Conclusion.....70**

**References.....73**

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that, in recent years, there has been a shift in the view on multiculturalism in the Western European countries (Joppke, 2004; Entzinger, 2003; Brubaker, 2001; Silj, 2010; McGhee, 2008; Castles & Miller, 2009). Especially in Britain, which has been a country often associated with multiculturalism, the debate about the failure of multiculturalism has been pronounced and still is to this date. In Western Europe, policies with elements of assimilation are increasingly replacing policies with elements of multiculturalism as nations are searching for alternative incorporation strategies that epitomize national culture and values as prerequisites for membership (Brubaker, 2001; Mitchell, 2004). Thus, whereas the focus in many countries was previously on supporting and maintaining cultural difference, the focus is now shifting as issues of social and national cohesion are taking over.

9/11 is an interesting turning point in history and in the debate about multiculturalism because it made many countries question their national incorporation strategies and the presence of ethnic minorities in general. After the July 7 attacks in London in 2005, this feeling became even more prominent in Britain, because suddenly British citizens with foreign backgrounds were a potential threat to national security. This has resulted in some of the British today turning against multiculturalism, and in February this year the British prime minister David Cameron announced that “State multiculturalism has failed” (BBC News, 2011). There is no doubt that the terrorist attacks were major contributors to this shift, but it remains unclear whether they were the principle reasons for this change or if there were other driving forces. Thus, is the British retreat from multiculturalism a direct result of an opposition to Muslim immigrants, or is there some other explanation? And is the retreat from multiculturalism a sign of nationalism and possibly xenophobia in Britain?

In this thesis, my objective is, through Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), to analyze the discourses that the leaders of the two leading political parties, the Labour Party and the Conservative Party, draw upon when talking about issues of multiculturalism, immigration and social cohesion in their speeches. Thus, my aim is to find an explanation as to what role discourse has played in this turn away from multiculturalism, and also to find out the role that politicians have played with their use and negligence of certain discourses. Politicians are hugely influential on the media as well as on public opinion, and *vice versa*. I therefore find it interesting to use discourse analysis to investigate

how the discourses surrounding multiculturalism have evolved in the two major British political parties in the past 11 years, since right before 9/11.

An analysis of the political discourses surrounding multiculturalism in this time period should reveal key issues that can contribute to an understanding of why British politicians are turning their backs on multiculturalism. At the same time, as mentioned above, politicians are influenced by their surroundings and therefore I will also look into the socio-cultural context surrounding the politicians in order to find explanations. Furthermore, as a supplement to the explanation of this, it is necessary to also consider the issue in the wider European context, since the British decline of multiculturalism might be part of a larger European trend.

## 1.1. Research Questions

My primary research question for this thesis is:

*What role have discourses used by the two major political parties in Britain played in the turn away from multiculturalism, and what are the possible reasons for this change?*

Sub questions:

- *What role have politicians and their surroundings played in this change?*
- *Is the British case part of a wider European or world-wide trend?*

## 1.2. Structure of the Thesis

In Chapter 2, I will make a review of the literature concerning the failure of multiculturalism, and I will account for the most prominent opinions in the debate as well as for the different suggestions that the literature gives as to why multiculturalism has failed, or has not failed as some claim. The chapter will also help position my research question within the field as well as guide the direction of my research.

In Chapter 3, my methodological considerations are outlined. Here, I will explain the epistemological and ontological considerations underlying my research, and I will argue for my



choice of research design and methods. Furthermore, I will account for my data collection and analysis.

Chapter 4 concerns the theory underlying my research. Here, I will describe the theories that I find most useful in helping to analyze my selected material. The chapter discusses the ideas of Michel Foucault and Norman Fairclough.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 constitute the analysis. In these chapters, I will, through my chosen research method, analyze speeches from Labour and the Conservative party from the past 11 years. Chapter 5 is the analysis of Labour's speeches and Chapter 6 is analysis of the Conservative Party's speeches. Both chapters contain an analysis and interpretation of the language in the speeches. This will be followed by Chapter 7, which combines the findings of Chapter 5 and 6 and is an explanation of these findings in a societal context.

In Chapter 8, I will discuss my findings against the literature and place them in a European context.

Finally, Chapter 9 is the conclusion, where I will sum up my findings and reflect on them. I will also make suggestions as to how my research could have been improved.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Literature Review**

Critique of multiculturalism is not new and has existed ever since multiculturalist policies gained foothold in the 1970s (Vertovec & Wessendorf, 2010, p. 4). However, during the past 10 years or so, the critique of multiculturalism has increased, and the avowed decline of multiculturalism in many Western countries has been a topic of increasing concern for the media, politicians, and academics. Several potential causes of the decline have been presented and subsequently critiqued or supported, and in this chapter, I will outline the major analyses of the debates taking place in the literature concerning the decline of multiculturalism in Britain and Western democracies in general.

The meaning of the concept of multiculturalism is widely debated, and there are a variety of definitions and versions of multiculturalism. Therefore, before reviewing the literature on the decline of multiculturalism, I will provide a brief run-through of some of the most prominent conceptualizations of multiculturalism and clarify in what way it is conceptualized in this thesis. This is important because I discovered that, when reviewing the literature, different academics refer to different notions of multiculturalism, and therefore it is pivotal to understand the different conceptualizations of the word. Finally, in this chapter, I will look at a few studies already conducted, which have drawn on some of the same ideas and methods that I will be using in this thesis.

#### **2.1. Multiculturalism**

First, I will clarify the understanding of *multiculturalism* that I am drawing on in this thesis. Meleha Malik points out that multiculturalism can refer broadly to any cultural diversity such as e.g. homosexuals or feminists, but it can also refer more narrowly to ethnic minorities (Malik, p. 13). The latter understanding of multiculturalism is the only way I will use the concept in this thesis. Furthermore, Malik mentions two uses of multiculturalism. The first one is on a descriptive level which is about the actual cultural diversity in the country. The second is on a normative level, which has to do with how the state responds to the increasing diversity (Malik, pp. 12-13). Thus, the concept of multiculturalism not only refers to a specific type of state policy but also to cultural

diversity, or *de facto multiculturalism*. Thus, when talking about the retreat from multiculturalism, I do not only mean in countries which have practiced multiculturalist policy, I also mean countries which are in fact culturally diverse, that is, multicultural in its ethnic composition. Thus, I share the viewpoint of Joe Kincheloe and Shirley Steinberg that multiculturalism is something that exists in all Western countries and, therefore, multiculturalism is not something a country can choose to either have or not have. However, a country can choose how to deal with the issue of multiculturalism (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2002, p. 2). And that is what I will be looking at in this thesis.

I find that the definition of multiculturalism provided by Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller (2009) covers the basic tenets. They claim that, originally, “*Multiculturalism* meant that immigrants should be able to participate as equals in all spheres of society, without being expected to give up their own culture, religion and language, although usually with an expectation of conformity to certain key values.” (pp. 247-248). They further point to two major variants of multiculturalism. The first is multiculturalism as an acceptance of cultural diversity with ethnic communities, but with no obligatory state intervention in upholding these communities, as seen in e.g. the US. The other variant they point to is when multiculturalism functions as public policy. “Here, multiculturalism implies both the willingness of the majority group to accept cultural difference and state action to secure equal rights for minorities” (pp. 248-249). This second variant is seen in several European countries such as the Netherlands, Sweden and Britain and has within it an assumption that this way of accepting cultural diversity does not work in a separating way (p.262). Irene Bloemraad, Anna Korteweg and Gökçe Yurdakul (2008) agree with this but mention a third variant, which is “particular policies or programs undertaken by governments or institutions (e.g. multicultural curricula)” (p.159). This third variant refers to the implementation of multiculturalism in e.g. teaching, which makes sure that curricula include views from different cultures, e.g. both minority and majority views on different issues (National Association for Multicultural Education). Thus, multiculturalism is a multifaceted word, and when reading and writing about it, it is important to clarify which meaning of the word one is referring to.

Additionally, there are several other suggestions as to how multiculturalism can be conceptualized and understood. For example, Kincheloe and Steinberg (2002) distinguish between five different types of multiculturalism. However, this thesis is concerned exclusively with the retreat from immigrant multiculturalism and therefore I will not provide further conceptualizations of

multiculturalism here. Conclusively, the way I use multiculturalism in this thesis is in a context that is connected to immigration and as Tariq Modood describes it “the political accommodation of minorities formed by immigration to Western countries from outside the prosperous west” (in McGhee, 2008, p. 1).

## 2.2. The Era of post-Multiculturalism

Reading through the literature on the topic of multiculturalism, it becomes apparent that there are at least two different debates taking place. On the one hand, there is a debate as to what the causes for the multiculturalist backlash are, which implies that there has in fact been a backlash of multiculturalism, while on the other there is a debate about whether there has indeed been a multiculturalist backlash or not. Therefore, I will provide an account for both of these debates, starting with the most prominent -the debate about the causes of the backlash. The objective of this chapter is to outline the major topics in the debate on multiculturalism and thus clarify which main topics will be of interest to me in conducting my own analysis.

### *The Multiculturalist Backlash*

There are a few predominant explanations for the causes of the multiculturalist backlash but, at the same time, there are also a number of less prevalent explanations available. The majority of the literature argues that multiculturalism has been on retreat ever since 9/11, and in Britain especially since the 7/7 bombings in London, and is thus closely connected to the presence of Muslim minorities (e.g. McGhee, 2008, pp. 2 & 122; Stephens & Vaughan-Williams, 2009, p. 45; Castles & Miller, 2009, pp. 15; 275). However, there are also accounts which claim that multiculturalism was already on retreat earlier than that, at least in Britain. For example, Nigel Copsey and Graham Macklin (2011) note that the Spring Riots in British towns in 2001, in which Muslims of South Asian descent rioted, resulted in a retreat from multiculturalism in Britain (p. 65). Whatever their starting point, there is a consensus among many academics that the failure of multiculturalism is, in part, connected to the presence of Muslims in Western democracies. In the following, I will look further into the relationship between multiculturalism, Muslims, and security.

One of the authors who claims that multiculturalism has declined after the 7/7 bombings is Vivienne Jabri, who notes that there has been a shift away from discourses of multiculturalism and

that the discourses that are now drawn upon are ones that stress the importance of community resilience and cohesion, and these discourses are related to issues of security (Jabri, p. 45). Thus, she notes that since the war on terrorism started, “multiculturalism has increasingly been associated with insecurity; that cultural difference as such is potentially a source of threat and danger” (p. 44). However, as Jabri also notes, relating security issues with difference is not new since historically, migration has often been deemed a threat to “our way of life” (p. 46). So, although multiculturalism is today closely connected to security issues, and although this might to some extent explain why there has been a shift in the discourse, the trend is not new and therefore is not sufficient in explaining why the change is happening now. Therefore, other explanations are needed as supplement.

Jabri herself points to another explanation that is not historically new either. Her claim is that although the terrorist attacks have been pointed out as the cause of the change of multiculturalist discourse, in fact the biggest problem is that multiculturalism and the liberal society clash because of the “universalism of liberal thought and practice, and the particularity of cultural affiliation based on tradition” (Jabri, p.45). Similarly, Christina Julios (2008) points out that British liberal values and Muslim religious values are often contrasted in public debate (p. 142). When analyzing my material, it will be interesting to see if the change in discourse as described by Jabri and Julios is also evident in the political party discourse in Britain and also whether Muslims are singled out when making references to multiculturalism.

The integration of Muslims in Western countries is also a topic that has gained much interest in recent years. As mentioned in the previous section, issues of national security are often mentioned when discussing the failure of multiculturalism, and the recent cases of terrorist actions made by *homegrown terrorists*, as seen in several European countries, have created debates about whether immigrants –Muslims in particular- are sufficiently incorporated into their host societies. Muslim immigrants stand out as a favorite target for criticism as they are often singled out as a problem minority due to their clear cultural differences from Western culture. This is also what Terri Givens (2007) claims when she notes that the different terrorist attacks on the West have made people question the integration of immigrants and thus whether policies of multiculturalism have worked (p. 68). However, Christian Joppke seems to disagree with this when he asks if it is not misleading to link terror and integration since no state policy of multiculturalism would have been able to prevent the attacks (2006, p. 1). Nevertheless, since much of the literature suggests that extremism,

terrorism, immigration and Muslims are key words related to the failure of multiculturalism, these are topics that I will be especially aware of when conducting the analysis of the data material I have chosen.

Another distinct voice in the debate about multiculturalism is David Goodhart who, despite belonging to the political left, has been accused of being racist due to his views on the issue. He criticizes multiculturalism, and in his view the British left does not occupy itself enough with immigration and diversity which is a problem because the British people are not willing to share the benefits of their welfare society with someone who hold different values than themselves. He clearly outlines his view when he says:

“We share public services and parts of our income in the welfare state, we share public spaces in towns and cities where we are squashed together on buses, trains and tubes, and we share in a democratic conversation – filtered by the media – about the collective choices we wish to make. All such acts of sharing are more smoothly and generously negotiated if we can take for granted a limited set of common values and assumptions. But as Britain becomes more diverse that common culture is being eroded.” (Goodhart, 2004)

Thus, in his view, the British Left’s preoccupation with diversity is becoming too divisive and making it impossible to share common values. Furthermore, he says “If you can show that you control your borders, you control who becomes *us*. And if people know this, they will be generous. If people believe borders are not under control, they close themselves off - and that's why you get things like white fright” (BBC News, 2004). So, according to Goodhart, multiculturalism is not good for the British people because it will deteriorate the British welfare state when no one is willing to pay for ‘foreigners’ (Goodhart, 2004). Goodhart’s point relates to some of the other explanations that have been put forth as to why countries are moving away from multiculturalism, which I will look into in the following.

Other explanations as to why there has been a shift away from multiculturalism come, among others, from Castles and Miller (2009) who point to three major causes of the retreat from multiculturalism: 1. “the growing awareness of the enduring social disadvantage and marginalization of many immigrant groups –especially those of non-European origin” (p. 275). 2. The clustering together of immigrants and their consequent refusal to integrate, 3. “Fear of Islam and terrorism” (ibid). They claim that no. two is the most dominant approach used to explain the

retreat (ibid). Thus, what Castles and Miller argue is that the retreat from multiculturalism is a consequence of a number of factors but that it can mostly be explained by the failure of immigrants to become incorporated in their respective host societies. This *refusal to integrate* is, in their view, due to the fact that many immigrants are separated from the rest of society by living where they can afford it, which is often together with many other immigrants. To the majority population, this makes it look like they are not willing to integrate (ibid).

Similarly, Alessandro Silj (2010) explains what he terms “the crisis of multiculturalism” (p. 9) in Europe, with three major causes. The first one is the number of immigrants, which is constantly increasing. The second is the economic recession. In his view, the two factors are linked because, especially in the last few years, employment has become harder to withhold or obtain, and thus extra competition in the form of immigrants is unwanted (ibid). The final cause, according to Silj, is the growing Muslim population and visibility through terrorist acts conducted by a few. The links that these academics make between the retreat from multiculturalism and the possible causes are beneficial for me to consider when making my analysis because they provide clues as to what types of discourses I should look for in the speeches.

Another point that will be of interest in my analysis is the claim by several academics that the failure of multiculturalism has resulted in a resurgence of assimilation. Silj writes that “assimilation is now the main thrust of immigration policies in most if not all countries” (2010, p. 10). On the same note, Han Entzinger (2003) describes how the Netherlands has made a shift from multiculturalism to assimilation, and Brubaker (2001) writes about a ‘modest’ return of assimilation. In Brubaker’s view, the shift is from “an overwhelming focus on persisting difference – and on the mechanisms through which such cultural maintenance occurs – to a broader focus that encompasses emerging commonalities as well” (2001, p. 542). However, as previously argued, most academics do not believe that the retreat from multiculturalism is all encompassing.

For example, Gary Freeman (2004) does not agree that the shift has been to assimilation. Instead, he claims “there is now a clear trend toward a middling form of incorporation – call it integration – that rejects permanent exclusion but neither demands assimilation nor embraces formal multiculturalism” (p. 945). Thus, like Christian Joppke, Freeman believes there is a convergence of integration policies. However, Freeman notes that the convergence is not a guarantee for common integration outcomes because the different countries are too different to be able to get the same outcomes (ibid). Will Kymlicka warns that reintroducing assimilation will not work, since

“minorities today are more conscious of their rights, better organized, and more connected to international networks. The fact that there are grave obstacles to multiculturalism does not mean that there are viable alternatives to it” (Kymlicka, p. 47). In this thesis, I will look for signs that suggest whether the discourses in British politics has an assimilatory undertone or not.

### *Rejection of the Multiculturalist Backlash*

As previously mentioned, not all of the existing literature agrees that there has indeed been a multiculturalist backlash or that the criticism towards multiculturalism as a state policy is valid. Two of the major supporters for multiculturalism are Will Kymlicka and Anthony Giddens, whose views I will describe in the following.

Will Kymlicka questions whether there has indeed been a “rise and fall of multiculturalism” and he critiques the critique that has been put forth of multiculturalism. Kymlicka claims that the retreat from multiculturalism is exaggerated (p. 32), a statement that is also agreed with by Vertovec and Wessendorf (2010, p. 28). Kymlicka writes that if there has been a retreat, it is not from all parts of multiculturalism. For example, he says that there has not been a retreat from the new models of multicultural citizenship for indigenous peoples or national minorities (p. 40). However, Kymlicka does agree that there has been a backlash of multiculturalism regarding postwar immigrants (p. 41). So, although partly skeptical, in the end Kymlicka does agree that there has been a retreat from multiculturalism, but he does not believe there has been a total retreat from it.

Kymlicka criticizes Joppke (2004) and Brubaker (2001) because they claim that the retreat from multiculturalism signals a “return to the traditional liberal and republican belief that ethnicity belongs in the private sphere, and that citizenship should be unitary and undifferentiated. In this view, the retreat from immigrant multiculturalism reflects a rejection of the whole idea of multiculturalism-as-citizenization” (Kymlicka, p.41). Kymlicka says that the explanation that Joppke and Brubaker give cannot explain the retreat from multiculturalism, because if that was the case, the countries would also have rejected claims from national groups and indigenous peoples whose claims are much more problematic than those of immigrants (ibid). However, Joppke himself points out that “In contrast to Canada or Australia, where multiculturalism is entrenched as an identity option for society as a whole (and –what could not be discussed here—is additionally linked up with the accommodation of national minorities and indigenous groups), European multiculturalisms have always been for immigrants only” (2004, p. 247). Kymlicka further notes that Joppke and Brubaker’s explanations cannot be right, because even though there might have



been a backlash against multiculturalism in some countries, it is not true for all Western democracies, e.g. Canada has not experienced the retreat. Furthermore, he notes that although there has been a backlash of multiculturalism in several European countries such as the Netherlands, France, Germany and Britain there has been a strengthening of the rights of national minorities (Kymlicka, p. 42).

