DISCOURSE APPROACHES TO POLITICS, SOCIETY AND CULTURE

Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World

Adrian Blackledge

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World

Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture

The series includes contributions that investigate political, social and cultural processes from a linguistic/discourse-analytic point of view. The aim is to publish monographs and edited volumes which combine language-based approaches with disciplines concerned essentially with human interaction — disciplines such as political science, international relations, social psychology, social anthropology, sociology, economics, and gender studies.

The book series complements the *Journal of Language and Politics*, edited by Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton.

Volume 15

Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World
by Adrian Blackledge

Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World

Adrian Blackledge
University of Birmingham

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Blackledge, Adrian.
Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World / Adrian Blackledge.
p. cm. (Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture, ISSN 1569–9463 ; v. 15)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Discourse analysis--Political aspects. 2. Language and languages. I. Title. II. Series.

P302.77.B53 2005
401'.41--dc22 2005048239
ISBN 90 272 2705 5 (Hb; alk. paper)

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Table of contents

Preface vii
Acknowledgements ix

Chapter 1
Language, ideology and power 1

Chapter 2
Language ideologies in multilingual contexts 31

Chapter 3
Discourse and discrimination in the social arena 59

Chapter 4
Political discourse and the rhetoric of discrimination 93

Chapter 5
Political discourse and the media 121

Chapter 6
Representing the voice of the people 155

Chapter 7
The legitimation of discriminatory discourse 181

Chapter 8
Discourse, power and the multilingual world 207

Notes 233
References 239
Name index 249
Subject index 251

Preface

Ideologies that appear to discriminate against languages often discriminate against the speakers of those languages. In a world where explicitly racist discourse which describes particular groups of people in negative terms is no longer permitted, symbolic means of discrimination will be found. In this volume languages other than English emerge as a symbolic marker of difference. That is, powerful ideologies which value some languages and varieties at the expense of others contribute to the production and reproduction of social difference. Language ideologies come into being in public and private contexts of discourse which include education, law, economics, media, politics and the academy. Very often, multilingual societies which apparently tolerate or promote heterogeneity in fact undervalue or appear to ignore the linguistic diversity of the people. An apparently liberal orientation to equality may mask an ideological drive towards homogeneity, a drive which potentially marginalises or excludes those who either refuse, or are unwilling, to conform. However, having established that language ideologies are powerful means by which discrimination occurs in multilingual societies, it is less clear where such ideologies originate. Nor is it immediately evident how such ideologies are reproduced, or how they gain power and authority. In order to understand these questions it is necessary to develop a theoretical and methodological framework which allows detailed analysis of discourse to be situated in the social, cultural, historical and political contexts in which it occurs.

In this volume the apparently liberal discourse of politicians and policymakers links languages other than English, and therefore speakers of these languages, with civil disorder, school underachievement, social segregation, societal burden, isolation, unhappy marriage, poor employment prospects, mental health difficulties, lack of social mobility, and threat to democracy, citizenship and nationhood. These are clearly fallacious and discriminatory arguments. However, such arguments are not only powerful, but they travel along 'chains of discourse' until they gain the legitimacy of the state, and are inscribed in law. The particular focus of this volume is discourse linking 'race riots' in England in 2001 with the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002*. Not only

did political actors associate languages other than English with violence on the streets, but also legislation to test the English language proficiency of British citizenship applicants was extended in the new law. In order to understand the ways in which discriminatory discourse gains power, and ultimately the legitimacy of the state, this volume develops a theoretical and methodological framework which draws on the following dimensions of previous research:

- Critical discourse analysis is adopted to reveal the linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures, and to connect linguistic features of discourse to social theory and social life
- Bakhtin's notion of the dialogic nature of discourse demonstrates how voices gain authority as they are transformed along chains of discourse, and shape and are shaped by previous or anticipated voices
- Bourdieu's model of the symbolic value of one language or language variety above others illuminates the way in which a symbolically dominated group is complicit in the misrecognition, or valorisation, of that language or variety
- The study of language ideologies provides a bridge between linguistic and social theory, linking considerations of language use, attitudes and beliefs with considerations of power and social inequality

These four dimensions of theory and method interlink to illuminate illiberal argument, policy-making and legislation which masquerades as egalitarian discourse, and maintains and reinforces boundaries between people. In this volume it becomes clear that political language which discriminates against speakers of minority languages contributes to a society in which social difference is not only acceptable, but is constructed in the discourse of some of its most powerful members.

Acknowledgements

This book develops from a need for research in multilingual societies to engage with powerful discourses which reproduce social arenas where discrimination against linguistic minorities becomes not only possible, but also acceptable. My thinking in this area developed in collaboration with, and in response to, academic researchers with whom I shared international conference panels on language ideologies in multilingual settings, and a Special Issue of *Multilingua*. In particular, the energy and enthusiasm of Aneta Pavlenko pushed me to engage with issues of multilingualism and power at new theoretical levels. Two anonymous reviewers provided valuable commentaries on the manuscript. I am grateful for the support and faith of Paul Chilton and Ruth Wodak, and the easy working relationship provided by Bertie Kaal and Isja Conen at John Benjamins. Alison Johnson and Anne Edwards of the School of Education, University of Birmingham readily created the space for me to complete the project. I owe most to my colleague and critical friend Angela Creese, who read drafts of the book and provided stimulating feedback with generosity and insight, always keeping me grounded in the multilingual world. All errors and anomalies are of course my own.

Chapter 1

Language, ideology and power

In the Summer of 2001 there were violent disturbances on the streets of towns and cities in the north of England. These disturbances, popularly described in the British media as 'race riots', principally involved young British Asian men, young White British men, and the police. In November 2002 the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* was granted Royal Assent, and passed into British law. Included in this legislation was a change to the existing law which went almost unremarked: whereas previously spouses of British citizens had not been required to demonstrate their proficiency in English (or Welsh or Scottish Gaelic) when applying for British citizenship, now the legislation was extended to include this group. In addition, the Home Secretary's powers to test the English (or Welsh or Scottish Gaelic) proficiency of all applicants for citizenship were extended. How are the disturbances on the streets and the new legislation connected? In the analysis presented in this volume I suggest that they are connected through complex chains of discourse. In these chains of discourse political actors argue that the violence was caused at least partly because some Asian residents of the northern towns and cities either were unable, or refused, to speak English. Absurd as this causal association may seem, I will demonstrate that it is an argument made not merely by ultra-Right wing activists, but by mainstream politicians whose illiberal, discriminatory discourse masquerades as consensual liberalism. Detailed analysis of media and political texts will also demonstrate that discourse is recontextualised and transformed in increasingly legitimate contexts, gaining authority as it travels, until it is enshrined in the least negotiable domain of all – the law.

The aim of this volume is not to simply examine a single instance of a chain of discriminatory discourse, important as it is to analyse the policy-making on language, immigration and citizenship of the British Labour Government at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Rather, the volume extends and expands the field of Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) as a theory and method appropriate for understanding the relations between discourse and social practices in diverse societies. Rogers (2003a) suggests that researchers who are interested in the relationship between language and society use CDA to de-

scribe, explain and interpret such relationships. This volume extends the field in three key areas. First, analysis of the contextualisation and recontextualisation of public discourses across diverse genres reveals links between apparently unconnected texts which, taken together, create the conditions in which discriminatory practice becomes legitimate and acceptable. This recognition that no text exists in isolation, that any text connects with other texts both synchronically and diachronically, profoundly informs analysis of the relations between discourse and social practice. Second, while it would be a straightforward matter to identify explicitly illiberal texts in British public and political life, this volume looks to more mainstream, apparently liberal discourses, to reveal their illiberal ideological basis. Throughout these discourses there is a tension between illiberal ideology and the need for mainstream politicians to be seen to be promoting justice and equality. It is this tension and contradiction which is a key feature of the analysis presented in subsequent chapters. Thirdly, the analysis extends previous work which has focused on the emergence of language ideologies and language ideological debates in multilingual societies. While we can never finally know the origin of discriminatory beliefs, attitudes and practices surrounding non-dominant languages in contemporary societies, we can at least identify their manifestation in public discourses. In this volume the discourses of newspaper reports and editorials, local council politicians, parliamentary politicians, senior Government ministers, official reports, policy documents and an Act of Parliament all contribute to an ideological relation to the presence of languages other than English in Britain which is discriminatory. In this introductory chapter I develop an account of CDA as an appropriate means of understanding these discourses.

CDA as theory

There is no such thing as CDA. That is to say, there is no *single* theory or method which is uniform and consistent throughout CDA (Fairclough 2003a, b; Meyer 2001; Weiss & Wodak 2003). While pointing to the positive features of a theory and methodology which is characterised by plurality and dynamism, Weiss and Wodak (2003:6) suggest that "the whole theoretical framework of CDA seems eclectic and unsystematic". Martin and Wodak (2003) point out that CDA has never been and has never attempted to be one single specific theory or methodology. Titscher et. al. suggest that this plurality is born of the concern of CDA with the social rather than the purely linguistic:

> CDA is concerned with social problems. It is not concerned with language or language use per se, but with the linguistic character of social and cultural processes and structures. Accordingly CDA is essentially interdisciplinary.
> (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, & Vetter 2000: 146)

It is this concern with social life, and with the role of discourse in social life, that is most characteristic of CDA. Fairclough (2003c) points out that CDA developed as a response to the traditional divide between linguistics and areas of social science such as sociology. Whereas linguistics traditionally focused on the micro analysis of texts and interactions, social science was traditionally concerned with social practice and social change. That is, whilst linguistics was concerned with the interactional dimension of analysis, social science was concerned with the structural dimension. In CDA the analysis of social life requires investigation of a combination of the interactional and the structural (Fairclough 1995a). Van Dijk (2001) presents a harder edge to the claim that CDA is concerned with social problems, representing it as "discourse analysis with an attitude" (96). In van Dijk's view CDA emphatically opposes those who abuse text and talk in order to establish, confirm or legitimate their abuse of power: "CDA does not deny, but explicitly defines and defends its own sociopolitical position. That is, CDA is biased – and proud of it". CDA is fundamentally political in its orientation, interdisciplinary in its scholarship, and diverse in its focus. Chilton (2004) concludes that while a primarily critical standpoint per se will not necessarily offer new insights into language and the human mind (after all, it is possible to be critical without being analytical), the political standpoint of the analyst should never be entirely absent, as it may be impossible to analyse political language behaviour unless one exercises one's political intuitions. Of course, as Chilton fully acknowledges, nor is it sufficient to base analysis on intuition. The salient characteristic of CDA is that it pays very close attention to the detail of textual features, which may serve to either confirm or contradict one's initial hunches about a discourse.

Since CDA is not a specific direction of research, it does not have a unitary theoretical framework (van Dijk 2003a, b). Van Dijk points out that critical analysis of newspaper reports is different from analysis of television debates, just as critical analysis of magazine advertisements is different from analysis of political speeches or interactions in the school classroom, and so on. However, it is not sufficient to say that CDA is eclectic and diverse. If we are to make any claim that CDA is more than a method, a toolbox to service a plurality of theoretical frameworks, it is necessary to say what unites CDA as well as what divides it. What can we say, then, about CDA as theory?

Theory formation is not a process which aims to produce a representation of an immutable truth, but rather "a continued development of tools and resources designed to help us understand the world" (Weiss & Wodak 2003: 9). Weiss and Wodak cite Bourdieu's statement that theory formation involves:

> the ability to actively reproduce the best products of the thinkers of the past by applying the production of instruments they left behind.
>
> (Bourdieu 1997: 65)

That is, the adoption of instruments and tools from linguistic and social theories can be incorporated and integrated in the research process in the production of innovative theory. It is precisely in the adoption of methods from a range of theories that CDA makes explicit the links between theory and practice. CDA does not construct theory for its own sake, but works in a transdisciplinary way in the mutually informing development of theory and method (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999: 17). CDA brings a range of social and linguistic theories into dialogue. There are a number of identifiable characteristics of theoretical positions adopted in CDA research.

First, CDA sees language as social practice. Social life can be seen as networks of diverse social practices, including economic, political, cultural, familial practices and so on. Social practices are more-or-less stable forms of social activity which always, or almost always, include discourse. The reason for emphasising the concept of social practice is that it allows for analysis from the perspective of social structure and of social action and agency (Fairclough 2003b: 231). Discursive practices should be regarded as both structured and structuring actions (Weiss & Wodak 2003: 10). That is, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned. It is constitutive in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the status quo, and in the sense that it may contribute to transforming it (Fairclough & Wodak 1997: 258). For example, discourse may serve to construct categories such as 'race', 'nation', 'ethnicity' and 'citizen', may perpetuate such categories, and may even dismantle or destroy them (Reisigl & Wodak 2001: 40). CDA explores the tension between understandings of language as socially shaped, and language as socially shaping. Language use is simultaneously constitutive of social identities, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief, although with different degrees of salience in different instances (Fairclough 1995a: 131). The role of discourse in social practices can not be taken for granted, but must be established through analysis. The concern of CDA is with changes taking place in contemporary life, with the role of discourse in those processes of change, and with shifts

in the relationship between discourse and other social elements within social practices (Fairclough 2003a: 205).

Second, CDA takes a particular interest in language and power. In his seminal 1989 volume, *Language and Power,* Fairclough set out to correct what he saw as a widespread underestimation of the significance of language in the production, maintenance, and change of social relations of power. In addition, he sought to increase consciousness of how language contributes to the domination of some people by others (Fairclough 1989: 1). In his more recent volume he sets out a "manifesto for CDA" in which he argues that "the language element" of critical social research has become more salient, more important, and a crucial aspect of making sense of changes and transformations in societies (Fairclough 2003a: 203). In CDA power is conceptualised both in terms of asymmetries between participants in discourse events, and in terms of unequal capacity to control how texts are produced, distributed and consumed in particular social contexts (Fairclough 1995a: 1). Wodak (2001) defines CDA as fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination and control as manifested in language (Wodak 2001: 2). That is, CDA sets out to investigate social inequality as it is expressed, constituted and legitimised in discourse. Wodak points out that a concern with the development of a theory of language which incorporates the notion of power as a central element of social life is a defining feature of CDA. In CDA language indexes power, expresses power, and is involved where there are challenges to existing relations of power:

> Power does not derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and long term. Language provides a finely articulated means for differences in power in social hierarchical structures. . .CDA takes an interest in the ways in which linguistic forms are used in various expressions and manipulations of power.
>
> (Wodak 2001: 11)

CDA is centrally interested in language and power because it is usually in language that discriminatory practices are enacted, in language that unequal relations of power are constituted and reproduced, and in language that social asymmetries may be challenged and transformed.

Third, the shared perspective of approaches to CDA relates to the understanding that language is not powerful on its own, but gains power by the use powerful people make of it. An important perspective in CDA is that a text is rarely the work of any one person, but often shows traces of different discourses contending and struggling for dominance (Weiss & Wodak 2003: 15). That is,

texts relate to other texts, and relate to the social and historical conditions of their production. This notion of 'context' is crucial in understanding the power of language, and plays a vital role in the analysis of political discourse in this volume. No text stands alone and outside of its context. A text relates to features of the same text, to other texts which represent the same social events, to other texts which make similar arguments, and to the broader socio-political and historical context within which the text was produced. A text relates to other texts, and to other social practices, through processes of 'intertextuality', 'interdiscursivity', and 'recontextualisation'. These processes are crucial to the analysis presented in this volume. I will present an elaborated definition of their significance in the second half of this chapter. In brief, the intertextuality of a text describes the presence within it of elements of other texts. The actual texts which are intertextually present may be specific, and known. More commonly, however, a text will refer to, draw on, and include, texts which are neither specific nor explicitly present. The interdiscursivity of a text refers to the presence within it of genres and styles. A single text may incorporate more than one genre or style, and may refer to and adopt genres and styles which relate to other texts. In doing so a text is contextualised within an 'order of discourse', a particular combination of genres, styles and discourses. The concept of recontextualisation is particularly useful as it allows analysis of the shift of meanings either within a single genre or across genres. In the process of recontextualisation meanings are transformed, as discourse is reiterated in modified form and/or in different contexts.

Fourth, there may be several 'voices' present in a single text. CDA has been very much influenced by the work of the early twentieth-century Russian theorist Mikhail Bakhtin, and his understanding of the 'dialogicality' of language. Again, later in this chapter I will present an expanded definition of the ways in which Bakhtin's work is a useful resource for understanding political discourse in contemporary societies. Related to the notions of intertextuality, interdiscursivity and recontextualisation, Bakhtin's theory suggests that texts relate to other texts by representing within their own utterance the voices of other texts. In doing so the voice of the text may be hostile to other voices, or may be in complete harmony with them, or may suppress them, leaving only a suggestion that they are in any way present. Although Bakhtin's theories were principally developed in the context of literary critical theory, they have been found to be of immense value in understanding the role and power of public discourse.

Fifth, CDA works within more than one discipline. The term 'transdisciplinary' has recently been preferred to 'interdisciplinary' or 'multidisciplinary' (Fairclough 2000, 2003a: 6). The distinction here refers to the notion that rather

than several disciplines working alongside each other, in transdisciplinary research theoretical categories are developed through dialogue which allows disciplinary logics to inform each other. It is this dialogue between theoretical approaches which is increasingly characteristic of CDA. Jessop and Sum (2001), and Graham (2003) extend the debate, calling for "post-disciplinary approaches to social analysis" (Graham 2003: 110). Graham proposes an approach which assumes that disciplinary boundaries are nothing more than the institutional and discoursal consequences of historical power struggles and vested interests. There is a need for social theories to inform linguistic theories, and for linguistic theories to inform social theories. This is not simply a question of 'micro' level theory informing the 'macro', and vice-versa. It is a question of identifying ways in which the logic of one discipline can be 'put to work' (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999: 16) in the development of another. This process has begun in CDA, and is continued in this volume. In one example, the theoretical categories of Mikhail Bakhtin, particularly those pertaining to dialogic discourse, initially developed in a literary critical context, are appropriated here to illuminate analysis of political discourse.