The difference between the researchers I have described previously and Kymlicka's view is that Kymlicka views multiculturalism as encompassing both ethnic and national minorities, whereas most other academics disregard the national minorities in this debate. Furthermore, whereas most of the academics refer to multiculturalism in primarily European countries, Kymlicka refers to multiculturalism in the whole world. For these reasons, Kymlicka stands out, and his denial of the failure of multiculturalism is referring to a broader debate which is outside the scope of this thesis.

Whereas Kymlicka rejects that multiculturalism has failed, Anthony Giddens (2006) is more focused on explaining why multiculturalism should continue to be used, and he critiques the critique of multiculturalism. He claims that multiculturalism has simply been misunderstood and that Britain is the most successful manager of cultural diversity and therefore needs more multiculturalism and not less. In his view, Canada is "the original home of multiculturalism" (Giddens, 2006) and the multiculturalism that is practiced there is very different from what people in Europe conceive of as multiculturalism. About the Canadian version he says:

"There, multiculturalism does not mean, and has never meant, different cultural and ethnic groups being left alone to get on with whatever activities they choose. It actually means the opposite. Policy-making in Canada stresses active dialogue between cultural groups, active attempts at creating community cohesion, and the acceptance of overarching Canadian identity." (ibid)

Thus, according to Giddens, the reason people in Europe are moving away from multiculturalism is that they have misunderstood it. Furthermore, Giddens critiques the linking between terrorism and the failure of multiculturalism. In his view, they have nothing to do with each other and he writes that "The sentiments that produce radicalisation do not come from general feelings of alienation or exclusion. They are more likely to be driven by religiosity, combined with ideas about social justice and world politics" (Giddens, 2006). Giddens downplays the significance of the fact that terrorists may be well educated and integrated, because in his view, this has nothing to do with terrorism.

Thus, although a large part of the literature explains the move away from multiculturalism as being due to ‘culture clash’ between the British people and the ethnic minorities, Giddens claims the reason is really that the situation is “misconceived”. It will be interesting, when conducting the analysis of this thesis, to see how the opinions of the proponents and opponents of multiculturalism match my findings.

Similar to Giddens’s view, is the view of Maleiha Malik, who also mentions Tariq Modood and John Gray as proponents of multiculturalism. She writes that although many politicians are critical of multiculturalism and are now instead talking about Britishness, two of the leading thinkers in the field have both proposed more multiculturalism as a solution to the problem of extremism (Malik, p. 58). Thus, there are several influential people who believe that multiculturalism should not be abandoned and that it is instead part of the solution to challenges such as extremism.

### 2.3. Studies Comparable to this Thesis

Although, in my search for literature, I have come across many references to the language and language use within multiculturalist discourse, I have not come across many studies which are similar to the one I am conducting. Most of the literature which I have described in the previous part of this chapter has been theoretical academic discussions and presentation of various hypotheses rather than being empirically grounded. However, I have come across a few studies which are somewhat comparable to my own, and I will discuss these in this section.

As I will elaborate on in the following chapter, I am taking an approach to this topic which focuses on the discourse and power of discourse on human action. More specifically, I am studying political discourse on immigration and multiculturalism in the case of Britain. This approach is somewhat similar to the approach taken by Maykel Verkuyten (2005). In this study, Verkuyten investigates how people are talking about immigrants and thereby placing them into certain categories. This, he claims, tells something about how multiculturalism is evaluated by these people. Verkuyten concludes that the way people evaluate multiculturalism has social implications for immigrants and refugees. Whereas Verkuyten’s study was conducted among native Dutch people, and thus resembling a trend in Dutch public perception of immigration and multiculturalism, my study will be on the political discourse and thus it will resemble the political perception of immigration and multiculturalism. I find this view interesting, because politicians influence people’s attitudes and, therefore, part of people’s attitudes comes from what politicians tell them. So if I can determine

how politicians place immigrants in certain categories, I should, according to this logic, also be able to say something about how they view multiculturalism.

Another study which comes close to what I am doing in this thesis is Derek McGhee's 2008 book *The end of Multiculturalism?*. Although McGhee's research is quite similar to what I am doing, he is focused on the rhetoric of Blair and Brown, who are both former Labour Party leaders. However, after his book came out, the Conservative Party has become the leading party, and their leader, David Cameron, has made an explicit rejection of state multiculturalism (Cameron, 2011). I find it interesting to look at both political sides of the debate, especially since Cameron's 2011 statements on multiculturalism have been a hotly debated topic in Britain. In the analysis of the speeches, I will elaborate further on McGhee's findings because I believe they can be a useful supplement to my own findings.

## 2.4. Chapter Conclusion

From reviewing the literature, it seems that few academics want to claim that multiculturalism has completely failed as has been purported by the media and several prominent political party leaders such as the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, the French President, Nicolas Sarkozy and the British Prime Minister, David Cameron. Rather, several academics point to a combination of causes for the retreat from multiculturalism, and some claim that the retreat has only been from some parts of multiculturalism. As the goal of my thesis is to reveal how discourse impacts on the view on multiculturalism in Britain as well as explain the reasons for it, the literature review has helped me clarify which issues are of particular interest. These are:

1. The effect that terrorist attacks have had on the view on multiculturalism. This includes looking at how issues of security and national cohesion are linked.
2. To what extent the integration of minorities (Muslims in particular) is affecting the view on multiculturalism. This also includes looking at the purported culture clash between majority and minority cultures.
3. Whether there are references in the speeches that suggest that there is a view that the universalism of the liberal state conflicts with multiculturalism as a state policy.
4. Whether multiculturalism is totally rejected or also supported. This includes looking for indications of a shift towards assimilationist discourses.

Apart from pointing out key issues in the debate, the literature review has also suggested that there is a gap in the research, which has already been conducted on the discourse analysis of British political discourse. This gap shows in the fact that there is no comprehensive analysis of political speeches in Britain which compares the two sides of the political spectrum. In fact, most analysis has only been on the Labour Party or on discourse in Britain in general, which is probably due to the fact that Labour has been the leading party for so many years, and it is only recently that the Tories have taken over government. Since my objective is to present a broader account of the discourses surrounding multiculturalism in British politics, I believe my research can help fill this gap by looking at the discourse from both sides of the political spectrum. In the following chapter, I will explain my research design in more detail.

## Chapter 3

### Methodology

In this chapter, I will explain the methodological considerations of this thesis. First, I will explain my research strategy, including my epistemological and ontological positions. Furthermore, I will describe my research design in detail. This will be done by accounting for my chosen methods for data collection. I will also look into the issues of limitations, reliability/validity and concepts.

#### 3.1. Research Strategy

I have chosen to make a qualitative research design for this thesis. In qualitative research, the collection of data is characterized by quality rather than quantity and the data is used to create theories. Silverman points out that qualitative research is hypothesis-generating rather than hypothesis testing (2006, p. 56). Qualitative research does not recognize the practices and norms of the natural, scientific model and thus it rather embraces an interpretivist and constructionist view on knowledge through which it understands the social world (Bryman, 2008, p. 22). The methods most commonly used in qualitative research, according to Bryman, are: ethnography and participant observation, interviewing, focus groups, conversation analysis, discourse analysis, document analysis (2008). My chosen method for answering my research question is, as previously mentioned, discourse analysis, more specifically critical discourse analysis. In the following, I will explain my research design, epistemological position and ontological position in more detail.

Before conducting research, it is necessary to consider the relationship between theory and research in one's research design. There are three different views on the nature of this relationship, which manifest themselves in deductive, inductive and abductive theory, respectively (Bryman, 2008, p. 9). Whereas in deductive theory, the researcher uses theory to conduct research, in inductive theory, the researcher generates a theory from research (p. 11). Thus, the deductive approach tests theory and the inductive approach generates theory (p. 22). Furthermore, there is abductive theory which is a combination of the two. This theory is also called *guessing*, where research is guided by a guess as to what the explanation for something could be (Douven, 2011). My research strategy has been to make use of an inductive approach for the analysis of my data. According to Bryman, when using

the inductive approach, theory is an outcome of research and “The process of induction involves drawing generalizable inferences out of observations” (2008, p. 11). However, as my theoretical framework has been the decline of multiculturalism, this has navigated my data collection, which has resulted in the collection of data being through a deductive approach. Thus, I have used a combination of the two approaches for my research strategy.

Another area to consider before conducting research is epistemology. Epistemology concerns the researchers view on knowledge and, according to Bryman, there are two contrasting epistemological positions: positivism and interpretivism (2008, pp. 13-15). Positivism studies the world through methods of the natural sciences as it is concerned with “things that can be seen or proved, rather than on ideas” (Wehmeier, 2007, p. 1174). In opposition to positivism, there is interpretivism, which studies the social world in a way that “respects the difference between people and the objects of the natural sciences and therefore requires the social scientist to grasp the subjective meaning of social action” (Bryman, 2008, p. 16). Interpretivism views human beings as individuals who can interpret reality in different ways and act accordingly (ibid). Thus, positivism views the acquisition of knowledge as objective and interpretivism views it as subjective. Rather than trying to explain human behavior through the use of a positivist epistemology, I am interested in understanding it through an interpretivist epistemology (p. 15).

The other important thing to consider before doing research is ontology, which has to do with “the nature of social entities” (Bryman, 2008, p. 18). Bryman makes a distinction between two ontological positions: objectivism and constructionism. Objectivism declares that “*social phenomena and their meanings have an existence that is independent of social actors*” (2008, p. 19). Thus, social actors are aware that there is a reality which they have not themselves created, because it is beyond their reach and influence (2008, p. 18). Constructionism on the other hand, states that social entities are social constructions, which are accomplished and constantly reproduced by social actors (2008, p. 19). Thus, knowledge is constructed by social actors and new knowledge is constructed on the basis of old knowledge. As I will look into in the following chapter, this fits with the ideas of Michel Foucault. Following the line of thought of my epistemological considerations, my ontological position is naturally constructionism, since I believe individuals are active in the social construction of social reality (p. 20). This relates to my thesis in that a part of having a constructionist view is also to view categories and social phenomena as constructed because their meanings are constructed through interaction, which also means that

social phenomena and categories are constantly changing and reproduced (pp. 19-21). Thus, I view *multiculturalism* to be a social construction which has a meaning that varies according to different people in different locations and at different points in time. In the analysis of the discourses surrounding multiculturalism in Britain, I will show how constructionism fits with my findings.

### **3.2. Data**

The data I have chosen to use for this thesis is textual data, and the data I will be analyzing is political speeches. According to Silverman (2006), there are several advantages of textual data. One of the major advantages is that it is easily accessible and rarely ethically constrained. Therefore, textual data can quickly be gathered without the researcher having to be concerned about whether the research is ethically defensible (p. 157). Furthermore, Silverman claims that textual data is more reliable than observations, because it has not been affected by other people's comments and views. However, it is possible that texts have been forged, in which case they are not necessarily reliable (p. 285). Nevertheless, since my chosen textual data is political speeches, I find it unlikely that they have been forged since they are transcribed from direct speech.

The data I have chosen to analyze is, as mentioned, political speeches from the Labour Party and the Conservative Party in Britain. My initial idea was to analyze the manifestos of the political parties. However, after reviewing the data I would get from that, I decided that it would not help me answer my research question. Therefore, I chose instead to analyze political speeches. Michael Laver, Kenneth Benoit and John Garry note about the difference between looking at manifestos and speeches that:

“...speeches differ substantially from party manifestos in several key respects. First, manifestos are typically comprehensive documents addressing a wide range of policy issues, while speeches tend to be much more restricted in focus. Second, manifestos are published in a political context that is fairly well defined. Greater care must be taken in establishing the political context of speeches if we are to justify the comparison of different speeches in the same analysis. Third, because manifestos and speeches use different language registers and lexicons, the analysis of speeches requires types of reference text different from those used in the analysis of manifestos. Finally, political speeches tend to be much shorter than manifestos. With fewer words to analyze, statistical confidence in the results is likely to be reduced.” (2003, p. 327)

Thus, there are both advantages and disadvantages of analyzing speeches rather than manifestos. Nevertheless, I believe it is an advantage to look at speeches exactly because their focus is much more narrow than manifestos which treat issues of all parts of society. Also, I plan to meet the shortcomings of point three with analyzing several speeches over a time span of approximately 11 years, which will give me a rather big amount of textual material for analysis. Nevertheless, as Chris Barker and Dariusz Galasiński (2001) point out, a limitation of CDA is that it is extremely labor intensive and therefore not easily applicable to large amounts of text (p. 26). Therefore, I also had to be restrictive in my method for analyzing the speeches from the 11 year time span I set out. I will elaborate on this in the following.

As for the collection of data, I have, first of all, chosen a timeframe which reaches from 2000–2011. The reason for this timeframe is naturally connected to my research question. Since my objective is to find out how the discourses surrounding multiculturalism have evolved since 9/11, it is natural to look at what the discourse looked like just before 9/11 (in 2000) and up till today – 11 years later. I have chosen to read speeches from each of the 11 years in order to follow the development of the concept closely. However, if I were to meticulously analyze every speech from each year, this thesis would have no ending. Naturally, it would be immensely time consuming to analyze every single speech given by the party leaders in the past 11 years. Because this thesis is only concerned with the development of the attitude to multiculturalism in British politics, I have only chosen to look further into speeches in which this theme is mentioned or implied. However, as mentioned in the literature review, Vertovec and Wessendorf claim there is a reluctance among politicians to use the *the M word*, that is, multiculturalism. Therefore, assuming they are right, it may prove difficult to find the word explicitly stated in the speeches. Therefore, I will not only be looking at instances of the mentioning of multiculturalism, but also look for a general mentioning of issues of diversity, immigration, integration, asylum and social cohesion as these are all issues connected to multiculturalism and issues that one could talk about without using the word multiculturalism.

It was not possible for me to find a single source from which I could collect all speeches from the selected politicians. Instead, I had to make use of multiple internet-sites. Some sites had a more comprehensive collection of speeches than others, and therefore there are many speeches from, for example, Guardian.co.uk while other sites only have a few. The criteria I used to select websites



were that they provided full text of the speeches. Furthermore, I double-checked the correctness of the transcripts with speech transcripts on other websites. I collected all the speeches I could find from the chosen politicians. Thereafter I scanned each article for keywords that were relevant to this thesis (*immigration, immigrant, asylum, refugee, diversity, values, community, society, terrorism, extremism, racism, security, multiculturalism, unity, cohesion, discrimination, Muslim, and national*). After the scan, I thoroughly read the speeches which could be useful and then chose the ones I was going to use in the analysis. Thus, although I have read speeches from each politician from each year of their leadership, I have not necessarily included speeches from each year for each of the politicians. This is because some politicians speak more about the issues I wanted to analyze than others. Therefore, there are for example a lot of speeches from Tony Blair and David Cameron, while not as many from the other party leaders.

In order to structure the analysis of the speeches, I have divided the data into four sections, resembling four periods in time. These periods are:

1. Before 9/11, 2001
2. Between 9/11, 2001 and 7/7, 2005
3. After 7/7, 2005
4. Today (since the 2010 general election)

I learned from reviewing the literature about the failure of multiculturalism that 9/11 and 7/7 were, by many academics, viewed as important in the changing attitude to multiculturalism. Therefore, I have chosen to divide my analysis into before and after these dates. Within each of these divisions, I will analyze what I find according to the first two stages of Fairclough's method for analysis, that is, the description stage and the interpretation stage, which will be elaborated on in Chapter 4. When I have analyzed the formal properties of the text and interpreted these, I will, in Chapter 7, analyze these findings at the third stage, the explanation stage. At the explanation stage, the discourses of the different time periods will be combined in a larger social context, which will elucidate how the discourses have evolved from 2000-2011.

Another consideration I had prior to conducting the research was which persons' speeches to analyze. I could have chosen to look at many other things apart from just speeches of the two leading figures of the two leading parties. For example, it would also have been interesting to look at the discourse of e.g. the home secretary and the discourse used in the policies etc., but I had to

limit the data somewhere. I chose the Prime Minister and his largest opponent, because I believe these are the people that the public see and hear the most, and therefore, I believe they are the ones who will most clearly get the message of the party across to the people, and therefore they are the most influential. Because my objective is to analyze the British political discourse in order to find out why Britain has moved away from multiculturalism, it is natural to analyze the discourse of the most influential people in this field. I am aware that the speeches from both parties have been carefully written in order to send across the desired message, and thus they are not naturally occurring. Nevertheless, since my aim is to reveal the discourse that the parties draw upon, I do not find this to be a problem, since what they are saying will always show what discourses they are drawing on.

Finally, I have also considered whether to look at only the ruling party in Britain or to look at more parties. It can be argued that the ruling party is the most influential on public opinion. Nevertheless, the party in opposition is also very interesting to look at since they too are drawing on the most powerful discourses in society, and thus they are also helping to reproduce societies' discourses. The different discourses that the parties are drawing on and thus reproducing through social practice can be different and thus suggest a battle of discourses in society. Whereas one party may talk positively about e.g. immigration, the other may talk negatively about it, and thus there will be a competition between these two discourses (Schou Nielsen, 2007, p. 39).

Another type of data in this thesis is the theoretical framework I have chosen. As I have chosen to draw on the thoughts of Michel Foucault and Norman Fairclough, naturally I have chosen to use many books that describe their theories. A common critique of Foucault's work is that his thoughts are complex and changing over time. It can be extremely hard to read and understand his thoughts. This is probably connected to the fact that Foucault did not view his work as a theory and did not intend to create one (Nilsson, 2009, p. 167). Therefore, his thoughts change, and throughout his work he comes to view things from new perspectives. The complications of reading Foucault's original work, has led me to resort to secondary literature about him in order to supplement my own understanding. However, I am aware that secondary literature can often contain incorrect interpretations of the original literature, and therefore I do not rely entirely on secondary literature. Whereas Foucault's thoughts can be hard to comprehend, Fairclough in some ways help the understanding of Foucault, because his thoughts are so closely connected to those of Foucault.

Also, Fairclough is more readable but does sometimes also have a complex system of thoughts. Therefore, his thoughts can also, at some points, be difficult to completely follow. Nevertheless, I have chosen his method for Critical Discourse Analysis, which he describes in his 2001 book *Language and Power*. I chose his book, because out of all the writers in the field, he is able to provide a somewhat comprehensible guide which one can use for research. Furthermore, Fairclough provides a method for analysis which is, as he says himself, not a blueprint but a guide (2001, p. 92), and therefore it is possible to use it in a way which fits a given topic but still within the matrix of CDA that he has created. Since Fairclough's method can be applied to written as well as spoken text, his method does contain elements which are only applicable to certain types of analysis such as e.g. conversation analysis, which I am not concerned with in this thesis. For this reason, I will not include all of the elements of Fairclough's method. Rather, I will only include the ones that will be of relevance for my study. In the following chapter, I will explain further Foucault's thoughts and Fairclough's method for critical discourse analysis.

### **3.3. Reliability/Validity**

In this section, I will discuss different considerations I have had concerning the reliability of my research and how it can be validated.

Fairclough points out that "What one 'sees' in a text, what one regards as worth describing, and what one chooses to emphasize in a description, are all dependent on how one interprets a text" (2001, p. 22). Therefore, I am aware that my analysis is influenced by my own background knowledge and might, therefore, turn out different if someone else were to conduct a similar analysis of the same material. Silverman (2006) suggests two ways in which one can make qualitative research more reliable: 1. Make the research process transparent through describing the research strategy and the data analysis in detail. 2. Make explicit the theoretical stance from which the interpretation takes place and show how this produces particular interpretations and excludes others (p. 282). I will follow these recommendations in order to make my study more reliable.

As for the validity of qualitative research, Silverman (2006, pp. 290-291) points to two ways in which a researcher can validate the findings. One way is through respondent validation which is not applicable to my study because I do not have someone to validate my findings. The other way is through triangulation. However, due to the space and time restrictions of this thesis, I do not find it

possible to test my findings through another theory. It would have been interesting to e.g. test my findings of the political discourse against the discourse prevalent in the media, but for the same reasons it is not possible in this thesis. Instead, I will test my findings against the findings that other researchers have made in studies comparable to my own as well as look for comparable results in the academic literature of this field.

### **3.4. Concepts**

In this thesis, *discourse* is a central word. However, it has several uses and therefore I will clarify my use of the word. Kieran O'Halloran (2003) describes the two most prominent uses of the word. According to him, the first use of *discourse*, which he calls (1) “refers to the coherent understanding the reader makes from a text. It can include how the values of the reader, the reading context and so on affect the reading of the text in the production of coherence” (p. 12). The other, which he calls “Foucauldian discourse”, or (2), refers to “the way in which knowledge is organised, talked about and acted upon in different institutions” (ibid). He also writes that “While discourse (1) is bound to a particular reading context, discourse (2) is bound to a particular sociocultural context” (ibid). As I will elaborate on in the next chapter, I draw on the ideas of Michel Foucault, and therefore my use of the word *discourse* will naturally be the second use that O'Halloran describes.

## Chapter 4

### Theory

In this chapter, I will explain my chosen theoretical framework for the thesis which is Discourse Analysis (DA). First, I will introduce the thoughts of Michel Foucault, since these will be part of my theoretical backdrop in this thesis. Then I will introduce Norman Fairclough, whose thoughts are heavily inspired by Foucault, and which will function as a supplement or development of his theory by the use of his Critical Discourse Analysis.

#### 4.1. Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is a theory and method which has been explained by many different theorists with a number of different approaches to it. Therefore, a large number of different ways of doing discourse analysis exist. However, the French Philosopher Michel Foucault is one of the persons most often cited in this field, and he was one of the earliest writers on the subject. Although he has not put forth a theory as such, his thoughts and writings have inspired many linguists throughout the world with what has later been termed “Foucauldian Discourse Analysis” (Burr, 2003, p. 18). His main concern can be described as being with “the description and analysis of the surfaces of discourse and their effects under determinate material and historical conditions” (Barker & Galasiński, 2001, p. 12). Through his work, Foucault has treated various subjects ranging from mental illness to discipline and punishment to the issue of sexuality. Through his writings, Foucault has criticized various institutions of society by looking at how discourses can both directly and indirectly uphold unequal relations of power in society. The aim of Foucault’s discourse analysis is to identify “the ideological and power effects of discourse” (Burr, 2003, p. 18). The most important concepts in relation to Foucault is knowledge, language, power, discourse and history, all of which I will explain in the following.

#### *Knowledge and Language*

Two crucial concepts in Foucault’s ideas are knowledge and language, which are basic concepts, but nevertheless concepts that Foucault attributes a particular meaning to. Foucault (1973) writes

that “Language is made up...of a system of notations that individuals first chose for themselves; by means of these marks they are able to recall representations, link them together, dissociate them, and operate upon them” (p. 82). He further notes that the interpretations people make are individual and therefore language comes to function as “an analysis of thought” (p. 83). Thus, this suggests that language use is individually determined, which is to some extent true. However, as Foucault points out, language is closely connected to knowledge because they both come from the same place within the person (p. 86). Thus, there is a dialectic relationship between language and knowledge, because they affect and help reproduce each other. And in this way, when people speak, what they say is an analysis of what they think, and what they think is determined by their knowledge, which again is determined by society and the dominant discourses therein.

Foucault’s conceptualizations of language and knowledge are relevant to the analysis in this thesis because they tell something about how individuals interpret and identify knowledge, which is what I will be looking at when analyzing the speeches from the chosen British politicians. In the analysis, I will be looking for constellations of words, meaning of words and representations which constitute overall discourses that are drawn upon. The dialectic relationship between language and knowledge is something I will look into when researching the link between discourse and society in Chapter 7, which is the explanation part of the analysis. In the following, I will elaborate on Foucault’s notion of discourse.

### *Discourse*

The notion of discourse is central in Foucault’s research and he defines discourse as “representation itself represented by verbal signs” (1973, p. 81), or “a sequence of verbal signs” (p. 83). Discourses represent various different subjects in society, and each discourse tells something about concepts and ideas of that particular field along with something about the knowledge that is considered valid in that field (Oliver, 2010, p. 28). Furthermore, there may exist different discourses on the same topic because different people will present issues in different ways thus resulting in different discourses describing the same issue (Burr, 2003, p. 64). Vivien Burr (2003) describes Foucauldian discourse as “a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events” (p. 64). This means that discourse

concerns more than merely words because it also has to do with specific usages, combinations and intentions of words used in specific contexts.

Although certain discourses are prominent in a given time period, this does not mean that everyone necessarily agrees with the particular prominent discourses; there will always be a battle between different discourses in society (Nilsson, 2009, p. 54). Also, Foucault believed that rather than mirroring reality, discourses constituted reality (Wodak & Krzyżanowski, 2008, p. 194). This means that although there is a reality independent of discourses, the only way people can describe and understand this reality is through the use of discourse (Nilsson, 2009, p. 63).

Discourse is, like the rest of the concepts described here, not a concept invented by Foucault. Nevertheless, Foucault has taken the concept and used it in a specific way. In fact, his use of the concept is complex because he, throughout his works, distinguishes between concepts such as *discursive formations*, *orders of discourse*, *discursive practice* and *discursive constellations*. In this thesis, I will however only refer to discourse as a broad concept encompassing the definitions described above. Discourse is one of the most central concepts in this thesis and thus important in the analysis as the aim of the analysis is, partly, to uncover possible discourses surrounding the decline of multiculturalism in Britain. Foucault's notion of discourses is closely linked to his notion of power, as will be elaborated on in the following section.

### *Discourse and Power*

According to Foucault, discourses are not intentionally made prominent by powerful people in order to help them sustain power. Rather, as Burr describes it:

“the practical and social conditions of life are seen as providing a suitable culture for some representations rather than others, and the effects of these representations may not be immediately obvious or intended. Nevertheless, once a discourse becomes available culturally, it is then possible for it to be appropriated in the interests of the relatively powerful.” (2003, p. 78)

Thus, Foucault was not interested in revealing conscious and intentional ways of using discourse by powerful people, rather, according to Foucault, power is not something a person possesses, but

something a person, through discourse, can exert on others because it is “an effect of discourse” (Burr, 2003, p. 68). When people talk, they represent things in a specific way and in this way they produce a particular type of knowledge. It is this knowledge which has power rather than the person who produces it (ibid). Nevertheless, in this way, Foucault believed that individuals were able to use widespread systems of thought to wield power and influence the lives of people (Oliver, 2010, p. 31).

Once having a powerful position in society, power holders will, according to Foucault, attempt to justify their use of power. In this way, by creating theories as to why people should believe this and that, power holders can attempt to persuade people into believing that what is being done is in their best interest (Oliver, 2010, p. 45). As they are doing this, they are producing new knowledge, which the public will adopt and thus power has been exerted on the people. Thus, what Foucault argues is that although it may seem like a person is acting out of free will and according to his own convictions, that person is in fact controlled by existing power regimes within society which make sure he only acts according to them (Bevir, 1999, p. 67). Furthermore, Foucault also notes that powerful people are able to define different subjects in certain ways, allowing them to control which concepts and ideas relate to that subject. As Oliver (2010) states “Power enables people and organizations to define the way that we look at the world, and if necessary to define the world in a way that is economically or politically advantageous to them.” (p. 96).

I find Foucault’s view on power relevant for my thesis, because Foucault rejected entirely linking power with the state and its institutions hence his view that power is not something one can possess. In the same way, I am not interested in claiming that the state exercises power over the people (although I do not deny that in some way it does). Rather, my objective is to reveal the prominent discourses that politicians draw on and thereby show the power of these discourses in defining multiculturalism (and maybe how it is treated by politicians). Although power, discourse and knowledge are some of the most central concepts in Foucault’s work, it is also important to bear in mind Foucault’s view on the role of history in relation to these concepts. In the following section, I will look further into this relationship and the importance Foucault attributed to history in explaining power.



### *Discourse and History*

According to Foucault, different discourses are characteristic of different periods in history, that is, discourse reflects the prevalent culture, norms and knowledge of a given time period (Oliver, 2010, p. 30). This means that Foucault believed that a concept will change its meaning over the course of time, and the definition of one concept may be radically different in one time period compared to another. Thus, although a concept may have a specific meaning at some point in time, the meaning can change dramatically later on. Another thing he notes about history is that civilizations and peoples leave behind representations of their thoughts, which enables us to analyze the knowledge they possessed. Thus, Foucault points out that what researchers can find in vocabularies can tell something about the knowledge and thoughts of people in certain periods in history. Furthermore, this also enables an analysis of the progress of concepts through time (Foucault, 1973, pp. 87-88).

Furthermore, Foucault also believed that discourse had an impact on history, because the prevalent discourses can in fact be so powerful that they help create history. Oliver (2010) gives an example of this: “If a form of discourse defines another nation as politically friendly, then a variety of consequences will follow from that, including economic trade and cultural links. History will thus evolve in parallel with the predominant discourse” (p. 31). This means that discourse can potentially be hugely influential on how history evolves, and in this thesis it will be interesting to see how discourses surrounding multiculturalism have potentially changed since 9/11 and how this has influenced the view on multiculturalism today.

When analyzing how the discourses drawn upon when talking about multiculturalist issues has evolved in the past 11 years, it is essential to look at the development of concepts over time and in relation to other historical specificities. The possible impact of discourse on history is also worth taking into consideration when making prospects for the future by the end of this thesis.

### *Critique of Foucault*

One critique of Foucault’s thoughts comes from Norman Fairclough, who criticizes Foucault’s ideas as being only theoretical and not “operationalized in the analysis of particular instances of discourse” (2001, p. 10). For this reason, in this thesis I will be making use of Fairclough’s ideas, which I will elaborate on later in this chapter.

Another critique is, according to Roddy Nilsson (2009) that Foucault's focus on the power of discourses should mean that the individual has no control over his or her own life because they are ultimately guided by the dominant discourses. This is, however, not exactly the case, because although peoples' understanding of the world is limited to certain discourses of their time, there will be a whole repertoire of discourses available, and it will always be possible to think differently (p. 63).

Also Stuart Hall has critiqued Foucault's work. One of his critiques is that Foucault's ideas do not explain the reason for the prominence of certain discourses and the neglect of others. Furthermore, he does not explain how subjects that are produced through discursive practices can resist power. Also, Hall criticizes the lack of agency in Foucault's ideas. Thus, what Hall criticizes is that Foucault fails to explain discourses 'from the inside' and only shows 'the outside'. Hall's solution to the missing link between the inside and the outside was to look into psychoanalysis (Barker & Galasiński, 2001, p. 31). Since it may be fruitful for me in certain parts of my analysis to take a look on 'the inside' of how discourses work in individuals, I will make use of theoreticians who can provide supplementary ideas to Foucault's ideas. For example, although the main focus of this thesis is to look at how the discourse on multiculturalism has changed since 9/11, it may also be important to make a note about how the new discourses that are now prevalent have an effect on how multiculturalism is interpreted by individuals in order to show the effects of the change in the discourses surrounding multiculturalism. I will look into supplementary ideas to Foucault's ideas later in this chapter.

### *Strengths of Foucault's Ideas*

Despite the critique that has been put forth against Foucault, there are, according to Nilsson (2009) several advantages of his ideas. For example, although there were many areas of the world that Foucault did not treat, his thoughts can today easily be applied to areas such as e.g. globalization, environmental problems and terrorism. Therefore, although several decades old, his thoughts are still meaningful today. Furthermore, Nilsson also points out that Foucault offers a way to become aware of our position as individuals in society and understand how we, according to his theory, are subjects of certain discursive practices. Foucault also emphasizes the role of our historical context in the shaping of our identity and ways of acting. Therefore, he makes us aware of the importance

of always regarding the historical context when analyzing social and discursive phenomena (pp. 177-178).

## 4.2. Norman Fairclough

Although the work of Foucault is often used in the analysis of discourse, it is only one approach under the umbrella of DA. In order to meet some of the shortcomings of Foucault, I will supplement my theoretical framework with Norman Fairclough's theory about Critical Discourse Analysis. As previously mentioned, the work of Norman Fairclough is heavily inspired by Foucault's ideas, although Fairclough calls his work Critical Language Study (CLS) or CDA as opposed to Foucault's Discourse Analysis (Fairclough, 2001, p. 4). In this section, I will explain Fairclough's key concepts as well as explain in which ways his ideas can contribute to and elaborate on the ideas of Foucault. The key concepts I will be discussing in this section are *ideology*, *common-sense assumptions*, *members' resources* (MR), and finally, Fairclough's view on the relationship between language and society. Thereafter I will explain Fairclough's method for CDA, which is also the one I will be using for the analysis of the speeches.

### *Key concepts*

Fairclough's main focus is *ideology*, which he claims is "pervasively present in language" (2001, p. 2). These ideologies are, according to Fairclough's theory, closely linked to his notion of *common-sense assumptions* which is something people are not generally aware of because it lies implicit in the conventions they follow when speaking. Nevertheless, everyone does make use of these implicit assumptions. This relates to Foucault, because these ideologies are closely linked to power and language (ibid). In this respect, Fairclough notes that "Ideology is the prime means of manufacturing consent" (p.3). Thus, Fairclough's aim is to reveal hidden ideological assumptions which create unequal power relations. Fairclough aims for resistance and change for the oppressed achieved through CDA, whereas Foucault seemed to reject the human agency in the power relations and aimed at merely explaining and understanding these relations.

Another key term for Fairclough is that of *members' resources* (MR). He describes MR as representations which each individual has stored in their long-term memory. These representations

are prototypes for various things in everyday life such as “the shapes of words, the grammatical forms of sentences, the typical structure of a narrative, the properties of types of object and person, the expected sequence of events in a particular situation type” etc (2001,p. 9). Thus, they can be understood as a form of background knowledge. These MR is something people unconsciously draw upon when interpreting an utterance. MR is also relevant to look into when analyzing discourse, because as Fairclough notes, “MR are socially determined and ideologically shaped” (ibid). This notion of MR is very close to Foucault’s notion of language as described in the previous section. Thus, this shows that there is a link between people’s MR and the language that is uttered, because language is determined by MR. In turn, as I have previously mentioned, MR is determined by the surrounding society’s norms and values etc.

Finally, another factor which plays an important part in Fairclough’s theory is society. According to Fairclough, language is part of society and therefore cannot be separated from it in an analysis. He makes three statements about language and society. The first is that “language is part of society, and not somehow external to it” (2001, p. 18). By this, Fairclough means that whenever people use language, the way they use it will always be conditioned by the social conventions surrounding them and therefore, no matter how conscious a person may be of what they say or how they read a text, they will always be affected by the society of which they are a part. His second statement is that “language is a social process” (pp. 18-19). Here, Fairclough means that text involves processes of both production and interpretation. Both of these processes contain an interplay between properties of the text and MR. Finally, the third statement is that “language is a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other (non-linguistic) parts of society” (p. 19). By this Fairclough means that although MR is something that exists in peoples’ heads, they are initially socially generated and therefore non-linguistic. For this reason, it is also important to take into consideration the surrounding society when conducting the CDA in this thesis, as I will describe in more detail later in this chapter.

Together, Foucault’s thoughts and Fairclough’s theory provide a theoretical framework that is based in discourse analysis, or more specifically, critical discourse analysis. These approaches will help me analyze the discourses surrounding multiculturalism and explain how these have changed in the political milieu in Britain since 9/11. In the following section, I will describe Fairclough’s method in detail. He distinguishes between three stages which he describes as “*description* of text, *interpretation* of the relationship between text and interaction, and *explanation* of the relationship

between interaction and social context” (2001, p. 91). These three stages constitute the overall structure of the method, and in the following I will describe the three stages in turn.

### *Description*

At the description stage, the focus is on vocabulary and grammar. Thus, this stage of analysis is used to “describe the formal properties of the text” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 21).

Looking at the vocabulary of a text includes a description of the actual words which are used and the meaning of these words. This includes looking at the values that the words signal. Values can be negative, positive or neutral, which can be determined by the connotations that are associated with the words. Also, the values of the words can imply a specific ideology held by the speaker. Finally, the way the words are used also tells us something about their influence. For example, if certain words are used frequently, this implies a preference for these words, which again tells us something about what the speaker wishes to emphasize. Another element for analysis within the vocabulary is metaphors, which have different ideological attachments and are therefore interesting to analyze, because they tell something about the ideological position of the speaker (Fairclough, 2001, p. 100).