These are the salient features of most approaches to CDA. However, as I have suggested, CDA is neither a single theory nor a single approach. By definition it is a shifting, unstable and broad-based field. In the remainder of this chapter I will set out in more detail the analytical approach adopted in this volume to understand the role of political and media discourse in debates about minority languages and citizenship in Britain. In developing such an analytical approach we move from theory to method.

CDA as method

Discourse

Before addressing in more detail the practical application of CDA, it is important to define what we mean by 'discourse', not least because one of the criticisms levelled at CDA has been that this term has been used so loosely and frequently in recent times that it has lost all meaning (Widdowson 1995: 169). Certainly, as the significance of language in social research has increasingly been recognised, 'discourse' (or, sometimes, 'Discourse') has come to refer to just about any use of language. Chilton (2004) concisely distinguishes between 'language' and 'discourse' by proposing that discourse may be conceptualised

as the use of a language, or 'language-in-use'. Wodak offers a helpful definition to guide our use of the term in CDA:

> 'Discourse' can be understood as a complex bundle of simultaneous and sequential interrelated linguistic acts, which manifest themselves within and across the social fields of action as thematically interrelated semiotic, oral and written tokens, very often as 'texts', that belong to specific semiotic types, that is, genres. (Wodak 2001: 66)

In this definition the complexity of discourse is highlighted. Texts relate to other texts across fields of action, and across temporal, generic and thematic dimensions. In social research 'discourse' often refers broadly to language used in relation to a particular topic. In CDA, and in this volume, discourse analysis is taken to involve a far more detailed analysis of texts than is commonly undertaken in other areas of social research. As we have seen, in CDA discourse is seen as social practice. Fairclough (2003b) suggests three ways in which discourse features in social practices. First, it figures as part of the social activity within a practice. Second, discourse figures in representations of social practices. And third, discourse figures in the constitution of identities, or ways of being. In order to better engage with the notion of 'discourse' it is helpful to develop an agreed understanding of the notion of 'genre'.

Genre

Chilton and Schäffner (2002: 18) suggest that an understanding of the notion of 'genre' is necessary because discourse is neither absolutely homogeneous nor absolutely heterogeneous. That is, discourse is variable, but that variability is not random or without pattern. Rather, "relatively stable patterns of utterance-type are reproduced, in a range of circumstances and over time" (p. 18). There is no common definition of 'genre' across disciplines (nor, often, within disciplines). However, for the purposes of the analysis of political and media discourse in this volume I adopt Chilton and Schäffner's (2002: 19) definition of genres as global linguistic patterns which have historically developed for fulfilling specific communicative tasks in specific situations. That is, a genre refers to the type and structure of language typically used for a particular purpose in a particular context. Members of a linguistic community have knowledge of the type and structure of language used for a particular purpose in a particular context because language has been used for that purpose in that context on previous occasions. While there is no rigid typology of genres, structures within genres are related to the function these genres fulfil. There are typical

ways of talking in (e.g.) job interviews, service encounters, political speeches, classrooms, and so on. Chilton and Schäffner point out that genre analysis is a salient feature of political discourse analysis, partly in terms of the role played by particular genres in exercising power and influence, and partly in terms of defining politics and political institutions. Fairclough (2003a) similarly defines genre as discourse which is part of social activity. However, he adds that while genres may be typical patterns of discourse for particular purposes in particular contexts, there are instances when genres are used which are *not* typical for a particular purpose or context. He terms this a "disembedded genre" (2003a: 68), which is lifted out of its usual context, and used for a new purpose in a different context. For example, if the genre typical of advertising a product in a magazine is used to advertise an academic post in a university, the atypical genre has a particular ideological function, and contributes to the representation of learning as commodity. Further, Fairclough (2003a) points out that within a single text there may be more than a single genre. In this kind of 'hybrid' text more than one voice may be evident within a single utterance. Generic structure is one aspect of the means by which texts refer to and incorporate other texts. This notion of 'genre chains' will be discussed in relation to the notion of 'interdiscursivity'.

Context

As briefly suggested above, a key feature of CDA is analysis of the relation of a text to its social, discursive and historical context. Chilton (2004) points out that the meaning of a text is not contained within the text itself. Rather, readers or hearers make sense of the text by linking it to their previous knowledge and expectations. Chilton terms this context the "backstage knowledge" (2004: 154), which is inherently unlimited, and is constituted not only by knowledge but by interests and presumptions of the hearer or reader. Van Dijk (2004: 349) proposes that the context of discourse should not only be defined in terms of the social situation in which discourse takes place, but "as a mental representation or model". Mental models are personal interpretations of discourse by individual language users, and may be generalised or abstracted from when constructed as general knowledge about the world (van Dijk 2003a). Van Dijk's point here is that mental models are constructed in the historical dimension of discourse, through what has been said before about a subject. In an example directly relevant to the focus of this volume, van Dijk suggests that: "M.P.s debating about a recent ethnic conflict do so on the basis of their personal interpretation of such a conflict, as represented in their mental model of

that conflict" (2004:349). Van Dijk argues (2003a:93) that socially or culturally shared knowledge is the result of a process of learning and is presupposed in public discourse. Such knowledge is represented in 'social memory', and assumed to be used for the understanding of all meanings of discourse and for the construction of mental models.

The context of a text is established through examination of the processes of 'intertextuality', 'interdiscursivity', and 'recontextualisation'. The notion of *intertextuality*, based on the theories of dialogism developed by Bakhtin and Voloshinov, and adapted by Kristeva (1986), has been widely adopted as a cornerstone of CDA. In this model it is assumed that every text is embedded in a context and is synchronically and diachronically related to many other texts. For any particular text or type of text, there is a set of other texts and a set of voices which are potentially relevant, and potentially incorporated into the text (Fairclough 2003a). In some cases it may be possible to identify the source of these voices and texts, but in many cases it is difficult to do so with any precision. In fact the texts and voices incorporated in a text may be multiple and complex. For example, if a political speech on immigration in Britain includes the word 'swamped' in relation to numbers of new arrivals, this will be understood as a specific reference to an infamous television interview given by Margaret Thatcher in 1978, when she was lagging behind in the opinion polls. In the interview for the *World in Action* programme, Margaret Thatcher said that immigration was excessively high, and that the British people were "rather afraid that this country might be rather swamped by people with a different culture... We do have to hold out the prospect of an end of immigration, except, of course, for compassionate cases" (Hansen 2000:210). Margaret Thatcher went on to suggest that she would like to see supporters of the (ultra-Right wing) National Front return to the Conservatives. Her interview provoked an outcry, and some commentators believe that it was influential in the Conservatives' subsequent election victory. Similarly, the phrase 'rivers of blood' is irrevocably associated with a speech given by Conservative M.P. Enoch Powell in Birmingham, England, in April 1968, in which he warned of the dangers to social cohesion of mass immigration.[1] On the other hand, if a political speech on immigration uses the phrase 'floods of immigrants', this similarly powerful metaphor has a less specific source. While it may be possible to track down other uses of the phrase in discriminatory political discourse, it is less likely to have a specific origin. These two types of intertextuality, specific and non-specific, perform similar roles in reproducing previous texts within new texts. Fairclough (2003a) suggests that an important aspect of intertextuality is the representation or reporting of speech, writing or thought within a text.

Reported speech, for example, may include direct quotation of a previous text, or an indirect summary of the previous text which either accurately or inaccurately represents the original text. At the same time, elements of other texts may be incorporated, but not attributed. This aspect of intertextuality will be a key feature of the analysis in subsequent chapters, in particular the linguistic means by which more than one voice may be evident in represented discourse. I will discuss this feature of intertextuality in more detail in the later section on 'Voice'.

Interdiscursivity refers to the intertextual relation of genres and discourses within a text. That is, while a text may refer to, and incorporate, a specific text, it also refers to, and incorporates, a type of text, or genre. Interdiscursive analysis links the text to what Fairclough (1995a: 12) terms the order of discourse, the "ordered set of discursive practices associated with a particular social domain or institution". Orders of discourse are the particular conventionalised practices which are available to text producers in particular circumstances. There are types of discourse practices associated with different social domains, for example the school classroom, the doctor's surgery, the political debate, the newspaper editorial, and so on. Features of these orders of discourse are genres. While orders of discourse are usually associated with relatively localised and specific practices (e.g. the school classroom), they can also be thought of at a broader, societal level. For example, in debates about immigration there may be similarities in the discursive strategies used, which transcend apparent institutional and social boundaries. The boundaries between orders of discourse at localised levels are therefore shifting and permeable. If, as Fairclough (1995a: 14) suggests, a genre is a socially ratified way of using language in connection with a particular type of social activity, a text may draw on a genre (or more than one genre), and on an order of discourse. Interdiscursive analysis sets out to locate a text in the context of genres and orders of discourse. Whereas for some texts this may be a straightforward process, in the case of others it is a complex matter, as different parts of a text may relate to different genres, or even a single phrase or clause may be multi-generic (parody or satire may be examples of this kind of hybridity). It is the role of interdiscursive analysis to identify as far as possible the links in chains of genres. The incorporation of more than one genre into a text creates a hybridity of social practices which is characteristic of the blurring of social boundaries (Fairclough 2003a). An example of this in political discourse would be the use of conversational features of language in the formal context of a speech to Parliament. Fairclough (2003a) suggests that interdiscursive analysis provides a potentially valuable resource

for social researchers who are concerned to better understand the permeability of social boundaries in contemporary societies.