When looking at the grammar of the text, the features such as agency and modality are analyzed. As when looking at the vocabulary, when looking at these features, what I look for is cues to the ideological position of the speaker. Agency has to do with looking at how the speaker represents e.g. events in terms of how or if they place agency in a sentence when describing something. For example, there is a difference between saying ‘all the people were killed’ and ‘the soldiers killed all the people’. About this, Fairclough notes that “choices to highlight or background agency may be consistent, automatic and commonsensical, and therefore ideological; or they may be conscious hedging or deception” (2001, pp. 101-102).

The other feature I look for on the grammar level is modality. Modality means to put an attitude into what is being said and thereby changing the tone or strength of a statement. Fairclough discusses how modality is used by the speaker to shape the position on what he/she is saying. This means that by using modality to change the tone of the sentence, the speaker can change the validity or seriousness of the sentence (Fairclough, 2003, p. 165). Modality has two dimensions; relational and expressive modality. Both show something about the speaker authority. Relational modality

shows something about the speaker's authority in relation to others. Expressive modality shows how the speaker evaluates the truth. Modality can be expressed in three ways: 1. By modal auxiliary verbs such as *may, might, must, should, can, ought*, and negated versions of these words. 2. By tense. Tense can express the speaker's version of the truth. 3. By adverbs either used alone or combined with modal auxiliaries such as *are probably* or *may possibly* (2001, p. 105).

### *Interpretation*

As previously mentioned, the interpretation stage has to do with establishing the relationship between text and interaction, and this stage is basically used to determine the discourses of the text as well as interpret the findings of the description stage. In this respect, Fairclough's notion of MR, as described previously, is pivotal. For example, whether one views certain words as positive or negative depends on their MR. In the same way, MR are constantly changing, and therefore prominent people like e.g. politicians can help change people's MR by the virtue of the authority they exude, but on the other hand, what they say can also say something about their own MR and thus their world view (Fairclough, 2001, p. 20). Thus, in this way, powerful actors in society can have a large influence on the perception of a concept such as multiculturalism, and the way they frame a specific notion will become a part of the reproduction of the general understanding of the concept.

Another crucial element of the interpretation is looking for presuppositions, which is closely linked to MR and common sense assumptions. Presuppositions tell something about whether a speaker speaks sincerely or manipulatively (Fairclough, 2001, p.128). A presupposition is something that lies behind an utterance and which requires an antecedent in either logic or fact (Merriam Webster). Having presuppositions is like taking something for granted (Chilton, 2004, p. 64); e.g. if a person says "the Soviet threat", that person takes for granted (or presupposes) that the Soviet was in fact a threat. Different intertextual contexts will determine the validity of this utterance; the Soviet might not have been a threat to all people, because people interpret utterances differently, and therefore, an utterance will not mean the same to every person. However, according to Fairclough, the way the most powerful people interpret utterances can be imposed on the less powerful, and in this way, powerful people can determine presuppositions in a context. Fairclough notes that presuppositions are not explicit, which makes it hard for people to accept or reject them, and therefore they can be

used by powerful people to manipulate the audience into accepting their views on certain issues (2001, p. 128). Paul Chilton, who also writes about presuppositions adds that “presuppositions are used when they are not expected to be challenged or rejected” (2004, p. 64). Explaining presuppositions requires looking at the historical context in which an utterance takes place (Fairclough, 2001, p. 129).

The interpretation stage brings us closer to revealing the hidden power relations and the purpose of this stage is to establish whether the verbal cues in the text contain certain assumptions or other hidden elements that are not obvious at a first glance. As Fairclough has mentioned, discourses are a part of society and can therefore not be separated from it. Therefore, in order to understand the power relations, it is important to take the societal influence into consideration, which is what happens at the explanation stage.

### *Explanation*

At the explanation stage, the results of the analysis of the previous two stages are explained in a societal context. This stage helps clarify the connection between discourse and society. Fairclough describes the explanation stage’s purpose as “to portray a discourse as a part of a social process, as a social practice, showing how it is determined by social structures, and what reproductive effects discourses can cumulatively have on those structures, sustaining them or changing them” (2001, p. 135). As mentioned earlier, the reproduction of MR takes place whenever discourses are drawn upon in different contexts, and at this stage, I will look at how this reproduction changes MR. To sum up the objective of the explanation stage, as Fairclough puts it, it is “a matter of seeing a discourse as part of processes of social struggle, within a matrix of relations of power” (p. 13).

The three levels of analysis described above will be the method I use for analyzing my data. The way I will be using CDA in my analysis is thus as Barker and Galasiński (2001, p. 25) describe, that is, to look at the surface of language which is the formal properties of the language in the speeches, and then look for the ideological power of language. Thus, in short, I will be looking for the social meaning of words

## Chapter 5

### Analysis of the Labour Party Discourse

This chapter analyzes the discourse of the Labour Party leaders in speeches from 2000 till 2011 according to Fairclough's first two levels of analysis: description and interpretation. The Labour leaders in the time period which is analyzed here are: Tony Blair (May 1997-June 2007), Gordon Brown (June 2007-May 2010), and Edward Milliband (September 2010-present). Any emphases in quotations are my own.

#### 5.1. Description and Interpretation

In this section, I will analyze the discourse of the Labour speeches according to Fairclough's description and interpretation stages of CDA. For the sake of clarity the analysis has been divided into four time periods, as previously explained. In this chapter, I will be looking for linguistic cues in the Labour Party discourse that relate to multiculturalism, in order to determine whether the party is drawing on discourses of multiculturalism.

##### *Before 9/11, 2001*

The vocabulary that dominates Blair's speeches before 9/11 is focused on positively loaded words such as opportunity, tolerance, equality, respect and solidarity (Blair, 2000a; 2000b; and 2001a). There is a heavy use of these words, which suggests that they are pivotal to the message Blair wants to send. The words stand for the values that Blair attributes to the ideal society. In his view, the ideal society is:

“A democratic, just and tolerant society. A society where everyone's worth is respected, regardless of their race or religion or skin colour. A society where each of us demonstrates, by our words and actions, our commitment to values of humanity and compassion. A society that has the courage to confront prejudice and persecution.” (Blair, 2001a)



What Blair says in this quote is that diversity is much welcomed and thus racism and discrimination are not something that should be tolerated in a modern society. In fact, in this same speech, which is about the Holocaust, Blair makes use of the good vs. evil metaphor where racism is *evil* as opposed to the *good* values of equality and diversity. By drawing on the ‘good vs. evil’ discourse, he is using a metaphor which everyone knows the meaning of, which makes his point much clearer. At the same time, this also shows Blair’s presuppositions about, on the one hand, racism and discrimination, and on the other the values he cherishes, because here Blair indirectly claims that the rejection of racism and discrimination and the values that he cherishes are what makes a good society. This is of course only one version of the truth, because people from e.g. a Nazi party may have totally different ways of interpreting these statements, and they would therefore reject the truth claims that Blair is making. However, Blair knows that the majority of the public does not hold right wing views. Therefore, his arguments are not likely to be contested since people, through their MR will have an understanding of the dichotomy between good and evil and, through what they have learnt from history, will know that racism has negative connotations. I will elaborate on this in Chapter 7.

What I gather from the above analysis and from the other speeches Tony Blair held that year, is that between the year 2000 and until 9/11, 2001, Blair does not talk directly about multiculturalism and, in general, his preoccupation is nowhere near the issue of immigration or integration. However, he does talk a lot about society and values. He clearly draws on a discourse of equality and anti-prejudice when it comes to talking about diversity in society, which suggests that he views the ideal society as a tolerant and diverse society. So, although not talking explicitly about multiculturalism, by making references to racial, religious and cultural tolerance, he shows what he believes to be an ideal society, that is, a multicultural society.

#### *Between 9/11, 2001 and 7/7, 2005*

In the immediate aftermath of 9/11, Blair talks a lot about terrorism and how it is a clash of good and evil values. Several times he emphasizes that Muslims in general are not to be blamed for the terrorism, because it is only a few who are terrorists (e.g. in Blair, 2001b). In fact, he says that “The true followers of Islam are our brothers and sisters in this struggle” (Blair, 2001c). By saying that Muslims are like brothers and sisters, Blair is appealing to peoples’ sense of kinship and thereby

encouraging them not to be angry with Muslims as a group. In general, Blair makes no links between terrorism and the ethnic diversity in Britain. He does, however, link terrorism to asylum, when he says that:

“Here in this country and in other nations round the world, laws will be changed, not to deny basic liberties but to prevent their abuse and protect the most basic liberty of all: freedom from terror. New extradition laws will be introduced; new rules to ensure asylum is not a front for terrorist entry. This country is proud of giving asylum to those fleeing tyranny. We will always do so. But we have a duty to protect the system from abuse.” (Blair, 2001c)

The quote is interesting, because Blair provides a lot of explanation as to why the asylum/immigration laws will be changed. Thus, he must be aware that it is a touchy subject within his electorate. Nevertheless, he is very cautious and instead of taking a firm stance, which he does in so many other contexts, he says that laws “**will be** changed” and “**will be** introduced” thus hiding agency. Only at the end, when he talks about “the duty to protect” does he introduce agency. In this way, he gives the impression that restricting immigration is a necessity but securing the people from harm is something Labour chooses to commit themselves to. Thus, for Labour, there is a security issue connected to immigration, and throughout the speeches in this period he clearly draws on a ‘danger vs. security discourse’, seen by the use of words like security, threat, war and danger. The effect that the use of this discourse has is that it legitimizes the stricter take on immigration and asylum that Labour has planned. In the following, I will look into how this security discourse goes from being linked to immigration and thus ‘the borders of Britain’ to becoming connected to issues concerning integration and ethnic minorities in Britain.

In a 2002 speech, Blair says that security measures are not enough to fight terrorism. The following quote is an example he gives as to why it is also important to focus on the battle between values:

“I remember a few weeks ago, doing a Q&A session with young people. In the audience were some young British Moslems. They were obviously bright, born in Britain, with a good future here, intelligent and articulate. And convinced: one, that the US was the real threat to world peace; and two, that the reason Iraq was in our sights, was that it was a Moslem country. In vain did I point out that Saddam had killed many more Moslems than any Western Government; or that when we took on Milosevic, we were fighting an Orthodox Christian oppressing Moslems” (Blair, 2002b)

What Blair does in this quote is that he comes closer to connecting the issue of terrorism with the British-born Muslims and stresses that the clash of values is evident even among well integrated British-born Muslims. He makes it perfectly clear that he does not accept their view on the issue. Actually, in the line preceding this quote, Blair talks about *the other danger* which refers to polarized opinion such as Muslim vs. Christians. By stating that the difference of opinion is a danger and then immediately after making an example of Muslims with another opinion than what he considers to be right, Blair makes the Muslims seem like a potential danger. What the quote also shows is that although Blair previously said that only a few of the world's Muslims supported the terrorists, he now says that the terrorist could be any Muslim in Britain, because it is all about peoples' convictions.

Another constantly reoccurring theme in Blair's speeches is diversity. Very often, when Blair speaks about the issue, he talks about diversity as a success, an enrichment, and a positive contributor to British society. He almost always mentions diversity as a British value. Thus, diversity is something Blair frames positively. For example, in a speech he says that "we celebrate the diversity in our country, get strength from the cultures and races that go to make up Britain today; and racist abuse and racist attacks have no place in the Britain we believe in" (Blair, 2001c). In this quote, Blair clearly puts his authority into what he is saying through the use of modality. First, he connects diversity with the positive word *celebrate*, and by saying that diversity is in fact celebrated he is thus saying that this is how it is. Instead, he could have said that it *should* or *must* be celebrated, but he chooses to say it as if it is a fact. In this way he creates a type of knowledge about diversity which is positive and by officially stating this, he brings on the attitude to the people. Later in the same speech, he glorifies the American society where, in his view, there is "inalienable rights granted to every citizen" (ibid), where a black man from poor conditions could become the secretary of state, where migrants can become part of the new world and where people of different ethnic origins can become successful and not be asked about their origins (ibid). Thus, adding to the values previously mentioned by Blair, these elements are also part of Blair's ideal, diverse society.

What the above shows is that without mentioning multiculturalism, Blair manages to purport a view that is very positive towards a multicultural society –multicultural in the sense that it consists of multiple cultures. Thus, multiculturalism does not seem to be a popular word for Blair. In fact, I

only found one speech where he uses the word, and it is only once. It is in a 2004 speech, where Blair says that “We will praise not apologise for our multi-cultural society” (Blair, 2004b). In Chapter 7, I will provide an explanation as to why the word is hardly ever used. The lack of mentioning of this word was something I anticipated due to the reluctance towards *the M word*, as described previously. Nevertheless, as with diversity, Blair speaks positively about multiculturalism. It is not possible to tell from the quote whether Blair refers to multiculturalism as a state policy or as diversity. However, as I have found out, he does support diversity, so it will be interesting to see in the further analysis if he makes any indications as to whether or not he supports multiculturalist policies.

As for Blair’s view on integration and social cohesion of ethnic minorities in Britain, he does not talk much about it. However, he does mention it a couple of times. Throughout the speeches Blair draws on a ‘rights vs. obligations’ discourse when he talks about ethnic minorities in Britain. For example, when talking about welcoming migrants Blair says that “migration is a two-way deal: there are **responsibilities** as well as **rights**” (Blair, 2004a). In another place he says “British residency and eventually citizenship carries with it **obligations** as well as **opportunities**” (ibid), and in another place he says that migrant communities have to recognize “the **obligations** that come with the **privilege** of living and working in Britain” (ibid). The obligations that Blair is referring to is the formal obligations of all citizens such as paying taxes, but also obligations specific to immigrants, such as “to learn something about the country and culture and language that you are now part of” (ibid). Although this does not suggest that Blair wants assimilation, it does put certain demands on immigrants to take measures in order to become integrated into British society. The ‘rights vs. obligations discourse’ appeals to people’s sense of justice, because it is common sense that in order to get something, one must earn it. By appealing to people’s common sense, Blair is placing the legitimization of putting demands on foreigners in a context of justice that people will agree with. Another area where Blair draws on this ‘moral discourse’ is in connection with asylum seekers, which I will look into in the following.

Previously, I showed how Blair makes use of a security discourse in connection with asylum, which was in the immediate aftermath of 9/11. The security discourse was used to legitimize the stricter take on asylum and immigration. Asylum and immigration are topics that Blair deals with frequently in the period between 9/11 and 7/7 (e.g. Blair, 2001c; 2001d; 2001e; 2002a; 2002b; 2003a). In the beginning of the period, Blair only focuses on asylum seekers and how they

constitute a problem. Whenever Blair talks about asylum seekers, he talks about how the asylum system is being abused by bogus asylum seekers but at the same time also about how the British have always helped those really in need. Again, in this context he draws on a discourse of morality by appealing to people's sense of right and wrong and thus justice. This discourse thus contains a type of knowledge about what is right and wrong in society; a knowledge which Blair projects to the people.

Towards the end of this period, Blair speaks increasingly more about immigration. In 2004, he makes a speech entirely on the issue (Blair, 2004a). And until the general election in 2005, he talks about it many times. Again, it seems like he is somehow trying to excuse himself for making a speech on the topic. For example, in a speech from 2005 he says "We faced up to the toughening of our asylum and immigration rules because like it or not, decent people, a million miles from the BNP, told us it mattered to them" (Blair, 2005a). Here he is referring to the electorate who has demanded that he takes action within the field. This also shows that there has probably been a trend within the British society where not only radical right wings like the BNP's voters want to talk about immigration. Thus, in this way Blair legitimizes the fact that he is talking about the issue.

Moreover, in a speech from 2005, Blair states that it is not racist to talk about immigration (Blair, 2005b). This further signals a shift in the discourse, a shift from not talking about immigration and the problems it may be associated with, to now talking about the issue and dealing with potential problems. Nevertheless, Blair does seem to constantly seek for ways to legitimize talking about it, which could be because he is not yet used to focusing so much on it and does not know how the electorate will react. Regardless, it is obvious that Blair makes a shift to talking much more about immigration than previously, which most likely is connected to the fact that this is right before the 2005 general election. I will look further into the explanations in Chapter 7.

In summary, the period from 9/11 up till before the 7/7 bombings was characterized by a discourse which supported diversity despite the threat from terrorism, but which also demanded responsibility for immigrant's inclusion in British society, and a tightening of possibilities for access to Britain. The discourses that Blair drew upon regarding these issues were 'danger vs. security', 'diversity', 'rights vs. obligations' and 'morality'. Indirectly, that is, without really using the word 'multiculturalism', he also draws on a multiculturalist discourse in the way that he talks about immigrants and diversity.

### *After 7/7, 2005*

Immediately after the London bombings, Tony Blair reacts similarly to the way he reacted to 9/11, by condemning the attacks and stressing that ordinary Muslims are not to be blamed for it (Blair, 2005c). Blair continues to draw on the 'positive diversity discourse', but he also continues to talk about the necessity of further immigration control (e.g. Blair, 2005d; 2006). However, there is also a big difference in his focus after these attacks that were executed on British ground as opposed to the 9/11 attacks, which were on foreign ground. Now Blair starts to talk a lot about the Muslim community in Britain and how it is important to work together with it in order to fight terrorism. For example, not long after the attacks he says "We must pull this up by its roots. Within Britain, we must join up with our Muslims community to take on the extremists" (Blair, 2005c), and in another speech he says Britain should implement "a more intensive and more frank engagement with the Muslim community here" (Blair, 2006). Furthermore, he recognizes that extremists can be found within Britain when he says that the roots of the extremist ideology, among others, is "in the extremist minority that now in every European city preach hatred of the West and our way of life" (Blair, 2005c).

Blair uses this 'root' metaphor twice in the speech from July 16, which creates a link between the two issues that he uses it on. First, he says that the roots of the extremist ideologies are, among others, within people in Britain. Later, he says that this threat should be pulled by its roots. Thus, he establishes a link between extremism and Muslims living in Britain. The word *root* denotes something that grows and which lies under the surface. And so, what he is implying is that the *roots* of British extremism must be found within the country, and more specifically within the Muslim community, since he says they need to help *find the roots*. Thus, although Blair says that Muslims as a group should not be pointed out as extremists, he is here establishing a clear connection between the terrorists and Muslims in Britain. Although it may not be intentional, it shows something about Blair's own presuppositions about Muslims and extremism. However, in general, after the 7/7 bombings Blair does not talk very much about immigration linked to terrorism.

Another shift which can be seen in this period is from a focus on immigration as something which is good for diversity, to a focus on immigration as something that is good for the British economy. And this involves a stricter take on immigration policy. By the end of his term, Blair increasingly

connects immigration to labor, and he talks about introducing a points system which will make sure the only ones allowed to reside in Britain will be people from whom society will benefit (Blair, 2005b). In addition to restricting access, Blair also talks increasingly about making demands that immigrants can speak the language and fulfill certain citizenship requirements (ibid). He points to Australia and Canada as role models. These are two countries which have often associated with multiculturalist practices of state policy, which suggests that this is also something he supports. Thus, the last message Blair emphasizes before he steps down as leader for Labour and Prime Minister of Britain, is that immigration should be more focused on making demands for people who want to come to Britain, which again appeals to the people's sense of justice.

In 2007, Gordon Brown succeeds Tony Blair as Prime Minister of Britain. Brown does not talk much about immigration or social cohesion in his speeches, and unlike Blair, Brown does not make continuous references to terrorism (e.g. Brown, 2007a; 2007b; 2009). During Brown's incumbency as Prime Minister he was, as the rest of the world preoccupied with the economic recession, which is an obvious explanation to this. Nevertheless, in the places where Brown does in fact talk about immigration and integration, he is much more frank and explicit compared to Blair, who seemed to be constantly looking for ways to legitimize his actions. One example of this is when he says that "Britain will continue to benefit from skilled workers from abroad and they will understand their **responsibilities** to earn the **right** to settle in Britain" (Brown, 2007b). He clearly states that in order to get rights in Britain, they must *earn* them and thus he draws on the same 'rights vs. obligations discourse' as Blair did, although he says it more frankly. In another example he says: "Tightening our points-based immigration system ensures that those who have the skills that can help Britain will be welcomed, and those who do not, will be refused" (Brown, 2009). Again, here there is no beating around the bush, as Brown clearly states that the only people that will be let into Britain are those who are considered valuable to the country. He shows his authority through the use of the modal verb *will*. In this context, the word *will* means certainty, and thus Brown's intentions are made very clear with this assertiveness.

A final example of Brown's firm stance is when he says "Let us affirm that in return for opportunity for all that we expect and demand responsibility from all: to learn English, contribute to and respect the culture we build together" (Brown, 2007a). Here, again, Brown draws on the same 'rights vs. obligations discourse' as Blair. What is noteworthy, however, in this quote is that Brown does not draw on an 'us vs. them discourse' that suggests that 'they' must adapt to 'our' culture, which is a

sign of assimilationist attitudes. Instead, Brown says the culture is built together by immigrants and the British. Thus, this signals a positive attitude towards mutual accommodation between majority and minority cultures. Nevertheless, it does not signal multiculturalism, since he is in fact talking about monoculturalism when saying that *the culture we build together* meaning one culture.

Summing up, in Brown's period as Prime Minister and leader of the Labour party, he overall continued drawing on similar discourses as the ones Blair drew on. One difference, however, showed in Brown's more frank approach to the issue of immigration and demands-making for immigrants. Also, whereas Blair drew on a discourse of multiculturalism, Brown does not – at least not as openly. In Chapter 7, I will look into explanations for these issues.

### *Today*

In 2010, Edward Milliband became the new leader of the Labour Party. He took over after Gordon Brown, who stepped down as leader of the Labour party after losing the general election and thus his title as Prime Minister. Like Gordon Brown, Milliband does not talk a lot about immigration and integration. Mostly, when he does talk about immigration he is talking about how this was the issue that made Labour lose 5 million votes and thus the election. The way he sees it, the British people were not prejudiced, they were “anxious and insecure about their wages and conditions and housing” (Milliband, 2010a). In another speech he says “You wanted your concerns about the impact of immigration to be heard, and I understand your frustration that we didn't seem to be on your side” (Milliband, 2010b). Thus, what he is acknowledging here is really what my analysis above showed, which is that there was a lack of dealing with the issue of the incorporation of foreigners into British society within the Labour party.

In one speech, however, he talks about immigration. He tells the story about his own Jewish family who migrated to Britain. He draws on the same ‘rights vs. obligations’ discourse that many other party leaders before him have drawn upon. This is clear when he says “They [his family] arrived with nothing. This country gave them everything. It gave them life and the things that make life worth living: hope, friendship, **opportunity** and family. And they took hope and opportunity. They worked hard; they got on” (Milliband, 2010b). The way he idealizes his family's migration suggests that he sees that as an honorable way of coming to a new country and thus the way he thinks immigrants should act. He also presents Britain as a sort of savior which legitimizes the rights vs.



obligations discourse. Furthermore, he shows his vision of integration when he continues to say that “My Dad learnt English, paid his way moving furniture during the day, and studying at night at technical college. He joined the Navy to fight for our country and afterwards he wanted to go to university. He did” (ibid). Again, this idealized picture of how his dad became integrated into British society says something about Milliband’s view on integration. What he is indirectly suggesting is that immigrants must work hard to become integrated into British society by learning to speak the language, work hard and, preferably, get an education. This is in line with what Milliband’s successors also believed in.

## **5.2. Summary of Description and Interpretation**

What I found through the analysis at the first two stages of Fairclough’s CDA was that initially, before 9/11, Tony Blair painted a positive picture of British diversity where values such as solidarity, tolerance, and equality were in the high seat. Overall, he drew on a multicultural discourse. Racism was something Blair clearly took his distance from. After 9/11, although Blair made a point about not demonizing all Muslims, he singled out Muslims as a potential problem in British society due to differing opinions between them and the British. This compromised the positive multiculturalist discourse and marked a shift away from the use of it. Although becoming slightly stricter on immigration, the overall view is that the discourse of Labour has not changed much since Tony Blair and the party is still quite immigration and diversity friendly although not as openly multiculturalist as earlier. There is, however, a lack of information about the party’s stance on multiculturalism as a state policy. However, Labour’s calls for stricter integration measures signal some movement away from complete diversity. In Chapter 7, I will look at the societal context of these findings.

## Chapter 6

### Analysis of the Conservative Party Discourse

In this chapter, I will analyze the discourse of the Conservative Party's leaders from 2000 till 2011. The leaders of the party in this time period are: William Hague (June 1997-September 2001), Iain Duncan Smith (September 2001-November 2003), Michael Howard (November 2003-December 2005), and David Cameron (December 2005- present).

#### 6.1. Description and Interpretation

As with the analysis of the Labour Party's speeches, I will, in this section, analyze the Conservative Party's speeches according to the description and interpretation levels of CDA. Any emphases in quotations are my own.

##### *Before 9/11, 2001*

From 2000 until around the time of 9/11, William Hague was the leader of the Conservative Party. In his speeches, he hardly talks about national cohesion, multiculturalism and immigration. However, two speeches are interesting. The first is a leader's speech he held in Blackpool on October 5, 2000, and the other is his *Foreign Land Speech* from March 4, 2001. A general theme in the two speeches is that he emphasizes that he wants to fight political correctness. This says something about his style and gives the impression that he might want to put forth some controversial opinions. Another feature that appears in both of the speeches is his strong underscoring of his understanding of the British people. He continuously claims to speak for the British people, because he understands them and their needs. In his *Foreign Land Speech*, he mentions the word *people* 55 times (implicitly meaning the British people). Moreover, he mentions Britain 22 times. This gives the speeches patriotic undertones and suggests that he is drawing on a discourse with nationalistic elements.

In the first speech, Hague describes the mainstream values of the Conservative Party as being "tolerance, mutual respect and the rich diversity of our country" (Hague, 2000). The words are

positively loaded, and these values suggest a positive stance towards immigrants in the country. Furthermore, later in the speech he talks about crime and tells the audience about a group of black teenagers that he spoke to, who were concerned about the high levels of crime. Then he says “These people are looking to the Conservatives now and they want to know what we’re going to do for them” (ibid), and later he says “We are going to give full force to the common sense and instincts of the British people and we’re going to win the war against crime” (ibid). So, in the latter sentence, Hague is talking about the common sense and instinct of the British people regarding crime, which refers back to the worried black teenagers. In this way, Hague is drawing on the assumption that the British people consists of multiple ethnicities, and that he is willing to fight for ethnic minority opinions as well, which suggests that he accepts a multicultural society.

However, the fact that Hague mentions the teenagers’ skin color, which in reality is irrelevant, implies a hidden assumption that many black people are criminal. Hague is probably using the example, because it underscores his support for diversity. Since black people are often, in the media, associated with crime, this story views it from the opposite perspective, describing the black people as the victims of crime rather than the perpetrators. Thus, the only purpose the story seems to have is to say that black people can also be afraid of crime, or else the mentioning of their skin color would not be relevant.

The other interesting speech from Hague is from March 4, 2001, and it is named *Foreign Land Speech*. The title lays out the theme of the speech. It is basically a critique of Tony Blair, and a claim that he has turned Britain into a foreign land. Not long into the speech, Hague says “Let me take you on a journey to a foreign land to Britain after a second term of Tony Blair” (Hague, 2001). The word *foreign* denotes something which is uncertain, unknown and possibly frightening. The interpretation of the word naturally depends on the interpreter’s MR, but in the context, it becomes obvious that it is not intended to mean something positive. Furthermore, the word also gives connotations to foreigners, which leads the thoughts to the issue of immigration and similar topics. And this is an issue Hague frequently talks about in this speech. Again, in this speech he is drawing on his ‘politically incorrect discourse’ indirectly claiming that Tony Blair is too politically correct. Thus, Hague’s aim of this speech is to show that he will treat societal issues differently from the government and, again, he justifies this by claiming that this is what the British people wants. For example he says that:

“There is nothing the British people can talk about, that this Labour Government doesn’t deride. Talk about Europe and they call you extreme. Talk about tax and they call you greedy. Talk about crime and they call you reactionary. Talk about asylum and they call you racist. Talk about your nation and they call you Little Englanders.” (ibid)

By saying that Labour derides these topics, he is implying that they should instead be taken seriously, and that it should not be wrong for people to question Labour’s approach to e.g. asylum. Thus, he is telling the British people that it is alright for them to talk in a politically incorrect manner. Later in the speech he says something similar when he says: “Above all, the people of Britain believe in their country. They are not narrow nationalists. They are not xenophobes. But they take pride in what our country has achieved” (ibid). Again, here he is ‘protecting’ the opinions of people who may want to oppose Labour’s *politically correct* opinions. Thus, Hague is portraying the British people as non-racist and non-nationalistic people which. This portrayal serves to legitimize the questioning of controversial issues. Since Hague is claiming to speak for the people, these attributes reflect back on him. This legitimizes his interest in speaking about immigration and asylum and keeping Britishness without making him seem extreme. So in this way, he legitimizes his alleged political incorrectness and argues that it is ok for him to use the metaphor of *the foreign land* because, as he stated, one does not become a racist for being critical towards asylum and immigration.

In the speech, Hague also talks about asylum and talks about his suggested toughening of the system, which he claims is being exploited. Several times, he says that Britain should be “a safe haven not a soft touch” (Hague, 2001). He thus distinguishes between the genuine and the bogus asylum seekers and claims action against those who are not genuine. Because Hague has previously told the people that it is not racist to talk about asylum, he has created a certain type of knowledge about the issue which legitimizes talking critically about it. Although Labour holds the same views on asylum and also distinguishes between real and bogus asylum seekers, the tone in the Conservative rhetoric is different due to what they have uttered before. So, when Hague sets out the style of the speech as being politically incorrect and with nationalistic undertones, his stance towards asylum comes across as being more negative than Tony Blair’s, even though they are actually saying the same thing.

Summing up on the discourses that Hague draws on before 9/11, I have found that the discourses he draws on in his speeches are somewhat multiculturalist and thus positive towards diversity.

Furthermore, he rejects discrimination, nationalism and racism. However, although he rejects nationalism, his rhetorical style does come across quite nationalistic and he does dismiss political correctness, which raises doubts about his potential underlying intentions. In the following, I will see how the discourse evolves after Hague steps down as leader of the party.

#### *Between 9/11 2001 and 7/7 2005*

Shortly after 9/11, the Tories get a new leader, Iain Duncan Smith. His response to 9/11 is similar to Labour's: condemning the attacks and emphasizing that Islam should not be blamed (Smith, 2001). Nowhere in this speech does he link terrorism to the ethnic diversity of Britain or suggest that Muslims should be feared. On the contrary, he says that it is his intention to make sure that ethnic minorities are better represented in the party. He says that he "will be intolerant of anyone who is intolerant of others" (ibid). Thus, he clearly favors diversity and rejects discrimination.

Nevertheless, he maintains the strict stance towards asylum as was set out by Hague. In a speech from March 2003, he says that Britain should learn from "Australia's tough but fair asylum policy" (Smith, 2003a), and that the Conservatives will make that work for Britain too. Like Hague, Smith also says that they should focus on helping those asylum seekers who are in genuine need and reject those who are not. In a speech in October that year, Smith says: "the asylum system is a disaster spiraling out of control. While Tony Blair travels the world, the world is travelling here" (Smith, 2003b), and "our country is no longer able to control immigration" (ibid). Rather than only focusing on asylum, he is now also mentioning immigration. The picture he is making of immigration is a rather negative one, which serves to incite fear among the public. By using a metaphor for the asylum system as being "a disaster spiraling out of control" (ibid), he gives the impression that it is about to go very wrong, which serves to frighten the people. So, by saying this, along with saying that "the world is travelling here", he is creating a picture of a Britain that is almost being invaded by hordes of people from the outside. Drawing on this 'chaos discourse' is a way to legitimize his tough stance towards immigration.

Another aspect which the quotes show is his use of modality to put his authority into what he is saying. He says the asylum system **is** out of control and that the country **cannot** control immigration. Thus, he is using tense and modal auxiliary verbs to show his version of the truth. In this way, he is creating a type of knowledge that accepts these things as facts. Furthermore, he is

also referring to something in the peoples' MR that makes it possible to say this. This could be the numbers of asylum seekers that people know are rising because they have heard it from politicians and in the media. Because they already have this knowledge, Smith is simply adding to it with his version of the truth, which is that immigration and asylum are becoming large problems.

In November 2003, Iain Duncan Smith was succeeded by Michael Howard as leader of the Conservative Party. Howard's speeches differ from the previous Tory speeches in that he addresses the issue of immigration more frequently (e.g. Howard, 2003c; 2004a; 2004b). But like his predecessors, he also distances himself and the party from racism and xenophobia. For example, in a speech given in Burnley, in February 2004, he mocks the British National Party, calling it "a bunch of thugs dressed up as a political party" (Howard, 2004a), and a party which is based on "bigotry and hatred" (ibid). Thus, he clearly distances himself from right-wing politics. In opposition to the BNP, Howard praises the immigration tradition of Britain, for example by saying that "For centuries, Britain has welcomed energetic, ambitious and optimistic people from every part of the world" (ibid), and "Our National Health Service depends in part on the talents of immigrants" (ibid), and "Britain is refreshed and renewed by the influx of new people from all over the world" (ibid). Thus, by drawing on the 'benefits of immigration discourse' he clearly paints a positive picture of immigrants and their contribution to Britain. This stands in opposition to the 'chaos discourse' that Iain Duncan Smith drew on a few months earlier. However, the reason for this difference is probably that whereas Smith was referring to the potential immigration into Britain, Howard is here referring to the immigrants who have already settled.

In the same speech, Howard says about diversity: "We are a stronger and better country, rich in our cultural diversity, because of the immigrant communities that have settled here" (Howard, 2004a), and "I do not see our society as a collection of minorities, but rather as a wide spectrum of individuals, all with their own talents, all British" (ibid). Thus, here he actually draws on a multiculturalist discourse and it sounds like he supports multiculturalism. Howard also talks about integration when he says "Britain has an enviable record of racial integration. Over decades and centuries, this country has successfully absorbed many immigrant communities. They have held on to their traditions and culture while at the same time embracing Britain's and playing their full role in our national life" (ibid). In these quotes Howard is drawing on a multiculturalist discourse.

All in all, Howard talks very positively about immigration and immigrants. Nevertheless, he does also call for stricter immigration control and argues that "It would be a tragedy if the failure to

respond to people's concerns led to a decrease in respect for and tolerance of our immigrant communities" (Howard, 2004a). So, what he is arguing is that the British people have concerns over immigration and therefore, in order not to make the public become annoyed with immigrants, it is important to ensure that only 'the right' immigrants are allowed entry, that is, the people who can contribute positively to society.

Furthermore, he does not only talk positively about immigration and immigrants. He also links immigration to crime when he says that the "failed immigration policy is contributing to the growth of crime in this country" (Howard, 2004a), and that "It is a fact that many of the people coming to this country illegally are at the mercy of criminal gangs. There is now a network of human traffickers and gangmasters, living like parasites off human misery" (ibid). So in a way, he is drawing on the chaos discourse that Smith also drew on when talking about immigration. He is telling people that failed immigration (which refers to the uncontrolled immigration) leads to crime and criminal gangs. This is, again, something which frightens people and in that way legitimizes the Conservatives taking action against it.

All in all, the rhetoric of the period between 9/11 and 7/7 is not so much focused on terrorism as it is on asylum and immigration. The Tories support diversity and multiple cultures and praise immigration, and thus they frequently draw on a multiculturalist discourse. As in the case of Labour, the support for multiculturalism does not necessarily refer to multiculturalism as a state practice, but more likely refers to multiculturalism as diversity. Despite this support for multiculturalism, the rhetoric between 9/11 and 7/7 is also characterized by the recognition of the need to restrict entry to Britain, because uncontrolled immigration can become a threat to British society. In the beginning, they are drawing on discourses of chaos when talking about the asylum and immigration system, but towards the end of this period, there is a shift, and the discourses that are drawn upon are more about the benefits of immigration.

#### *After 7/7 2005*

After the 7/7 bombings, Michael Howard is still the leader of the Conservative party. When talking about the London bombings, Howard draws on an 'us vs. them' discourse, which clearly shows that he does not view the terrorists as British although they actually were. For example, he says "**They** failed to cause panic in our capital city. Instead **we** went about our business, determined to show

that **we** would not be defeated” (Howard, 2005a). Furthermore, he says “the terrorists failed to divide us one from another. **They** failed to incite one group in our national community to blame another” (ibid). Later in the speech he says “**we** are all in this together” (ibid). What these quotes show is that Howard paints a picture of the terrorists as being a threat from outside the British community. Thus, he does not link the terrorists to ethnic minorities in Britain. It is also clear in the second quote that Howard underscores that Muslims as a group should not be blamed for the events, and in another place in the speech he says that “There is only one group of people who should be blamed – that is the evil terrorists who carried out this deed” (ibid). This also implies that Muslims in general are not responsible. Also in another speech he says that “If we are to have new laws against terrorism we must make sure that they are used against their real targets, not against innocent people who represent no terrorist threat at all” (Howard, 2005b). Thus, Howard makes a great effort in showing that he does accept the Muslim minority in Britain as a part of the people and definitely not as terrorists.