The analysis presented in subsequent chapters of this volume is dependent on the notion of *recontextualisation*, which can be applied to chart shifts of meanings across semiotic dimensions (Wodak 2000). Caldas-Coulthard (2003:276) points out that "as soon as one writes or speaks about any social practice, one is already recontextualising. The moment we are recontextualising, we are transforming and creating other practices". The recontextualisation of discourse does not refer merely to the repetition of the same argument in a new context. Rather, recontextualisation involves the transformation of discourse. The repetition, verbatim, of the same argument in a new context involves a transformation, as discourse almost always attracts new meanings in new settings. But argument is rarely repeated verbatim. Instead it is often summarised, with new parts added, and others deleted, so that while it bears many features of the original, it is transformed in ways which comment on, legitimate or otherwise evaluate it. Fairclough (2003a) suggests that in the process of recontextualisation events may be represented in ways which foreground or background particular elements, events may be rearranged, so that new elements become salient features, events may be abstracted or generalised, and events may be explained, criticised or legitimated. Recontextualisation is particularly manifest in the discourse of newspapers, as social events are inevitably represented accurately or otherwise. As will become clear in later chapters, recontextualisation is also a powerful feature of the discourse of politicians, as parts of arguments are emphasised at the expense of others, new arguments are introduced, and other parts of arguments are deleted altogether. Van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999) propose that in the process of recontextualisation discourse is legitimated or otherwise evaluated in terms of the deletion, addition, substitution and rearrangement of elements of the text. I will develop a more detailed summary of these features of recontextualisation in Chapter 5.

A key question in CDA is that of how communicative events are transformed as they move along a chain of discourse. One text may recontextualise others, even across genres and semiotic dimensions. For example, an argument made in a newspaper editorial that British Asians ought to speak English at home for their own good and for the good of their families, may be transformed as new parts of the argument are added, some parts are deleted, some terms are substituted for others (which may be more or less liberal in their sense), and the main points may be rearranged so that particular features of arguments are foregrounded. The transformation of discourse through changes to the discursive strategies and linguistic means and realisations used is not the

whole story in the process of recontextualisation, however. Another feature of the transformation of discourse is in the repetition of argument in a new, perhaps more authoritative context. That is, each recontextualisation may move the argument into an increasingly non-negotiable materiality. As a meaning is repeated in a more authoritative voice, and in a more legitimate context, it gains power and status. To return to our example, if an argument is made in the queue in the local post office that British Asian people ought to speak English at home, the argument may have some influence and authority. If the same argument is made in an editorial piece in the local newspaper, it gains in status. When repeated in the debating chamber of the Town Council, the argument continues to move 'up' the chain of discourse. When this same argument is repeated by an elected Member of Parliament in a Westminster debate, the argument continues to move along the chain of discourse – all this time transforming itself as some features are deleted, substituted, added, and rearranged. The argument is then repeated and contested in the national newspapers, and perhaps on national radio and television. It continues to gain status and authority as the argument is picked up by Government ministers, even members of the Cabinet, and it enters official discourse as part of a Government policy paper. After a period of further debate, the argument may become part of draft legislation, and finally become law, entering into the least negotiable materiality. This is not to suggest that this is a linear process in all or even most cases, nor that the origin of Government legislation is to be found in the conversation of the post office queue. In fact 'chains' of discourse are neither straightforward nor unidirectional, but are likely to be circular, reflexive, tangential, and fractured. Also, it is important to recognise that the everyday linguistic practices of multilingual people in Britain may contribute to an ideology which contests the monolingual ideology which is reproduced in political, media and other public discourses (Blackledge & Creese 2005). Nevertheless, the dimension of the increased authority and power of discourse as it gains legitimacy in new semiotic domains is crucial for understanding how existing representations of differentiated groups in society come to constitute dominant ideologies. This process of the transformation of discourse through the movement of meanings along a chain of discourse towards a more legitimate and authoritative context is a key, and often neglected, aspect of recontextualisation (although see Wodak 2000). As discourse moves along a chain of discourse it may become less and less negotiable. In this sense the notion of intertextuality is informed by a theory of power. In political discourse discriminatory argument often gains power through its repetition in increasingly powerful contexts. This is an important aspect of the analysis of political discourse presented in subsequent chapters.

Voice

The notion of intertextuality does not suggest that just any voice has equal opportunity to inform authoritative and powerful discourse. Relations of power in society are influential in determining which voices gain authority as they are transformed along chains of discourse, and which voices diminish either partly or entirely. To develop an understanding of how the voices of social actors are shaped in the process of their transformation, it is helpful to turn to the work of Russian theorists Bakhtin and Voloshinov.[2] Bakhtin emphasised the dialogicality of language, in the sense that a text is always aware of, responding to, and anticipating other texts, and also in the sense that discourse is at times 'double-voiced'. The process of the transformation of discourse, outlined above, is recognisable in Bakhtin's theory:

> The speech of another, once enclosed in a context, is – no matter how accurately transmitted – always subject to certain semantic changes. The context embracing another's word is responsible for its dialogising background, whose influence can be very great. Given the appropriate methods for framing, one may bring about fundamental changes even in another's utterance accurately quoted. Any sly and ill-disposed polemicist knows very well which dialogising backdrop he should bring to bear on the accurately quoted words of his opponent, in order to distort their sense. (Bakhtin 1984: 78)

In Bakhtin's theory of language as responsive to the social world, discourse is dialogic, shaped and influenced by the discourse of others. An utterance is a link in a complex chain of other utterances, and is informed and shaped by other utterances in the chain.

In political discourse it is not uncommon for more than one perspective to co-exist within a single utterance, as speakers incorporate other speakers' discourse into their speeches:

> Parliamentary discourse is composed of monologues which are intertextually and contratextually interwoven as M.P.s respond to what has been said previously, not just in the House but elsewhere. It is thus multivoiced.
> (Bayley 2004: 24)

As we will see in analysis of some of the more authoritative discourses of senior politicians, illiberal discourse may masquerade as liberal argument, as that which is less acceptable is dressed in more acceptable clothing. In other instances a political speech may be sharply aware of the discourse of its opponents, responding to it, clashing with it and dismissing it. In each of these instances we can look to Bahktin's notion of 'double-voiced discourse' for clar-

ification. For Bakhtin dialogical relationships are possible not only between entire utterances; the dialogical approach can be applied to any meaningful part of an utterance, even to an individual word, "if we hear in that word another person's voice" (1973: 152). Bakhtin refers to the "innerly polemical" word, a word with a sideward glance at another person's hostile word, which possesses enormous style-determining significance (1973: 163). This includes speech which is aware of a contradictory utterance and responds to it with cutting remarks ('jabs and needles'). It also includes speech which is aware of a contradictory utterance but cringes in its presence, or in anticipation of the contradictory utterance. In either case the way in which speech is constructed is determined by awareness of, and reaction to, the speech of the other. Dialogical relationships can penetrate an utterance, or even an individual word, so long as two voices collide within it. A further aspect of double-voiced discourse is that of 'hidden dialogicality', or 'hidden polemic' (Bakhtin 1973: 163). In this type of discourse it is as if there is a dialogue between two people, in which the speeches of the second person are omitted, but in such a way that the sense of the speech is still clear:

> The second interlocutor is invisibly present, his words are absent, but the profound traces of those words determine all of the first interlocutor's words. Although only one person is speaking, we feel that this is a conversation, and a most intense one at that, since every word that is present answers and reacts with its very fibre to the invisible interlocutor, it points outside itself, beyond its own borders to the other person's unspoken word. (Bakhtin 1973: 164)

In dialogic discourse more than one voice is evident in a single utterance, shaping and re-shaping the word, so that the author's thought no longer completely dominates, and it responds to the voice of the other. It is important to recognise that this is a *social* model of language – that is, the relation between the various voices within an utterance is subject to the relations of power within society. The authority of the authorial voice is likely to be maintained where it belongs to those in powerful positions in society. Its discourse may nevertheless be double-voiced, where it dismisses or deletes voices which contradict its perspective.

An important feature of political and media discourse is reported speech, described by Voloshinov as "speech within speech, utterance within utterance, and at the same time also speech about speech, utterance about utterance" (1973: 115). The linguistic means by which speech is reported is an important feature of the analysis presented in subsequent chapters of this volume. Whereas reported speech may often be thought of as standing outside of the

reporting, or representing speech, Voloshinov suggests that in some instances reported speech may be represented in such a way that it merges with the representing speech. Fairclough (1995a: 58) introduces the term "boundary maintenance" to refer to the extent to which the voices of primary and secondary discourse are either kept apart or merged. Merging of primary and secondary discourse can mean the secondary discourse being translated into the primary discourse, so that both voices are speaking at once, or the secondary discourse may overwhelm the primary discourse, so that the voice of the primary discourse comes to closely resemble the voice of secondary discourse. Voloshinov (1994: 119) described a "dynamic interrelationship" between the speech being reported and the speech doing the reporting. That is, the boundary between the speech doing the reporting and the speech being reported may be firmly in place, as is often the case when the reported speech is represented as a direct quotation in speech marks. On the other hand, the boundary may be permeable or removed altogether, as may be the case when the transformed words of the reported speech are represented in the voice of the reporting speech. In reporting the speech of others in a new context, the representing speech will often provide an evaluation of that speech.

In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* Bakhtin argues that "The idea" does not live only in one person's isolated individual consciousness, where it would degenerate and die. Rather:

> The idea begins to live, that is, to take shape, to develop, and to find and renew its verbal expression, to give birth to new ideas, only when it enters into genuine dialogic relationships with other ideas, with the ideas of *others*.
>
> (Bakhtin 1994: 98)

That is, thought only becomes genuine thought when it comes into contact with another and alien thought, a thought embodied in someone else's voice. At the point of contact between voices the idea is born and lives. In political discourse, the authoritative voice senses and responds to the voices of others, is influenced by them, transforms and is transformed by them.

Bakhtin categorises three types of discourse. In the first type discourse is referentially oriented towards its object. This voice will name, express and inform. The second type of discourse is represented discourse, which is characterised by some degree of objectification or distance from the authorial discourse. The first and second type of discourses in Bakhtin's typology are relatively 'single-voiced' ('relatively' because these are broad-brush categories, and there is a wide diversity of discourses which may be identified as of the

first or second type). The third type of discourse is 'double-voiced'. That is, discourse which

> has a twofold direction – it is directed both toward the referential object of speech, as in ordinary speech, and toward *another's discourse*, toward *someone else's speech*. (Bakhtin 1994: 105)

Examples of the third type include discourse which acknowledges its own opposition within a single utterance, discourse which clashes with another, absent discourse, or discourse which adopts the perspective of another's discourse. Bakhtin identifies three varieties of the third type, and, within these varieties, several manifestations of them. It is not necessary to detail the full range of Bahktin's typology here. It is more important to recognise that in all varieties of the 'third type', discourse is 'double-voiced', as two or more voices either clash within a single utterance, or lose their distinctiveness, and become internally merged in a single perspective.

Criticism of CDA

Having outlined the reasons why I believe CDA to be the most appropriate theory and method for the study of political discourse in relation to multicultural societies, it is important to recognise and answer criticisms of this approach. Criticisms of CDA made by Schegloff (1997) have been rehearsed and responded to elsewhere (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999; Fairclough 2003a; Gouveia 2003; Meyer 2001; Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, & Vetter 2000). In summary, Schegloff takes the position that text analysts should produce description of texts first, and only then should critical analysis be conducted. Schegloff's concern is that in CDA the researcher can introduce into the analysis pre-ordained categories which arise from the bias of the researcher rather than from the text itself. Widdowson (1995, 1998, 2000) also warns against the dangers of bias in CDA, as researchers may start from a particular ideological position, then select for analysis only those texts which support this position. Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999: 7) and Meyer (2001: 17) counter the criticism that CDA starts from a pre-ordained ideological position by contesting the assumption that it is possible to conduct any research which is free from *a priori* ideological value judgements. Gouveia makes this point explicitly: "Widdowson is, strangely enough, missing the fact that there is no value-free CDA, that, ultimately, there is no value-free science" (2003: 57). In terms of the selection of which discourse structures should be used for analysis, van Dijk (2001) ar-

gues that selection is necessary because a 'complete' analysis of a text (let alone a large corpus) would be quite unmanageable, as it would have to take account of paraverbal, visual, phonological, syntactic, semantic, stylistic, rhetorical, pragmatic, and interactional levels and structures. Instead, CDA must select which structures are most appropriate if analysis is to answer specific questions about social issues. For example, analysis of discriminatory political discourse may take as the focus for analysis 'topoi', or argumentation strategies typical of the common-sense reasoning about specific issues (Reisigl & Wodak 2001; van Dijk 2000a; Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart 1999). The structures to be analysed are determined very largely by their appropriateness in answering the specific questions at hand. Weiss and Wodak (2003) argue that one methodological way for CDA to respond to the risk of simply politicising rather than accurately analysing is through the principle of 'triangulation'. They set out their triangulatory approach in terms of four 'levels' of analysis:

1. the immediate language or text internal co-text
2. the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses
3. the extralinguistic social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a specific 'context of situation'
4. the broader socio-political and historical contexts, which the discursive practices are embedded in and related to.

(Weiss & Wodak 2003: 22)

In the 'discourse-historical approach' (Reisigl & Wodak 2001: 41), the immediate language or text-internal co-text of an utterance includes (depending on the texts for analysis) lexical solidarities, collocational particularities and connotations, implications, presuppositions, thematic and syntactic coherence, as well as local processes of negotiation such as turn-taking, the exchange of speech acts, mitigation, hesitation and perspectivation. As we have seen, the analysis of intertextual and interdiscursive texts includes identification of links and patterns in the relationships between utterances, texts, genres, and discourses. The extralinguistic social/sociological variables and institutional frames of a specific context of situation include the formality of situation, place, time, occasion of the communicative event, the recipients, the political and interactive roles of the participants, their ideological orientation, their sex or gender, age, profession, level of education, as well as their ethnic, regional, national, and/or religious affiliation. The broader socio-political and historical context which the discursive practices are embedded in include the history of the discursive event itself as well as the history to which the discourse is related. The integra-

tion of the analysis of the immediate textual context with the intertextual and socio-historical contexts is a crucial dimension of CDA which is sometimes unacknowledged by its critics. In investigating the historical and political contexts of texts, the discourse-historical approach to CDA integrates knowledge about historical sources and the background of the social and political environment within which discourse as social practice is embedded (Reisigl & Wodak 2001). CDA attempts to base its method on a broad range of empirical data, as well as on historical and socio-political information. That is, a detailed CDA investigation will (depending on the questions at hand) pursue analysis of texts through a range of semiotic dimensions. Multiple genres and multiple public spaces are studied, and intertextual and interdiscursive relationships are investigated. These genres and spaces are connected through analysis of the process of recontextualisation:

> concrete analysis should take account of historical developments of discursive practices (change), intertextuality and interdiscursivity. This might explain why it is so difficult to provide 'short, telling' examples in a single paper: an example needs the deconstruction of the entire social-political and historical context in which the discursive practices are embedded.
>
> (Martin & Wodak 2003: 6)

In the present study, questions about discriminatory political discourse as social practice are analysed with reference to political and media texts relating to the social and historical context of violence in the streets of northern England in 2001. I set out below the method and purpose of selection of these texts.

Theory and method in analysis of political discourse

The discourse-historical approach to CDA, which I adopt in the present study, has in recent times been successfully used to investigate (*inter alia)* antisemitic discourse in Austria (Reisigl & Wodak 2001), discourses of commemoration of the 'Third Reich' (Wodak, Menz, Mitten, & Stern 1994), and the discursive construction of national identity in relation to immigration to Austria (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart 1999). The discourse-historical approach has been developed for the purpose of analysing discriminatory political discourse (where 'political' includes the discourse of those who do not necessarily claim to have any involvement in politics). Although most previous studies have focused on explicitly Right-wing discriminatory discourses (for an exception see Blommaert & Verschueren 1998b), the discourse-historical approach

is equally appropriate for analysis of discriminatory discourse practices which masquerade as liberal discourses in the mainstream of political life. Wodak (2002) suggests that discriminatory political discourse in relation to immigration is fundamentally based on distinguishing between 'us' and 'them' in the processes of positive self-presentation and negative presentation of the other. Once these groups have been discursively constructed, a range of discursive strategies and linguistic tools are used to debase the 'other' and to characterise the in-group as positive. In the following section I set out the framework within which these discursive strategies and linguistic tools can be identified.

The discourse-historical approach to CDA distinguishes between three closely related dimensions of analysis (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart 1999):

1. Contents
2. Discursive strategies
3. Linguistic means and forms of realisation.

Titscher, Meyer, Wodak and Vetter (2000) suggest that as the discourse-historical method is hermeneutic and interpretive, it should be understood not as a sequence of separate operational steps but as a cycle in which the three analytical dimensions are systematically and recursively related to the totality of contextual knowledge. The 'contents' of a discourse or set of discourses include the thematic concerns of the texts for analysis, and the historical and political contexts of the production of the texts, as well as any other aspects of the social and cultural setting which may be of relevance to the analysis.