Again, his support for multiculturalism shows. In fact, he also explicitly mentions multiculturalism when he says “The very society – multi-faith and multi-cultural – which stands as an affront to the warped ideology of the terrorists is a source, not of weakness as they suppose, but of strength” (Howard, 2005b). Describing diversity as a strength is a recurrent theme in so many speeches from both Labour and Tories that it is safe to say that it is a dominating discourse in Britain –at least up till this point. Whether it continues will show in the further analysis.

Although being very positive towards Muslims and ethnic minorities in general, Howard maintains that Britain should toughen its immigration policy due to terrorism. He justifies this claim by drawing on a security discourse which shows through phrases like “**defend** those values” (Howard, 2005b) (referring to Western values), “**secure** our borders” (ibid), “**controlling** immigration” (ibid), and “**protecting** our country” (ibid). Thus, immigration comes to stand for a potential threat to Britain, but also to Western values, due to the possibility of terrorists getting access to the country. He defines these values as: “freedom of speech, the rule of law, free elections and the equality of women” (ibid). Most of the British people will most likely hold the same values, and therefore he is appealing to the protection of their values here.

In December 2005, David Cameron becomes the new leader of the Conservative Party. Already before he becomes the leader, he is preoccupied with issues of integration and national cohesion and, as the analysis below will show, they also come to play a large role in his leadership of the



Conservative Party. When Cameron becomes the leader, he immediately states that the course of the Conservative Party has to change in order to win the next election, and that he will make sure it does (Cameron, 2005). Cameron's new focus for the party most clearly manifests itself in his rejection of state multiculturalism and his call for greater social cohesion. In Chapter 7, I will explain how this fits in the broader social context in Britain. Cameron also explicates links between the 7/7 bombings and British citizens who are not properly integrated into British society. In the following, I will look into these issues.

Cameron hardly talks about asylum but talks instead about immigration and its effects on the country. Like his predecessors, Cameron speaks positively about the immigrants that have come to the country, and he says that "We wouldn't be half the country we are without immigration" (Cameron, 2007a). But also, like his predecessors, he holds a firm stance towards further immigration and says that it has to be controlled in order to make sure that those immigrants who do come to the country can be properly integrated. Furthermore, he also draws on the 'rights vs. obligations discourse' when he says "immigrants who come to live here must know they have responsibilities –as well as rights" (Cameron, 2008). This is a way of legitimizing his views and thus making the public accept them. Here, he is also drawing on the presupposition that people cannot get rights without fulfilling some responsibilities. In this way, without people knowing it, Cameron is exerting his version of the truth on them because he is appealing to something in their common sense. Hereby, he is justifying why it is right for him to talk about the responsibilities of the immigrant. The responsibilities he talks about are the core of his new vision for immigrants in Britain, which I will explore further in the following analysis.

The dominating discourse that Cameron is drawing on throughout his speeches is a discourse of social cohesion, which manifests itself in a strong anti-multiculturalist rhetoric. Cameron makes it clear that the notion of multiculturalism that he critiques is "the doctrine that seeks to Balkanise people and communities according to race and background. A way of seeing the world that encourages us to concentrate on what divides us, what makes us different" (Cameron, 2006c). Thus, his critique of multiculturalism does not refer to the fact that Britain is multicultural in its ethnic composition, but is rather a critique of multiculturalism as a state policy. By using the word *Balkanise*, which has negative connotations to the conflicts in the Balkans, Cameron is clearly creating a negative link to multiculturalism as a state practice that makes one think of division and multiethnic conflict. He also critiques that multiculturalism is "the idea that we should respect

different cultures within Britain to the point of allowing them – indeed encouraging them – to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream”(Cameron, 2008). Cameron also compares multiculturalism to racism when he says that

“People from ethnic minorities are today less likely than ever before to encounter old-fashioned racism but, instead, they’ve become enmeshed in multicultural policies that racialise them anew. The principle of equality – that all people should be treated the same regardless of their background, colour or creed – has become replaced with the principle of diversity, where all cultural identities must be given separate public recognition.”(Cameron, 2006c)

Instead of multiculturalism, Cameron’s view is that the British “should respect different cultures. But ... shouldn’t encourage them to live apart” (Cameron, 2008). Furthermore, he criticizes that in some parts of Britain there is in fact a “de facto apartheid”, which has been enabled by multiculturalism (Cameron, 2006c; 2008). Thus, in Cameron’s view, multiculturalism has failed as a state policy because, in his view, it serves to divide rather than unite people and that multiculturalism has worked towards segregation rather than cohesion.

About social cohesiveness, Cameron says that “There’s a widespread acceptance of the need for greater social cohesiveness and, in that context, a sense of national identity is becoming more, not less important” (Cameron, 2006a). Furthermore, he says “there is a real appetite for things that bring us together rather than drive us apart. The demand comes as much from black and minority ethnic communities as elsewhere” (ibid). What Cameron is saying is thus that measures should be taken to promote more social cohesion and that it is in the interest of both majority and minority cultures to do that. Again, here he is drawing on a discourse of cohesion.

This leads up to Cameron’s core argument which is that the British people need a common culture or identity. This identity, should be composed of elements of both traditional British culture, but also ethnic minority culture, because as he also says, it is inevitable that the majority culture will be affected by the ethnic minorities. He exemplifies this when he says “Curries are already replacing cucumber sandwiches as a culinary emblem” (Cameron, 2006a), referring to the culinary influence that Indian food has had on the country. Moreover, in a speech from February 26, 2008, he metaphorically describes the creation of a new common identity: “we need to think of our country, as the Chief Rabbi has put it, as a house we build together, with the common foundation of the

values of a liberal society, but perfectly capable of alterations and additions so long as these changes are compatible with the existing architecture” (Cameron, 2008). This metaphor makes his vision clear to people, and what these quotes show is that Cameron dismisses multiculturalism as a state practice and rather wants a state practice that serves to give people a shared culture. Thus, according to Cameron, both majority and minority cultures must come together in one common British culture which will enhance social cohesion.

About how to make Britain more socially cohesive in practice, Cameron says: “Rather than banning things that may make people different, we should be encouraging things that bring people together” (Cameron, 2006a). His proposals for how to do this are to make sure all immigrants learn to speak English, prioritize the teaching of British history in school, and, finally, to “encourage more integration by promoting school exchanges that introduce children to other young people from different backgrounds” (ibid). He says about this strategy that “the most powerful way to bring people together is to give them shared experiences” (Cameron, 2006b), and “It is by contact that we overcome our differences” (ibid), and finally, that British society should be one that “encourages active citizenship, not a passive standing on the sidelines” (Cameron, 2007b). By drawing on his discourse of social cohesion, which is a positively loaded discourse, Cameron is here justifying why there should be stricter requirements for immigrants. In this way he is producing a type of knowledge about social cohesion which presupposes that in order for Britain to become socially cohesive, every citizen must speak English and share the same values. I will look further into the effect that this has on the British people in Chapter 7.

Another theme that I have dealt with throughout this analysis is terrorism. Although Cameron does not place any blame for terrorism on Muslims as a group, they are the only group of people he uses in his examples of integration gone wrong. And he does clearly link terrorism with the failure of integration of Muslims when he says “July 7<sup>th</sup> and its aftermath have provoked a healthy scrutiny of the part that national identity should play in a multi-ethnic Britain” (Cameron, 2006a). Here, Cameron does single out Muslims as the reason that British identity should be redefined. Furthermore, he legitimizes this by saying that the scrutiny is *healthy* thus implying it is good for the country. Also, in many other instances, he refers to Muslims when talking about the failure of integration that multiculturalism has resulted in. For example, he mentions the 2001 riots in Britain as being a problem. These riots were between the ethnic British and the Muslim minorities in the cities where the riots took place.

Furthermore, in another speech Cameron singles out Muslims as being a problem for integration when he says that “We now have a situation where the children of first-generation immigrants – children, let us remember, who have been born and raised here – feel more divorced from life in Britain than their parents” (Cameron, 2008), and continues to say that 81 % of British Muslims see themselves as Muslim first and British second (ibid). In another speech he says: “Today, a new generation of Muslim schools is emerging. If these schools are to be British state schools, they must be part of our society, not separate from it” (Cameron, 2006b). By stating all these examples throughout his speeches, Cameron manages to single out some Muslims as the ones who are the problem to social cohesion in Britain. Because the lack of integration and a lack of belonging was, in the media, called out to be the reason for the London Bombings, the public will know what a lack of integration of Muslims can potentially result in, and therefore it will be natural for them to see it as a potential problem that some Muslims have a different culture than the majority.

Another element in Cameron’s speeches that implicitly makes people understand he is referring to Muslims is when he states some new values that the party focuses on. He mentions values like: human rights, freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of religion and protection of minorities, respect for the rule of law, fairness and tolerance, and respect for other people (Cameron, 2006a). At the time when Cameron holds this speech, the Muhammad Cartoon crisis is going on in Europe, and because of this, when Cameron mentions these values as new values for the Conservative Party, people will automatically relate them to the ongoing debate about Western democratic values of freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Thus, in this way, Cameron has again managed to single out Muslims as the problem and legitimize it with a reference to the protection of Britishness and British values.

### *Today*

In May 2010, David Cameron became the new Prime Minister of Britain, after the Conservative Party won the general election. After his victory, Cameron maintained the course that he had had before the election, claiming that multiculturalism had resulted in a lack of social cohesion which was what led to some young people from the ethnic minorities becoming alienated from British society and values and thus become potential extremists and terrorists. His solution is still to limit

immigration and make sure that the immigrants who are allowed into Britain are better integrated through language tests and education in common culture and curriculum (Cameron, 2011).

## **6.2. Summary of Description and Interpretation**

Before 9/11, a discourse of political incorrectness was prevalent as was a subtle nationalistic discourse. These discourses were, however, not dominating the speeches. Also, Hague was drawing on a multiculturalist discourse. Nevertheless, he displays strong dissatisfaction with the asylum system, but only does so from a discourse of justice, that is, from the view that illegal immigration should be stopped. Thus, he does not use this as a platform from which to talk about immigrants as a problem for British society and social cohesion. Rather, he takes distance from xenophobic feelings. His subtle use of a nationalistic discourse serves to legitimize the concerns about immigration.

After 9/11, under Iain Duncan Smith's leadership, the discourse towards immigration toughens further. The multiculturalist discourse is, however, still prevalent and diversity is hailed. But then, in 2004, the discourse shifts again under the leadership of Michael Howard and becomes more positive towards immigration. Nevertheless, the wish for the party to make tightenings on immigration remains, the difference being that it is now justified more positively than earlier by drawing on a 'benefits of immigration' discourse. In Chapter 7, I will look further into why this could be.

After the 7/7 bombings, a security discourse replaces the positive discourses on immigration and there is an 'us vs. them' discourse about terrorists. Through these discourses, immigration is now portrayed as a potential threat to British society. However, then Cameron becomes the party's new leader, which again, results in a shift of discourse. Whereas the discourse up till his leadership has been multiculturalist, it now changes to the complete opposite, as Cameron makes heavy use of an anti-multiculturalist discourse and a discourse of social cohesion. Furthermore, Cameron also places immigrants within the 'rights vs. obligations discourse', which helps to legitimize his new visions for the party. This does, however, not mean that he is hostile towards immigrants. On the contrary, he says that his ideas are in the best interest of everyone. Today, Cameron is the Prime Minister of Britain, and in the next chapter, I will look into how the discourses he is drawing on reflect on the people.

## Chapter 7

### Explanation

This section makes out the third stage of the analysis, the explanation stage. In this section, I will place the political speeches in a historical context, and thereby examine the underlying forces or structures in society, which helped sustain or change certain discourses that were drawn upon by the Labour Party and the Conservative Party. Furthermore, at this stage, I will also be looking into how the discourses that the different party leaders have drawn upon, have helped reproduce and change the MR of the British people, but also how British society might have influenced the discourses that the politicians have drawn upon.

Before 9/11, the Labour Party was in government and thus the Conservative Party was in opposition. This fact has large influence on the topics and compositions of the speeches. For example, a large part of the Conservative party's speeches was dedicated to mudslinging against Labour. This also explains the party's determination to break with the political correctness, because in their view, the Labour party, that is, the government, was far too concerned being politically correct than dealing with 'the important issues', which they also explicitly state in some speeches. So, when the Conservative party dedicates so much time to criticizing Labour, it is because they have to do what they can to make Labour look bad and hopefully win back some votes in the future. Similarly, when the Labour Party became the opposition in 2010, their speeches also changed into becoming more focused on criticizing the Conservatives. Therefore, as I will also argue in this analysis, the extent to which the two parties discuss certain topics is dependent on their power position within Britain at the time, and thus it varies from year to year.

Another example of this change in focus points for the parties can be seen under William Hague's leadership. According to Stephen Ingle (2008), Hague's leadership was characterized by a friendly attitude towards community in which he "reached out to the young, to women, to ethnic minorities and to the homosexual community" (p. 36). However, in the 2001 election, the Conservatives returned to their anti-European and anti-immigrant politics. As I too concluded in my analysis, Ingles also concludes that this stricter stance towards immigration was due to the election, and an attempt to gather votes from the people who would traditionally vote Conservative, and as Ingles says "that was all it did" (ibid). Thus, the fact that there was a general election made the party

change its focus issues. Later in this chapter, I will look into how this was also the case in the 2005 elections.

It is characteristic for the speeches from both the parties that in 2000 and up until just before 9/11, 2001, issues of multiculturalism and immigration were not high on the agenda in the speeches. This was despite the 2001 Spring Riots, which had created debates about community cohesion and multiculturalism in Britain (Copsey, 2011, p.65), and despite the Rushdie affair in the late 1980s, which had resulted in concerns that Muslims were not able to become part of British society (McGhee, 2008, p. 32). Thus, although these events had taken place before 9/11, they had not managed to become the center of attention in British politics. However, after 9/11 there was a shift in focus.

While Blair was the leader of the party, he was also the Prime Minister of Britain, meaning he was, at the time, quite powerful. Thus, his words can potentially have been highly influential on the British people. When he, early on after 9/11, singled out Muslims as a group of concern for British society, he could legitimately do that because the terrorist attacks on 9/11 were planned and conducted by Muslims. Thus, in British society, there already existed an acceptance that Muslims could potentially be dangerous, which Blair could draw on. So in this way, Blair's placing of Muslims in this box was rather a sign that he was governed by the dominating and accepted discourses in society, that is, discourses which were suspicious of Muslims. However, by saying this, Blair was still indirectly sending a message to the people that some British Muslims could potentially become terrorists.

On the other hand, Blair also made a point out of telling people not to suspect Muslims as a group. This is based on another social structure – one that denies prejudice and racism. Britain has, in the past, had a long history of racism and discrimination of immigrants. Britain has, for a long time, been multicultural due to the fact that it consists of England, Scotland and Wales, with the different languages, religions and cultures of these respective countries. Furthermore, Jews, Roma and Irish are all peoples that have a history of immigration to Britain that dates back hundreds of years. Roma and Jews were, at different points in time, expelled from Britain due to cultural and racist reasons. They were treated with suspicion and blamed for social bads. Thus, the phrase 'England for the English' became a popular expression in the late 1800s and beginning of the 1900s. The Irish who also immigrated to Britain on a large scale were however not treated this way, although also foreign and with a different culture than the British. Thus, multiculturalism in Britain is not new, and the

racist and nationalist responses to the presence of multiple cultures in Britain has been an integral part of Britain's past (Silj, 2010, pp. 38-39). Furthermore, the 20<sup>th</sup> century has also shown British racism with the treatment of its commonwealth citizens and Enoch Powell's influence during the 1960s.

Therefore, today racism is viewed as socially unacceptable by the majority of people and is also often rejected by both parties in their speeches. And for this reason, Blair strongly distances himself from any racism and prejudice, which moreover appeals to people's need for political correctness. This also shows in his strong support for diversity, where everyone is equal. Through this representation of anti-discrimination and the diverse society, Blair produces his view on what is socially acceptable for the British society. The social context, in which Blair's speeches occur, as described above, creates a suitable culture for his version of what constitutes the perfect British society. For example, if he had promoted discriminatory views, the British society would probably not have been ready for it and would thus have rejected his discourse. Instead, Blair has, between 9/11 and 7/7 adapted his views into the existing discursive environment.

In the speeches from the Conservative party after 9/11, the discourse on immigration toughens, but there are not any links drawn between terrorism and national cohesion. This is probably because 9/11 is viewed as an attack from the outside, and the party makes use of an 'us vs. them discourse', which also shows they view it as a foreign threat. Therefore, the diversity in Britain is generally not seen as a problem in relation to terrorism. However, as it is also the case with the Labour Party, a security discourse slowly emerges after 9/11, and it is connected to terrorism. This security discourse helps both parties take a stricter stance towards the issue of immigration. In this way, the discourses that were prevalent in Britain at the time have created a discursive environment in which it is not out of order to take precautionary measures such as tightening immigration to Britain. Thus, the discourse of security that both the parties have drawn upon has reproduced in the public's MR and made them more open to immigration restrictions. This is the environment in which the 2005 general election takes place, and this shows in the discourse.

As I found in the previous analysis, Labour changes its course on immigration before the general election of 2005. Blair's talk about immigration accelerates when the general election is near. Therefore, it is obvious that the reason Blair made this shift, was that he wanted to secure enough votes to win the election. Immigration was a topic that the Conservative party took very seriously, and since British society had changed into becoming more concerned with immigration, Blair



would also have to change. So, a possible explanation as to why Labour made a course shift in its politics could be that it was following the general trend in Britain. It should, however, also be noted that the enlargement of the European Union in 2004 resulted in a large influx of labor from Eastern European countries because Britain was one of the few countries that allowed almost unrestricted access of labor from the new accession countries to enter Britain (Drinkwater et al., 2009, p. 161). In fact, Salt and Rees (2006) argue that the emigration from the new EU countries to the UK resulted in a large increase in immigration to Britain (p. 6). Therefore, it is inevitable that Blair has also been affected by this fact when he decides to make a speech about immigration.

However, as I also found in the analysis, Blair did not seem comfortable talking about restricting immigration. As mentioned in Chapter 4, Foucault believed that once a person has gotten a powerful position in society, that person will try to justify their use of power. Furthermore, I also mentioned that the power can be advantageous for the person using it. So, when Blair continuously seeks to legitimize his views on immigration, it is probably not because he does not want to take a firmer stance on the issue; it is more likely because he needs to legitimize it in order for the people to accept it. And this is because it is not the 'traditional' Labour ideology, which is normally pro-immigration. So, by presenting his view that immigration must be restricted, Blair is saying to the public that it is alright to share this view and that it is in their best interest. The way he shows that it is in their best interest, is to draw on discourses such as the 'danger vs. security' and the 'rights vs. obligations' discourse. Thus, what Blair has done is that he has changed the previous Labour discourse into being one that has a tougher stance towards immigration.