In terms of discourse strategies, Reisigl and Wodak (2001:44) and Wodak (2001:72) propose that there are several discursive elements which deserve to receive special attention in the analysis of discriminatory discourse. These arise from five straightforward questions to be asked of the data: How are persons named and referred to linguistically? What traits, characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to them? By means of what arguments and argumentation schemes do specific persons or social groups try to justify and legitimise the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others? From what perspective or point of view are these namings, attributions and arguments expressed? Are the respective discriminating utterances articulated overtly, are they even intensified, or are they mitigated? These apparently straightforward questions relate to five types of discursive strategies, each of which is involved in the positive presentation of the in-group, and the negative presentation of the out-group. Reisigl and Wodak (2001:45) propose that a discursive strategy is a "more or less accurate and more or less intentional

plan of practices adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic aim". However, I would argue that in critical analysis of discriminatory discourse which purports to be liberal in its orientation, the question of 'intention' is complex. It may be that politicians, authors of official reports, and newspaper editors set out to deliberately deceive their audiences by dressing their illiberalism in liberal clothes, the better to have their point accepted. On the other hand, it may be that illiberal discourse so frequently masquerades as liberalism in contemporary multicultural societies that these authors are simply drawing on an order of discourse which dictates that their discourse is framed in a particular way. In fact the question of intent may finally not be of great importance in the critical analysis of text. What we have is the text itself, and what we know we can identify is its intertextual relationship to other texts, genres and discourses.

Discourse strategies

The five types of discursive strategies which relate to the questions outlined by Reisigl and Wodak (2001:45) are located at different levels of linguistic organisation and complexity. These levels of complexity are represented by the following categories:

1. Referential strategies
2. Predicational strategies
3. Argumentation strategies
4. Perspectivation strategies
5. Intensifying and mitigation strategies

Referential strategies

The question of how persons are named and referred to linguistically in discriminatory discourse often involves membership categorisation devices which represent them in a derogatory way, or at least as the out-group, or 'other'. *Referential strategies* are often metaphorical or metonymic, representing people in terms of specific characteristics which they share with others. Where a specific feature or characteristic is selected and foregrounded to represent the group, this frequently involves negative evaluation. People may be referred to in terms of national, linguistic, ethnic, cultural, economic, citizenship, legal, religious or sexual characteristics, to name only some of the ways in which individuals and

groups are referred to in discriminatory discourse. For example, if a newspaper (or other media) story makes reference to an individual as a 'black youth', the individual is almost inevitably associated with crime. While the terms 'black' and 'youth' are not derogatory in themselves, and may well be acceptable to the individual, the social and historical context of the news item dictates that there is a negative association. While some referential or naming strategies are explicitly discriminatory and racist, others are discriminatory by implication. Referential strategies such as 'Paki', 'nigger', 'wog', 'coon' and so on, once relatively common in public and private British discourse, are now deemed unacceptable in even Right-wing texts. But when *The Sun* newspaper announces on its front page 'Asylum seekers steal the Queen's birds for barbecues' (July 4th 2003), the term 'Asylum seekers' constructs a discriminatory discourse, in a referential strategy which is recognisably discriminatory not only because of the sense of the term itself, but because *The Sun*, along with other tabloid newspapers, had previously run a persistent, hard-hitting campaign against refugees entering Britain, regardless of their status or circumstances. This story falsely accused 'asylum seekers' of stealing swans from public parks and cooking them. Readers of *The Sun* would be aware of the ancient law forbidding anyone other than the ruling monarch to eat swans in Britain. The purported thieves were referred to in the story as 'poachers' and 'savages': 'This sickening behaviour is an insult to our nation's civilised traditions. If people want to come here from other nations, then let them respect our way of life. If they want to behave like savages, let them get back where they came from'. In the referential strategy employed in this extreme but not untypical example, refugees and other immigrants are represented as uncivilised criminals. This is clearly identifiable as part of an ongoing discourse in certain British national newspapers. In order to understand referential and nomination strategies, it is necessary to view them in the social and historical contexts in which they are used.

Predicational strategies

A second aspect of self- and other-presentation is the feature of '*predication*' (Reisigl & Wodak 2001:54):

> 'Predication' is the very basic process and result of linguistically assigning qualities to persons, animals, objects, events, actions and social phenomena. Through predication, persons, things, events and practices are specified and characterised with respect to quality, quantity, space, time and so on. Predications are linguistically more or less evaluative (deprecatory or appreciа-

tive), explicit or implicit and – like reference and argumentation – specific or vague/evasive.

In British political discourse some of the traits frequently predicated to the discriminated group of 'immigrants' (even when they are not immigrants, but second, third and fourth generation descendants of immigrants) is that they are lazy, greedy, dirty, diseased, refusing to integrate, abusive, oppressive to their own women, criminal, culturally primitive, responsible for unemployment, producing too many children, overwhelming the welfare state, receiving too many benefits of public spending, and so on. As we will see in analysis of political and media discourse in subsequent chapters, many of these discriminatory predicates are used in argumentation strategies which become familiar, and even assumed to be true, as they are repeated in new contexts.

The linguistic means by which the discriminatory strategy of difference-levelling is achieved include metonymy and synecdoche. Metonymy replaces the name of a referent with the name of an entity which is closely associated with it (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart 1999). There are several types of metonymy, depending on the relationship between the neighbouring conceptual fields. Metonymy may replace a person with a place, as in this example: 'Downing Street intervened again to deny refugees would be compelled to study English'. Metonym may similarly replace an abstract idea with a place, as in this example, in which the idea of 'Britishness' is replaced with 'Britain': 'It (acquisition of citizenship) can be seen as an act of commitment to Britain'. Metonym can further replace events with the place where they occur or people referred to there: 'they (young Muslim men) had not impressed the world or Bradford with anything else'. Other types of metonym include (*inter alia)* replacing the user of an object with the object itself ('the factory is on strike'), replacing persons with the time or period in which they live(d) ('the twentieth century brought mass immigration'), and replacing the representatives of an institution with the institution itself ('Parliament will introduce new legislation'). In general, metonym allows speakers to 'conjure away' responsible, involved or affected actors, or to keep them in the background (Reisigl & Wodak 2001: 58). The synecdoche is similar to metonym, but has a more specific linguistic role, replacing the name of a referent with the name of another referent which is either semantically wider or semantically narrower (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart 1999: 43). Generalising synecdoches replace a semantically narrower expression with a semantically wider one, while particularising synecdoches replace a semantically wider term with a semantically narrower one.

In addition to the specific linguistic means of metonym and synecdoche, public discourse about immigration is predicated on the basis of a wide range of metaphors. Metaphor can be understood as "the 'transfer', or 'projection', or 'mapping' from one experiential domain to another" (Chilton & Schäffner 2002: 28). In this process well understood source domains of experience are mapped onto more schematic ones (Chilton 2004: 51). Much of metaphorical structure has become conventionalised as idioms. Metaphor is one resource for producing distinct representations of the world (Fairclough 2003a). In the analysis presented in forthcoming chapters, differences between local communities are commonly metaphorically represented as 'barriers'; learning English by linguistic minorities is represented as a 'burden'; citizenship is represented as having (or lacking) 'content'; a strongly-expressed opinion is represented as 'a storm of protest'; a Government minister is represented as 'a safe pair of hands', immigration is represented as 'invasion' – and this is only a hint of the list of metaphorical representation manifest in these political and media discourses. Reisigl and Wodak (2001) point out that there is a typical set of racialising, nationalising and ethnicising metaphors associated with racist and discriminatory discourse (including 'floods', 'impurity', 'overcrowding'). These metaphors are rather less evident in discriminatory discourse which masquerades as liberal discourse. However, they are still recognisable in mainstream political and media discourse. In the data presented in this volume the languages of 'Asian' immigrants are associated with poverty, violence, disease, and mental health problems. Such metaphorical associations construct a conceptual world in which immigration is a problem for British society.

Argumentation and perspectivation strategies

Following referential and predicational strategies, a third category of discourse strategy is *argumentation*. A key feature of the analysis of argumentation strategies presented in this volume is 'topoi', parts of argumentation that "represent the common sense reasoning typical for specific issues" (van Dijk 2000a: 97). As such, topoi connect arguments with the conclusion, as familiar arguments are repeated in new contexts. Topoi represent a significant means by which texts are linked in chains of discourse across semiotic dimensions. In Chapter 3 I will introduce twelve typical argumentation strategies which apply to the political and media discourse analysed here, with examples from the data. These include topoi of advantage/usefulness, danger/threat, definition/name-interpretation, burdening/weighting down, law/right, culture, abuse, authority, finance, equality, human rights, and responsibility. The *topos of burden* (for

example), in relation to discourse about immigration, typically argues that immigration should be prevented, as it puts a financial burden on the state. This argument may be made in private, semi-private and public discourses. It may be made in a range of genres, and across a range of semiotic dimensions, and may be made in the context of neo-liberal or explicitly illiberal discourse. It is connected across such diverse domains through its consistent and robust argument. In another topos in the context of argument about immigration, the *topos of abuse*, it is argued that immigrants demand more than they justifiably should, and their welfare and services should therefore be cut. Once again, such an argument may be made, and recontextualised, across genres, semiotic dimensions and discursive contexts. Topoi provide a central means by which discriminatory argument can be tracked along chains of discourse. Of course argumentation strategies are not separate from referential and predicational strategies. Arguments about immigration and multicultural societies will frequently involve naming and difference-levelling strategies.