In the year leading up to the general election of 2005, the Conservative Party maintains their firm stance towards immigration, but talks about it more positively. This could have something to do with the fact that the BNP is becoming more pronounced at this point in time, and both being on the right side of the political centre, the Conservatives do not want to risk being put in the same box as the anti-immigration and alleged racist BNP. They also explicitly criticize the BNP and thereby take official distance from them. Thus, this could very well be the reason that the Conservative party starts talking more positively about immigration. The reason they would take such distance from the BNP is that, at this point in time, there is a growing critique and dissatisfaction with the BNP in Britain. Due to the rejection of racism and prejudice, the mainstream British society is most likely shocked that the BNP is able to become increasingly popular. Thus, there is a heavy criticism of the party within Britain, and the Conservative party joins this position.

Nevertheless, the 7/7 bombings changed the political climate once again. As described in Chapter 4, according to Foucault, whenever a discourse has become culturally available, it is possible for the powerful people in society to make use of it to their own advantage. After the 7/7 bombings, Blair wanted to take a firmer stance on immigration, but it seemed like he was constantly excusing himself for talking about it and finding ways to legitimize his change. This is probably connected to the fact that, traditionally, Labour is very pro-immigration. However, in the aftermath of the London bombings, there is a shift in British society, where suddenly many people demand more control on the issue of immigration and integration because Muslims were increasingly associated with fear and suspicion (Copsey, 2011, p. 67). This puts Blair in a position where he has to find a balance between holding on to the core Labour values, which a large part of the electorate still agree to, while at the same time pleasing the public in general. Thus, he has to justify his use of power. This also backs Foucault's claim that different discourses are characteristic of different periods in history, and they reflect the culture, norms and knowledge of that period, as I mentioned in Chapter 4. So whereas before the terrorist attacks in the US and Britain, Labour would hardly draw on discourses critical of immigration and immigrants, after the incidents, Labour has been able to become more critical due to the prevalent knowledge and norms in society.

Within the Conservative party, after the 7/7 bombings the issue of terrorism was still not connected to the multiculturalism of Britain, and until Cameron became the party leader the relatively positive multiculturalist discourse prevailed. However, as I found in the analysis, the discourse concerning values changed after this. In January 2006, Cameron talked about the new values which included, among others, freedom of speech. At this point in time, as previously mentioned, the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis was prominent in the media, and a debate had been sparked about Western values of free speech and free press. So, when Cameron suddenly decides to draw on these values, it must be connected to the international situation. In this way, Cameron is creating knowledge about what the values in Britain should be and that all people in Britain should adhere to these values. This means, that if someone has values which do not approve of free speech and press, they are not British. Ultimately, since the debate is about many Muslims not believing in freedom of press and thus free speech, Cameron is pointing out that they cannot become British and thus part of British society. By talking about it in these terms, he projects this knowledge on to the people thus changing their MR, giving them the impression that Western values contradict the values of many Muslims.

Similarly, Blair also focused a lot on Muslims after the 7/7 bombings, and he persistently talked about how the ideology of extremism was what they were up against. So, both parties made a change in focus after 7/7. This also reflects in the wider trend in Britain at the time. Copsey and Macklin (2011) write that after the 7/7 bombings, the British media showed opposition to multiculturalism. One example was when the BBC showed speeches of Enoch Powell and “appeared to operate on the premise that, in the wake of the 2001 riots and the 7/7 bombings, multiculturalism had failed, and Powell’s dystopian image of racial conflict had to a large extent come to fruition” (p. 68). Powell warned about immigration and multiculturalist policies in his 1968 speech (The Telegraph, 2007), and if one compares this to the events of 7/7, his *rivers of blood* metaphor is given new life. So what this suggests is that the 7/7 bombings had a major impact on the general shift away from multiculturalism in Britain.

Although the discourses of the speeches suggest a move away from multiculturalism, it is interesting to consider what McGhee (2008) writes in his assessment of the failure of multiculturalism. He says “In many ways this retreat from and open hostility to multiculturalism is, on examination, an exercise in avoiding using the term *multiculturalism* rather than moving away from the principles of multiculturalism altogether” (p. 85). And for this reason he prefers to call it “the rather confused retreat from multiculturalism” (ibid). The point McGhee is making here is interesting, because, as I also found in my analysis of the speeches, the word multiculturalism hardly ever appears (except from David Cameron’s speeches). Thus, this avoiding of the term was very clear throughout all the speeches. In connection with this, McGhee, referring to Brubaker, also writes about how there can be:

“shifts in the boundaries of legitimate discourse in liberal democracies where previously accepted modes of discourse (for example multiculturalism) may become stigmatized and excluded; but, on the other hand, previously illegitimate and effectively marginalized themes may gain a foothold in public debate (for example, suggestions that ‘the veil’ and the lack of English skills in foreign spouses are sources of, or barriers to integration.” (p. 86)

Comparing this to my findings, it makes sense when explaining why the word *multiculturalism* is almost never used in speeches from both parties. Because if the dominating discourses in British society is avoiding the word ‘multiculturalism’, this will ultimately affect the politicians’ use or lack of use of the word. Similarly, this would also explain the increased use of integration

discourses that is taking place within both of the parties in later years. As politicians adopt this strategy of not talking explicitly about multiculturalism, they will reproduce the public's MR on the subject, and in this way it will contribute to the whole society moving away from it. In this way, it is done very subtly, which means people may not think much about it, but still slowly accept it. In the following, I will look further into Cameron's explicit move away from multiculturalism, which was something that stirred a great debate on the issue in Britain and resulted in a lot of criticism towards him in 2011.

In the analysis of Cameron's speeches, I found that he clearly rejects multiculturalism as a state practice and that he draws on an explicit 'anti-multiculturalism' discourse. Cameron's predecessors generally talked very little about issues of social cohesion and integration. They were more focused on keeping immigrants out so to speak. Therefore, Cameron signaled a clear shift for the party's course. As I wrote in Chapter 4, certain conditions in society may make certain representations more suitable than others at certain points in time, according to Foucault. When Cameron makes his shift, Europe in general is in a transition phase, where countries demand more of immigrants and do not tolerate separate communities within societies. Furthermore, as McGhee notes, the word multiculturalism had, within the British public policy become a "pejorative term associated with 'social bads' such as perceived favouritism, preferential treatment and the competition for scarce resources" (2008, p. 106). Furthermore, Cameron's increased focus on social cohesion also happens at a time when this issue is highly debated in Britain due to the 2001 riots and the Cantle Report following these. The Cantle report discussed the problems that come with multiculturalism, such as parallel societies which can ultimately result in riots like the 2001 Spring Riots (Cantle, 2006). Therefore, Cameron's new ideas fit within this British as well as larger European trend. Thus, Cameron's use of this discourse may be somewhat unintentional, because it is a symptom of the changing times and a discourse which is already being drawn upon in other centre-right parties in Europe.

As the 2010 general election approaches, Cameron has already established this anti-multiculturalism discourse within the British society and can therefore draw on it in order to attract more votes. Because his discourse is part of and result of the general trend, many people will also find it appealing. And because the people are ready for it, he can get their votes. The fact that Cameron won the 2010 general election confirms this. It should, however, also be noted that during his leadership, Cameron has changed the ideological ground for the Conservatives. According to

Ingles (2008), Cameron managed to change the politics that Thatcher had introduced and which had been maintained by her successors until Cameron. Cameron returned to traditional conservatism as it was before Thatcher (p. 39). Thus, although the Conservative party won the latest election, it does not necessarily mean that it did so because Britain has become more immigrant-hostile. Rather, it means that the Conservative party has changed its ideology and is therefore appealing to more people. In a way, Labour and the Conservatives have moved closer ideologically by both displaying immigrant-friendly views, as long as it does not compromise integration and national cohesion.

Although Labour's view on diversity had also changed in the 11 year time frame of this analysis, this was not enough to secure their victory in 2010. Their discourse on diversity went from being very positive and focusing on the tolerance and equality of all people, to requiring more on the immigrant's part. Copey and Macklin (2011) write that, after 7/7, Labour moved away from multiculturalism "towards a strategy of integration" (p. 67). This is confirmed by the increased demand for language skills and knowledge of British society that Labour mentions in the newer speeches. All in all, what this suggests is that Labour, as well as the Conservatives, has increasingly been drawing of discourses of integration rather than multiculturalism in later years. At the same time, the two parties, and especially David Cameron, has reproduced the discourse of multiculturalism and thereby created a counter discourse which instead of emphasizing the multicultural society, emphasizes unity and national cohesion, but not in an immigrant-hostile tone.

## Chapter 8

### Discussion

In this chapter, I will discuss my findings from the analysis and place them in a European perspective in order to find out if the move away from multiculturalism in Britain could possibly be part of a wider European trend. I will take as my point of departure the main debates for the move away from multiculturalism as outlined in the literature review. What I found there was that there are two debates which dominate the literature. On the one hand, there are those who question whether Britain has in fact moved away from multiculturalism. On the other, there are those who do believe there has been a shift and who discuss the reasons for this. In this chapter, I will continue the discussion of these two areas and compare them to my own findings from the analysis.

#### 8.1. Where is Britain Headed?

First, I will address the debate about whether Britain is in fact moving away from multiculturalism and if so, if Britain is moving towards assimilation or integration. From looking at the discourses that were drawn upon in the speeches, it was obvious that the current PM David Cameron has decided to turn his back on multiculturalism, and the discourse that showed in his speeches showed hints of assimilation. This also goes for the Labour Party's discourse, and both parties supported the demands for immigrants to learn the English language and acquire knowledge of British society, history and culture. In the literature review, I wrote that Castles and Miller claim that the main reason for the decline of multiculturalism is in fact the failure of integration of immigrants. Thus, what both the parties are emphasizing is, in fact, to minimize this factor, which has been the primary reason for the failure of multiculturalism.

Although the parties' focus on immigrant integration is similar to what lies in the concept of assimilation, there might still be some elements of multiculturalism left. At least, this is what McGhee (2008) concludes in his analysis of the British political discourse, when he writes that

“The principles of multiculturalism endure at the ‘local level’ (however the term itself has become taboo). In ‘national level debates’, however, Britain has entered an authoritarian ‘anti-

multiculturalism' period in which multiple identities, loyalties and allegiances are both being problematized and deployed in order to facilitate 'our' primary identification as British citizens who must accept British values above all else." (p. 145)

The quote confirms what I found about the increased focus on specific values which are not only British, but more general Western values. Thus, the new focus on values implies some kind of 'us vs. them' discourse which distinguishes between those who hold the right values and thus belong in Britain, and those who have different values and therefore do not belong in Britain. In this way, the universalism of Britain as a liberal state comes to stand in contrast to the particularism that a multiculturalist nation requires. Thus, Jabri's explanation of the move away from multiculturalism as being due to a clash between the universalism of the liberal state and multiculturalism as a state ideology fits very well with my findings. In addition to this, I also found that the values that are presented as the British values do clash with the values of many Muslims in particular, which suggest that Britain is harshening the tone towards this particular religious minority.

This quote also supports what I found in the analysis about the 'anti-multiculturalism discourse', and although McGhee's analysis was conducted a couple of years ago (in 2008), it still holds true to the development that is taking place today now that the Conservative Party is in government instead of Labour. What this shows is that in spite of their different ideological positions, the two parties are drawing on some of the same discourses when speaking about multiculturalism, which could be because their development is part of a wider trend. Furthermore, what McGhee is saying is similar to what I also wrote in the literature review about Gary Freeman's suggestion of a trend which is not assimilation, but integration, that is, one "that rejects permanent exclusion but neither demands assimilation nor embraces formal multiculturalism" (p. 945). Also, I found in the analysis of the speeches that both of the parties are strong proponents of cultural diversity, which does not fit into the practice of assimilation. Therefore, my findings support the view that Britain is moving away from discourses that accept cultural separatism as multiculturalism does, and towards policies that accept that immigrants hold on to their own culture, as long as it does not conflict with British values and they can speak the language, which can be difficult for many non-Western immigrants.

Apart from the increased focus on the significance of values, I also found, through my analysis, that Labour's Gordon Brown was talking about favoring highly skilled immigrants in the future, and the discourses of rights vs. obligations, in general, suggested that in order for people to be allowed into Britain in the future, they would have to be able to contribute positively to British society. Joppke

(2007) writes that European states today are making “dualistic immigration policies” (p.8) that combine immigration with integration policies, and which favor highly skilled immigrants and makes it hard for low skilled immigrants to get in. Thus, these civic integration measures hit especially hard on the low skilled. Joppke also writes that in the Netherlands, which, like Britain, has seen a retreat from multiculturalism, the dualistic immigration policies have served to decrease immigration numbers and make sure that family migration in particular is reduced. Furthermore, he writes that family migration to the Netherlands is mostly consisting of Muslims, which means the state is putting a halt to Muslim immigration (ibid). This form of civic integration policy, according to Joppke, is implemented throughout Europe in different versions, and thus it is not unlikely that Britain has now also become part of this trend.

Joppke also writes that just because the European countries have changed to civic integration, it should not be explained with nationalism and racism. He says “These policies are carefully observing the dividing line between ‘integration’, which leaves the ethnical orientation of the migrant intact, and ‘assimilation’, which does not” (Joppke, 2007, p. 14). Rather, he points to the explanation given by Desmond King, who claims that it is an inherent part of liberalism that the balance between rights and duties will shift. Thus, Joppke points to the explanation being that the shift is now on duties (ibid). Again, this fits with my own findings that there has been an increase in the demands that are put on immigrants in Britain.

However, as Joppke later points out, explaining the turn to civic integration as a part of liberalism does not hold true when one looks at Canada and Australia which are both liberal countries that have optional integration measures as opposed to the “repressive” European ones. Therefore, the answer must be that the majority of people that enter these two countries are highly skilled immigrants that can easily adapt, as opposed to the ones that come to Europe which are more often low skilled and problematic to adapt. Thus, Joppke concludes that “the obligatory and repressive dimension of civic integration in Europe cannot be decoupled from the non-selected quality of most of its immigrants” (2007, pp. 18-19). So, as I found in my analysis, Britain is eager to attract more high skilled immigration to the country, and if Britain introduces policies of integration rather than multiculturalism, the country will be able to attract the people it wants rather than the “non-selected” people who have previously dominated the picture. Therefore, the ‘anti-multiculturalism’ discourse will be more beneficial for the country.



From the above discussion of the literature , and from my own analysis, I can conclude that Britain is moving away from multiculturalism towards integration. However, diversity is still in high regard in both major political parties. Nevertheless, there has been much speculation since 9/11 and 7/7 whether the failure of integration of Muslims in Britain is to blame for the shift away from multiculturalism, or whether the reason should be found elsewhere, e.g. in a wider trend. In the following, I will investigate this trend further.

## **8.2. European Trend?**

As I mentioned previously, there is in Europe a general trend of toughened immigration policies as well as stricter demands for incorporation of immigrants, and McGhee argues that multiculturalism in the EU has been on the retreat since 9/11 (2008, p. 2). The tone in the Netherlands and France has sharpened dramatically as both countries are now alleged of forcing assimilatory measures on its foreign citizens. In Denmark the integration minister has said that the word integration should be replaced with the word assimilation (DR Nyhederne, 2011). Germany is a country which has received large amounts of immigrants despite calling itself a non-immigration country. Nevertheless, Germany has had an increasingly restrictive integration and immigration policy (Green, 2004). Thus, there is no doubt that Britain is not alone in the restricting of immigration and the harshening of incorporation strategies.

Nevertheless, when looking more broadly across Europe, there seems to also be other explanations as to why the countries are tightening their immigration and incorporation demands than merely the presence of Muslims. For example, there are economic reasons related to the costs of supporting immigrants and, as mentioned, the high presence of low skilled immigration is something that makes countries limit immigration that is not beneficial to the country. However, almost whatever reason one can find as to why countries would tighten immigration and make more demands for incorporation, Muslim immigrants are always mentioned.

Thus, a reason that is often mentioned for Europe's stricter course is the large presence of Muslim minorities who are not very well integrated into the different countries as well as a general fear of Islam and terrorism (Castles and Miller, 2009, p. 275). Furthermore, Joppke writes that "With its new stress on civic integration, however, the liberal state is becoming more assertive about its liberal principles, and shows itself less willing to see them violated under the cloak of

‘multicultural’ toleration” (2004, p. 252). Since Britain has experienced a lot of controversy with its Muslim minority as during the Rushdie affair and the London Bombings of 2005, the new visions for immigration that indirectly limit the access given to Muslims, and the harsher incorporation demands, are indications that Britain is also part of the harshening European tone towards Muslims. However, as Giddens points out:

“The fact that the UK has produced some home-grown jihadist terrorists has been widely deployed as ammunition in the battle against multiculturalism. But it has virtually nothing to do with the overall state of cultural and ethnic relations in the country. It only needs a tiny number of individuals to mount a terrorist act, especially if they get assistance from abroad. It should not be surprising if they are well-educated and "British" in much of their lifestyle. The sentiments that produce radicalisation do not come from general feelings of alienation or exclusion. They are more likely to be driven by religiosity, combined with ideas about social justice and world politics.” (2006)

What Giddens suggests here is that although Muslims may be indirectly blamed for the move away from multiculturalism, there is no proper backing for that claim, and therefore, the wrong people may in fact be targeted. This leads me to think that it is possible that the British politicians have been able to make use of the public ‘fear of Islam’ to legalize their move away from multiculturalism. By drawing on a ‘security discourse’ and connecting it to British values and failed incorporation of foreigners and indirectly Muslim minorities, Muslims as a minority group become the scapegoat, when the real reason could just be that it is more beneficial for the country to limit all non-Western immigration regardless of people’s beliefs.

Nevertheless, I found in my analysis that the 7/7 bombings did have a large impact on the move away from multiculturalism in Britain. However, although 7/7 happened in Britain and was very influential in Britain’s move away from multiculturalism, it still affected the rest of the European countries as well, because they all felt it was an attack on them too. This can be attributed to the common western values that all the countries share. So an attack on a Western country is an attack on the whole Western world. Thus, although 7/7 took place in Britain, the fact that Britain is part of Europe and that there is a community feeling across Europe, makes the move away from multiculturalism seem a common trend in Europe. In this respect, it is also necessary to take into consideration that the clash between some Muslims and Europeans have taken place outside Britain.