Intensifying and mitigation strategies

Discursive strategies which respond to questions relating to the perspective or point of view from which namings, attributions and arguments are expressed can be conceptualised as the *framing* of discourse. This feature is often closely associated with linguistic processes in which discriminatory utterances are articulated overtly or covertly, or are even *intensified*, or *mitigated*. The latter are particularly crucial dimensions of analysis in the investigation of illiberal discourse which masquerades as liberalism. It is often precisely strategies of mitigation which are the means by which utterances which are not usually acceptable find their way into mainstream discourse. The 'framing' of a text is a dimension of the incorporation of a voice into a text. Fairclough (2003a: 53) suggests that there are always choices to be made about how to contextualise a new voice, in terms of other parts of the text. Framing involves the relations between report and authorial account, in the representation of discourse. In an example from a newspaper article in the chain of discourse relating to language tests for citizenship, a direct quotation from a Government minister is preceded by a commentary which frames the statement as controversial: "In a move likely to provoke a storm of protest, Lord Rooker said. . .". Framing also speaks to the ordering of voices in relation to each other in a text. The different voices in a text may be represented in oppositional discourse, but in a way which accords more authority and status to one or other of the voices. Intensification or mitigation strategies can be used to express involvement in,

or detachment from, the sense of the text. In discriminatory discourse, for example, the speaker may mitigate explicitly illiberal meanings with linguistic strategies which create a distance from the text, while at the same time leaving implicit, and recognisable, illiberal footprints. Mitigation strategies include structures such as 'I think', 'I suppose', 'It seems', 'It appears that. . .', as well as the use of questions instead of assertions, the use of mitigating adverbs (e.g. 'fairly', 'quite', 'probably'), and hesitations and false starts. In an example from data analysed in more detail in Chapter 5, a Government minister is directly reported to have said:

> There are situations. . .where sometimes people are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English.

Here 'sometimes' and 'There are situations' mitigate the confidence of the assertion. As we will see in the analysis in Chapter 5, there is also a lexical mitigation here, as 'people' refers euphemistically to Asian immigrant women.

Investigating discourses of discrimination

This chapter sets out the main features of the approach to CDA to be used in the analysis of political and media discourse in this volume. In this final section I will define more precisely the method used in this analysis. As outlined above, the analysis will follow Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl and Liebhart (1999) in distinguishing between three dimensions of analysis: (i) Contents (ii) Strategies (iii) Means and forms of realisation. The content of the study was identified pragmatically. Investigation of discriminatory mainstream text in relation to language ideologies in Britain emerged from political and media response to the violence on the streets of Bradford, Burnley and Oldham in northern England in the Summer of 2001. In particular, a speech by Labour Member of Parliament (M.P.) Ann Cryer in the immediate aftermath of the 'riots' made causal links between the inability or refusal of some 'Asian' residents of these towns and cities to speak English, and the violence on the streets. As Ann Cryer's speech was picked up and reported by newspapers, then repeated in various forms by other politicians, it was clearly an example of discourse worth investigation. My own pre-existing interest in the politics of discourse in the construction of language ideologies in multilingual societies (Blackledge 2001, 2002b, 2004) meant that the response in political discourse to the civil disorder caught my attention.

A key aspect of the approach I planned to take to investigation of the discursive response to violence was that there should be a *historical* dimension to

the analysis. This meant that in relation to the social events and practices of the Summer of 2001, there should be analysis of the dimensions of past, present and future. Taking the violence itself, and Ann Cryer's speech, as starting-points, this meant identifying links between these events and practices and texts which preceded and succeeded them. The selection of texts was therefore driven by the need for discourse-historical data. Texts were sought which established the discourse-historical context of the social conditions within which young men from different cultural groupings may become engaged in conflict. These were found through an extensive search of the (internet editions of) local daily newspapers published during the preceding three years in the towns and cities in which the violence occurred. While there were many examples of news items and commentaries which represented the oppositional voices of social actors who purported to represent one side or other of communities divided along the lines of 'Asians' versus 'Whites', relatively few of these referred to debates about the role of languages other than English in these areas. Taking Ann Cryer's speech about the causal links between English language proficiency and violence as a starting-point, this meant that I was able to leave aside most of the local newspaper articles, and focus on the small number which referred to the role of languages other than English. The articles selected for detailed analysis were from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph*. While I make no claims about the representativeness of these articles, they appeared to be more or less typical of the pieces which appeared in the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* during this period.

The other dimension of the discourse-historical approach is to investigate texts which are connected in the realm of the future. That is, it was essential to identify other texts which were intertextually linked. Newspaper reports of the initial speech were included here. I made a decision at this point to include for analysis only the 'liberal', national broadsheet press. The reason for this was that I was interested in the representation of political discourse relating to language ideologies in relatively liberal settings. While there are certainly British national newspapers which take an illiberal approach to the reporting of cultural differences, I was able to identify some which had (and continue to have) a reputation for fairness and balance. These were *The Guardian*, *The Independent*, *The Observer*, and *The Independent on Sunday*. I restricted analysis to the editions of these broadsheet newspapers during the week-end following publication of an interview with Home Office minister Lord Rooker, and the same week-end as a press statement was released by the Home Office relating to the issue of English language testing for citizenship. The articles selected from these newspapers were chosen for their relevance, and in particular for their

intertextual links to the ongoing language ideological debate. Once again this meant that the number of articles available for analysis was relatively small. In addition to the articles in these newspapers, speeches, interviews and articles of politicians were also analysed, where there were intertextual links to Ann Cryer's speech and the debate about the extension of English language testing for citizenship. These were pursued chronologically as far as possible, so that the most recent political text included is from August 2004. Political texts selected for analysis included an interview with a Home Office minister, a statement from the Home Office, a statement from the Prime Minister's office, and an article by the Home Secretary. A further type of text chosen for analysis was the profusion of official reports produced in response to the violence of 2001. These included reports commissioned by the Councils of Burnley, Oldham and Bradford, and a further report into the violence which was commissioned by the Government. In addition, following the Government-commissioned report, a Government White Paper was produced (in British political process a 'White Paper' precedes the drafting of a Bill to be presented before Parliament) which was informed at least partly by the previous reports. Further to the White Paper, a new piece of legislation was drafted, and gained Royal Assent as the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* (2002). A Government report was commissioned to make recommendations for the implementation of the new legislation, and Guidance Notes were published in August 2004, based on some of these recommendations. These texts also became part of the chain of discourse, connected across semiotic dimensions, which was subject to detailed analysis. These reports and policy documents were intertextually connected to each other, and to the political and media texts which preceded them. Of course the chain of discourses does not end with the new legislation – in fact it does not end at all. The purpose of this volume is not merely to present the story of a discriminatory piece of legislation as it made its journey onto the statute books, but rather to develop an understanding of the ways in which discriminatory ideologies about languages other than English are constructed and reproduced through their recontextualisation along chains of discourse in increasingly authoritative settings.

Discourse strategies and linguistic means

A major feature of the analysis of political and media texts was the recontextualisation of argument. The reproduction of topoi, or argumentation strategies, in forms in which some features were deleted, substituted, added, or rearranged, were key aspects of the recontextualisation of discriminatory discourse

about the role and status of languages other than English. The context in which the argument was recontextualised was a further dimension of the analysis, as topoi appeared to be more powerful in more authoritative settings, and when uttered by those with greater political status. The means by which recontextualisation occurs in the texts analysed in this volume include a vast range of linguistic features and forms which have ideological significance. These include use of the personal pronoun, metaphor, metonym, synecdoche, euphemism, omission, substitution, and personification. The list goes on, and further linguistic features are discussed in the analysis in subsequent chapters. It was not possible to discuss all aspects of every text. Many linguistic features were not relevant to the discussion of language ideologies at the heart of this volume. Linguistic features were therefore only analysed and discussed where they were relevant and appropriate to questions about multilingualism, power and ideology. This meant that a good deal of the initial discussion of texts did not appear in the final analysis, as that which was irrelevant was filtered out. The key questions which guided the analysis investigated the ways in which people are referred to or named, what characteristics are attributed to them, what arguments are used to try to justify and legitimise their exclusion, from what perspective discriminatory arguments are made, and to what extent discriminatory utterances are intensified or mitigated. In the context of these questions, the representation of the discourse of others is a key focus in the analysis of recontextualised discourse. Using a Bakhtinian framework, analysis of double-voiced discourse in the utterances of politicians illuminates language which can appear to be either opaque, or banal, or both. In this volume I suggest that through analysis of intertextual links, the discourse of politicians can be seen to be at its most powerful when it is least confrontational.

This chapter has set out the means by which the analysis of texts is conducted in subsequent chapters. It is important that this analysis should be situated in the context of developed understandings of the ways in which ideologies about language are constructed and reproduced in multilingual societies. It is to these understandings that I turn in Chapter 2.