Examples are: the 2004 Madrid bombings, the Muhammad Cartoon Crisis as well as several minor attacks.

To sum up this discussion, I have found that Britain is undoubtedly moving away from multiculturalism as a state practice. Although the country has never had an official multiculturalist state policy, it has implemented many laws that have been of a multicultural nature. Discursively, the retreat has been long underway, which was especially seen in the fact the word itself has hardly been used. Furthermore, the current PM has explicitly stated that multiculturalism as a state practice has failed. Instead, the country is moving towards an emphasis on civic integration, which suits the premises of the universalism of the liberal state better. Although several European countries are moving towards what looks like assimilation, Britain's approach is more modest as diversity is still highly important to the British. Nevertheless, the values that Britain is promoting are general Western values that all the other European countries are also promoting. Thus, the European countries are all moving in the same direction, which leads me to the conclusion that Britain is part of a wider European trend that epitomizes certain values as prerequisites for membership thus creating filter that sorts out many non-Western immigrants.

## Chapter 9

### Conclusion

The objective of this thesis was to investigate the alleged retreat from multiculturalism in Western Europe, and Britain in particular. Through a CDA of speeches from the selected British politicians from 2000 to 2011, I sought to answer my research question: *What role have discourses used by the two major political parties in Britain played in the turn away from multiculturalism, and what are the possible reasons for this change?* In this chapter, I will briefly sum up my central findings from the thesis, as well as discuss the value of these results and areas for supplementary research.

The literature review revealed important focus points for the thesis and suggested that 9/11 and 7/7 are crucial for the retreat, due to the growing feelings of suspicions towards foreigners as well as the increased focus on successful integration of foreigners in British society. It also suggested that the presence of Muslims in particular could be the reason for the retreat. With the findings of the literature in mind, I conducted the analysis, in which I found that although the word multiculturalism has almost never been used in the speeches, multiculturalism was previously supported by politicians from both the Labour Party and the Conservative Party. However, this is no longer the case, as both parties are now drawing on discourses which have assimilationist elements which reflect an increased demand for collective British identity, values, and national cohesion.

The results I got from this thesis showed that, although rather old, Foucault's ideas about power, history and knowledge can still be relevantly applied today. I found that the developments in knowledge and history have a large impact on the dominance of certain discourses over others, and that the dominant discourses have a great deal of power over society and the actions of people within it. However, I also found that there is indeed a dialectic relationship between the language of politicians and their surroundings, which means that although politicians are certainly highly influential in affecting their surroundings, they are also subjected to changes from society which also affects them. This is what Fairclough refers to as the reproductive effects of discourse and society.

For this reason, I find that it could have been very interesting to also look at the role of the media in this thesis. Media have a large impact on politicians as they, to a large extent, constitute the link between politicians and the public. It would have been extremely beneficial for me to include an analysis of this relationship by also analyzing the role of the media in this retreat from multiculturalism. However, it was not possible due to the spatial restrictions of this thesis and, instead, I chose to look solely at the role of politicians.

Another area of research which would also have helped support my findings is if I had made a comparative analysis with a country such as Canada, which has in fact successfully implemented multiculturalism as a state policy. It would have been interesting to investigate how politicians in Canada reacted discursively to the 9/11 and 7/7 incidents and whether these incidents had any implications on their stance towards multiculturalism. Furthermore, the claim that there is a clash between the universalism of Western democracies and multiculturalism would have been interesting to compare to the case of Canada. Because Canada is so different and yet so similar to the case of Britain, a comparative analysis of the two cases could possibly have brought different aspects to the analysis.

This thesis has confirmed that, at least discursively, there has been a move away from multiculturalism in Britain. However, multiculturalism as a state practice is almost never mentioned, except by Cameron. Therefore, the analysis has not provided much insight into how the politicians' view on this topic has evolved in the 11 years. A policy analysis of the actually implemented policies could support the findings I have made, and establish whether Britain has in fact moved away from multiculturalism in practice as well. Although the thesis does not include such a policy analysis, there were many references to ambitions for policy changes within the speeches of the two parties. In both cases, the two parties talked about implementing laws which indirectly diminish practices of multiculturalism. Furthermore, both of the parties suggested measures to limit immigration so as to restrict entry for all non-high skilled immigrants. This is also in line with the current European trend on immigration issues. Therefore, I found that the contents of the speeches did somewhat satisfy my curiosity for the retreat of multiculturalism in practice.

Since previous discursal analyses of British political rhetoric have mostly been concerned with the Labour Party, this thesis has also analyzed the discourses drawn upon by the Conservative Party,

and therefore presents an assessment that reaches across the political spectrum in Britain thus representing a broader view on the issue of multiculturalism. What can be concluded from this thesis is that the discourses that the British politicians have drawn upon when treating subjects of - or connected to- multiculturalism have been affected by both the British society and the International community. Therefore, the retreat from multiculturalism in Britain is more a part of a general trend in Europe than it is part of a specifically British smear campaign against immigrants. Additionally, the retreat from multiculturalism seems to be more a practical solution than an act of racism or nationalism.

## References

- Barker, Chris., Galasiński, Dariusz. (2001). *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: SAGE Publications
- BBC News (2004, April 26). *Is this man the Left's Enoch Powell?* Retrieved June 28, 2011, from [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/magazine/3652679.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/magazine/3652679.stm)
- BBC News (2011, February 5). *State multiculturalism has failed, says David Cameron*. Retrieved June 28, 2011 from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12371994>
- Bevir, Mark. (1999). Foucault and Critique: Deploying Agency Against Autonomy. *Political Theory*, 27(1), 65-84
- Blair, Tony. (2000a, March 2). *Active Community Convention and Awards*. Retrieved on June 15, 2011, from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page1515>
- Blair, Tony. (2000b, June 30). *Prime Minister's Speech to the Global Ethics Foundation, Tübingen University, Germany*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://keepTonyBlairforPM.wordpress.com/blair-speech-transcripts-from-1997-2007/>
- Blair, Tony. (2001a, January 28). *PM's speech on the Holocaust*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20061004085342/number10.gov.uk/page7446>
- Blair, Tony. (2001b, September 14). *Full text of Blair's speech to the Commons*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2001/sep/14/houseofcommons.uk1>
- Blair, Tony. (2001c, October 2). *Full text: Tony Blair's speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2001/oct/02/labourconference.labour6> (part one), and <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2001/oct/02/labourconference.labour7> (part two)
- Blair, Tony. (2001d, November 12). *Full text of Blair's speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/nov/13/september11.usa1>

Blair, Tony. (2001e, November 22). *Full text of Blair's speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/nov/23/euro.eu1>

Blair, Tony. (2002a, April 8). *Full text of Tony Blair's speech in Texas*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2002/apr/08/foreignpolicy.iraq>

Blair, Tony. (2002b, November 11). *PM speech at the Lord Mayor's banquet*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page1731>

Blair, Tony. (2003a, July 18). *Tony Blair's speech to the US congress*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2003/jul/18/iraq.speeches>

Blair, Tony. (2004a, April 27). *Full text: Blair's migration speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/apr/27/immigrationpolicy.speeches>

Blair, Tony. (2004b, September 28). *Full text: Blair's conference speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/sep/28/labourconference.labour6> (part one), and <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/sep/28/labourconference.labour5> (part two)

Blair, Tony. (2005a, February 14): *Full text: Blair's spring conference speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2005/feb/14/labour.speeches>

Blair, Tony. (2005b, April 22). *Full text: Tony Blair's speech on asylum and immigration*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2005/apr/22/election2005.immigrationandpublicservices>

Blair, Tony. (2005c, July 16). *Full text: Blair speech on terror*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/4689363.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4689363.stm)

Blair, Tony. (2005d, September 27). *Tony Blair's conference speech 2005*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/sep/27/labourconference.speeches>

Blair, Tony. (2006, September 12). *Full text of Tony Blair's speech to the TUC*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2006/sep/12/tradeunions.speeches>



Bloemraad, Irene., Korteweg, Anna. & Yurdakul, Gökçe. (2008). Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34, 153-179

Brown, Gordon. (2007a, June 24). *Leadership acceptance speech, 2007*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=216>

Brown, Gordon. (2007b, September 24). *Leader's speech, Bournemouth 2007*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from: <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=179>

Brown, Gordon. (2009, September 29). *Leader's speech, Brighton 2009*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=181>

Brubaker, Rogers. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (4), 531-548

Bryman, Alan (2008): *Social Research Methods*. Oxford University Press Inc.

Burr, Vivien. (2003). *Social Constructionism*. Routledge: East Sussex

Cameron, David. (2005, December 6). *Speech after being announced as the new Conservative Party Leader*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.totalpolitics.com/speeches/conservative/conservative-politics-general/34988/speech-after-being-announced-as-the-new-conservative-party-leader.shtml>

Cameron, David. (2006a, January 26). *Cameron: Politicians should never claim patriotism for one party*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from [http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2006/01/Cameron\\_Politicians\\_should\\_never\\_claim\\_patriotism\\_for\\_one\\_party.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2006/01/Cameron_Politicians_should_never_claim_patriotism_for_one_party.aspx)

Cameron, David. (2006b, October 4). *Leader's speech, Bournemouth 2006*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=151>

Cameron, David. (2006c, November 29). *David Cameron speech to Ethnic Media Conference*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from

[http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2006/11/David\\_Cameron\\_speech\\_to\\_Ethnic\\_Media\\_Conference.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2006/11/David_Cameron_speech_to_Ethnic_Media_Conference.aspx)

Cameron, David.(2007a, January 29). *David Cameron: Bringing down the barriers to cohesion*.

Retrieved June 15, 2011, from:

[http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2007/01/David\\_Cameron\\_Bringing\\_down\\_the\\_barriers\\_to\\_cohesion.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2007/01/David_Cameron_Bringing_down_the_barriers_to_cohesion.aspx)

Cameron, David. (2007b, December 10). *David Cameron: Stronger Together*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from

[http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2007/12/David\\_Cameron\\_Stronger\\_Together.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2007/12/David_Cameron_Stronger_Together.aspx)

Cameron, David. (2008, February 26). *David Cameron: Extremism, individual rights and the rule of law in Britain*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from

[http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2008/02/David\\_Cameron\\_Extremism\\_individual\\_rights\\_and\\_the\\_rule\\_of\\_law\\_in\\_Britain.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2008/02/David_Cameron_Extremism_individual_rights_and_the_rule_of_law_in_Britain.aspx)

Cameron, David. (2011, February 5). *PM's speech at Munich Security Conference*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/speeches-and-transcripts/2011/02/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference-60293>

Cantle, Ted. (2006). *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team*. Home Office. Retrieved June 29, 2011 from

<http://resources.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/Publications/Documents/Document/DownloadDocumentsFile.aspx?recordId=96&file=PDFversion>

Castles, Stephen., & Miller, Mark J. (2009). *The age of Migration: International population movements I the modern world*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillian

Chilton, Paul. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London; New York: Routledge

Copsey, Nigel., & Macklin, Graham. (eds). (2011). *British National Party: Contemporary Perspectives*. Oxon; New York: Routledge

Drinkwater, Stephen., Eade, John., & Garapich, Michal. (2009). Poles Apart? EU Enlargement and the Labour Market Outcomes of Immigrants in the United Kingdom. *International Migration*, 47(1), 161-190

Douven, Igor. (2011). *Abduction*. Retrieved June 29, 2011, from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/abduction/>

DR Nyhederne. (2011, March 9) *Assimilering? Assimilation? Integration?* Retrieved June 25, 2011, from <http://www.dr.dk/Nyheder/Indland/2011/03/09/102045.htm>

Entzinger, Han (2003). Changing the Rules while the Game is on; From Multiculturalism to Assimilation in the Netherlands. In Y. Michal Bodemann & Gökçe Yurdakul, Eds. (2006) *Migration, Citizenship, Ethnos: Incorporation Regimes in Germany, Western Europe and North America*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, pp 121-144.

Fairclough, Norman. (2001). *Language and Power*. London: Pearson Esl.

Fairclough, Norman. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge

Foucault, Michel. (1973). *The Order of Things. An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Random House Inc

Freeman, Gary. (2004). Immigrant Incorporation in Western Democracies. *International Migration Review*, 38 (3), 945-969

Giddens, Anthony. (2006, October 14). *Misunderstanding multiculturalism*. Retrieved June 5, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2006/oct/14/tonygiddens>

Givens, Terri E. (2007). Immigrant integration in Europe: Empirical research. *Annual Review of Political Science* 10, 67-83

Goodhart, David. (2004, February 20). *Too Diverse?* Retrieved June 28, 2011, from <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/2004/02/too-diverse-david-goodhart-multiculturalism-britain-immigration-globalisation/>

Green, Simon (2004). *The politics of exclusion: Institutions and immigration policy in contemporary Germany*. Manchester; New York: Manchester University Press

Hague, William (2000, October 5). *Leader's speech Bournemouth 2000*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=146>

Hague, William (2001, March 4). *Foreign Land Speech to Spring Conference*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.totalpolitics.com/speeches/conservative/conservatism/34728/foreign-land-speech-to-spring-conference.shtml>

Howard, Michael. (2003c, November 26). *Reply to the Queen's speech 2003*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.totalpolitics.com/speeches/parliament/queens-speech-opposition-replies/33618/reply-to-the-queens-speech-2003.shtml>

Howard, Michael. (2004a, February 19). *Full text: Michael Howard's Burnley speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2004/feb/19/conservatives.uk1>

Howard, Michael. (2004b, October 5). *Leader's speech, Bournemouth 2004*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=150>

Howard, Michael. (2005a, July 11). *Michael Howard's Commons speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk\\_news/politics/4673083.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/4673083.stm)

Howard, Michael. (2005b, October 6). *Full text: Michael Howard's farewell speech as Tory leader*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2005/oct/06/conservatives2005.conservatives3>

Ingle, Stephen. (2008). *The British Party System: An Introduction*. Oxon, New York: Routledge.

Jabri, Vivienne. Security, Multiculturalism, and the Cosmopolis. In Stephens, Angharad Closs., Vaughan-Williams, Nick. (eds.) (2009). *Terrorism and the Politics of Response*. Oxon; New York: Routledge

Joppke, Christian. (2004). The retreat of Multiculturalism in the Liberal state: theory and policy. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 55 (2), 237-257

Joppke, Christian (2006). *Immigrants and Civic Integration in Western Europe*. Retrieved June 10, 2011, from <http://www.irpp.org/books/archive/AOTS3/joppke.pdf>

Joppke, Christian. (2007). Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics*, 30 (1), 1-22

Julios, Christina. (2008). *Contemporary British Identity: English language, Migrants and Public Discourse*. Hampshire; Burlington: Ashgate

Kincheloe, Joe L., & Steinberg, Shirley R. (2002). *Changing Multiculturalism*. Buckingham; Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Kymlicka, Will. The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism? New Debates on Inclusion and Accommodation in Diverse Societies. In Vertovec, Steven, & Wessendorf, Susanne. (2010). *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. London; New York: Routledge

Laver, Michael, Benoit, Kenneth, & Garry, John. (2003). Extracting Policy Positions from Political Texts using Words as Data. *American Political Science Review* 97 (2), 311-331

Malik, Maleiha. Progressive Multiculturalism: The British Experience. In Silj, Alessandro (ed). (2010). *European multiculturalism revisited*. London; New York: Zed Books

McGhee, Derek. (2008). *The end of multiculturalism? Terrorism, integration and human rights*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Milliband, Edward. (2010a, September 25). *Acceptance speech 25/9/10*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://edmiliband.org/speeches/acceptance-speech-labour-conference/>

Milliband, Edward. (2010b, September 28). *Leader's speech 28/9/10*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://edmiliband.org/speeches/leaders-speech-2010/>

Mitchell, Katharyne. (2004). Geographies of Identity: multiculturalism unplugged. *Progress in Human Geography* 28 (5), 641-651

National Association for Multiculturalist Education: <http://nameorg.org/>

Nillson, Roddy. (2009). *Michel Foucault: En Introduktion*. København: Hans Reitzels Forlag

O' Halloran, Kieran. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Language Cognition*. Edinburgh: Edingburgh University Press

Oliver, Paul. (2010). *Foucault: the Key Ideas*. London: teach yourself

Salt, John., Rees, Phil. (2006). *Globalisation, population mobility and impact of migration on population*. ESRC Public Policy Seminar Series. Retrieved June 29, 2011, from [http://www.yorkshirefutures.com/system/files/ww\\_docs/GAA11%20Population%20Globalisation%20and%20Impact%20of%20Migration.pdf](http://www.yorkshirefutures.com/system/files/ww_docs/GAA11%20Population%20Globalisation%20and%20Impact%20of%20Migration.pdf)

Schou Nielsen, Pernille. (2007). *Tag ordet og brug det! Om sprogets betydning for integration*. København: Frydenlund

Silj, Alessandro (ed). (2010). *European multiculturalism revisited*. London; New York: Zed Books

Silverman, David. (2006). *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. Oxford: Sage Publications Ltd

Smith, Iain Duncan. (2001, October 10). *Full text: Iain Duncan Smith's speech*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2001/oct/10/conservatives2001.conservatives4>

Smith, Iain Duncan. (2003a, March 2003). *A Fair Deal for Everyone*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.totalpolitics.com/speeches/conservative/conservatism/34548/a-fair-deal-for-everyone.thtml>

Smith, Iain Duncan. (2003b, October 9). *Leader's speech, Blackpool 2003*. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=149>

Stephens, Angharad Closs., Vaughan-Williams, Nick. (eds.) (2009). *Terrorism and the Politics of Response*. Oxon; New York: Routledge

The Telegraph. (2007, November 6). *Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech*. Retrieved July 20, 2011, from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3643823/Enoch-Powells-Rivers-of-Blood-speech.html>

Verkuyten, Maykel. (2005). "Immigration discourses and their impact on multiculturalism: A discursive and experimental study". *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44, 223-240

Vertovec, Steven, & Wessendorf, Susanne. (2010). *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*. London; New York: Routledge

Wehmeier, Sally (2007): *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, Ruth., & Krzyzanowski, Michał (eds). 2008. *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Houndmills; Basingstoke; Hampshire, New York: Palgrave Macmillan

Illustration on front page retrieved on July 23, 2011, from <http://thegrouhotendency.blogspot.com/2011/02/multiculturalism-is-dead-long-live.html>