Chapter 2

Language ideologies in multilingual contexts

This chapter develops a theoretical framework within which ideological debates about minority languages in multilingual societies can be analysed and illuminated. Aspects of the discussion include relations between language and identity, language and nationalism, language and hegemony, language and symbolic racism, multilingualism and social cohesion, native-speaker status, and language and citizenship. The analysis presented here suggests that in a society which claims an identity which is tolerant, even proud, of its diversity, the underlying, dominant ideology is one which erases difference in favour of homogeneity. This dominant ideology, securely seated on the Government benches in Parliament, and even in the Cabinet, is dismissive of languages other than English, firmly believing that the only route to success for immigrant groups is to leave behind their established linguistic resources, and to replace the language of the home with the language of the host country. In this chapter I review research from a wide range of linguistic contexts which describes the construction and reproduction of discriminatory language ideologies in multilingual societies.

Language and ideology

Beliefs and attitudes relating to languages in societies are not always fixed or straightforward. Recently, studies of multilingualism in societies have drawn attention to the social positioning, partiality, contestability, instability and mutability of the ways in which language uses and beliefs are linked to relations of power and political arrangements in societies (Blackledge & Pavlenko 2002; Blommaert 1999; Blommaert & Verschueren 1998a; Gal 1998; Gal & Woolard 1995; Kroskrity 1998; Woolard 1998). Attitudes to, and beliefs about, language, are often not only about language. Gal and Woolard (1995) persuasively argue that ideologies that appear to be about language are often about political systems, while ideologies that seem to be about political theory are often implicitly about linguistic practices and beliefs. Ideologies of language are therefore not

about language alone (Woolard 1998), but are always socially situated and tied to questions of identity and power in societies. Political and popular discourse often comes to regard official languages and standard varieties as essentially superior to unofficial languages and non-standard languages (Collins 1999).

Language ideologies are positioned in, and subject to, their social, political and historical contexts. Nor are language ideologies fixed, stable, or immutable. They are multiple, and influenced by changes at local, national, state and global levels. Moreover, language ideologies are often contested, and become symbolic battlegrounds on which broader debates over race, state and nation are played out. However, to say that language ideologies are contested and changeable over time is not to assert that they are necessarily always negotiable. As I have suggested elsewhere (Blackledge & Pavlenko 2001), there is often a dynamic tension between identities asserted and chosen by the self, and identities asserted and chosen for the individual by state, nation or institution. This tension is often played out in the domain of language ideological debate. In this section I explore these questions of language ideologies as socially positioned, changeable, symbolic and (non)-negotiable.

Language ideologies are about more than individual speakers' attitudes to their languages, or speakers using languages in particular ways. Rather, they include the values, practices and beliefs associated with language use by speakers, and the discourse which constructs values and beliefs at state, institutional, national and global levels. One of the key theoretical paradigms which underpins analysis of reproduction of language ideologies in this volume is that developed by French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. The complex ways in which language ideologies are produced and reproduced can be understood in relation to Bourdieu's (1977) model of *habitus* and *field*. One of Bourdieu's key concepts in understanding the discursive reproduction of power is that of *habitus* – the set of dispositions, or learned behaviours, which provides individuals with a sense of how to act and respond in the course of their daily lives. Habitus is a way of being which has been inculcated through patterns of behaviour of the group in its history, culture, language and other norms. In linguistic terms, individuals may learn how to use language in certain markets (e.g. non-standard or minority language markets), but not others (e.g. those requiring standard or majority language). However, just as in the economic market there are monopolies and power relations which mean that all the producers and their products do not start out equal, so too in the linguistic market there are power relations which mean that all speakers do not start out equal (Bourdieu 1993). The habitus of an individual exists in relation to the *field* in which that individual acts. A 'field', in Bourdieu's sense, is a social arena in which negotiations take place over

resources or stakes and access to them (Bourdieu 1990). Each field (e.g. housing, education, welfare, employment) has a different structure and set of rules, which is both the product and producer of the habitus which is appropriate to that field. The habitus of an individual may or may not be consistent with that expected in a particular field. When habitus experiences a social arena in which there is familiarity and continuity, all is well. Bourdieu expresses this relationship between habitus and field as being "*comme il faut*", "just so" (1993: 85), or having a "feel for the game" (1990: 66). Those groups which have alternative systems of habitus may have little opportunity for public participation. However, we should not take for granted the production of the social arena. Rather, the field is constructed at least partly in the values and beliefs associated with linguistic practices. For Bourdieu, the social order is produced and reproduced in "an abundance of tangible self-evidences" (2000: 181), which give the illusion of common-sense reality. Dominated groups in society are complicit in their own domination because the power of the dominant group is inscribed in the bodies of the dominated. The inscription of this *habitus*, or way of being, comes about through ongoing acts of recognition and misrecognition in the social arena. The relation between *habitus* and *field* creates the conditions in which existing shared self-evidences are produced and reproduced. In this context 'self-evidences' are those apparently common-sense misrecognitions which constantly construct and reinforce hegemonic ideologies. This process of *symbolic violence*, of production and reproduction of common-sense consensus, occurs in discourses in the media, education, politics, the economy, and the law, to mention only institutional contexts:

> It follows that any analysis of ideologies in the narrow sense of 'legitimizing discourses' which fails to include an analysis of the corresponding institutional mechanisms is liable to be no more than a contribution to the efficacy of those ideologies. (Bourdieu 1990: 133)

That is, language ideologies contribute to the production and reproduction of social difference, constructing some languages and varieties as of greater worth than other languages and varieties. This process can only succeed when, in the "institutionalised circle of collective misrecognition" (Bourdieu 1991: 153), dominant and dominated groups alike accept the greater value of certain languages and varieties. The circle of collective misrecognition comes into being through ideological discourse in contexts which include education, law, politics, economics, media and the academy. In an increasingly globalised environment, the State is not necessarily involved in this process at all levels. However, "the State makes a decisive contribution towards the production and reproduc-

tion of the instruments of construction of social reality" (Bourdieu 2000: 175). As we will see in the analysis of political and media discourse in this volume, this contribution is often in the form of illiberal and hegemonic discourse which wears a liberal mask.

Bourdieu's model of the symbolic value of one language or language variety above others rests on his notion that a symbolically dominated group is complicit in the misrecognition, or valorisation, of that language or variety. The official language or standard variety becomes the language of hegemonic institutions because the dominant and the subordinated group both misrecognise it as a superior language. For Bourdieu, this misrecognition of the arbitrary nature of the legitimacy of the dominant language (and culture) "contributes towards reproducing existing power relations" (1977: 30). Irvine and Gal (2000) note that there are striking similarities in the ways ideologies misrecognise differences among linguistic practices in different contexts, often identifying linguistic varieties with 'typical' persons and activities and accounting for the differentiation among them. In these processes the linguistic behaviours of others are simplified and are seen as deriving from speakers' character or moral virtue, rather than from historical accident. Irvine and Gal offer the example of nineteenth-century Macedonia, which was unusually multilingual, with language use not falling within expected ethnic boundaries. Outsiders thus positioned Macedonians as untrustworthy, since apparently shifting linguistic allegiances were construed as shifting political allegiances and unreliable moral commitments. The official language, or standard variety, often comes to be misrecognised as having greater moral, aesthetic and/or intellectual worth than contesting languages or varieties (Bokhorst-Heng 1999; Heller 1999; Jaffe 1999; Schieffelin & Doucet 1998; Spitulnik 1998; Watts 1999). In Bourdieu's terms, those who are not speakers of the official language or standard variety are subject to symbolic domination, as they believe in the legitimacy of that language or variety, and "Symbolic power is misrecognised as (and therefore transformed into) legitimate power" (1991: 170). Bourdieu suggests that we have to be able to identify relations of power in familiar discourses, because:

> symbolic power is that invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that they themselves exercise it. (1991: 164)

Very often, multilingual societies which apparently tolerate or promote heterogeneity in fact undervalue or appear to ignore the linguistic diversity of their populace. A liberal orientation to equality of opportunity for all may mask an

ideological drive towards homogeneity, a drive which potentially marginalises or excludes those who either refuse, or are unwilling, to conform.

If language ideologies provide one of the means by which powerful groups exercise domination over those less powerful, this is not to say that they are either permanent or unitary factors. That is, the ideologies of dominant groups are rarely monolithic or stable (Gal 1998: 320). The exercise of domination by one group over another is fragile, relying as it does on the compliance of the less powerful group. At the same time, ideologies are multiple and shifting. A speaker's beliefs, values and practices associated with a language may vary from one social context to another. Similarly, language ideologies may vary over time, and may vary within small communities, even within families: 'Ambiguity and contradiction may be key features of every ideology, and subjects' adherence to one ideology or another is often inconsistent or ambivalent' (Blommaert 1999: 11). This is not to say that we are less able to identify where hegemonic processes occur in language. Rather, we require a means to come to a more nuanced understanding of the relationships between speakers' linguistic habitus and their relation to a broad range of social arenas, or fields.

Multilingualism and identity

In multilingual societies language choice, use, and attitudes are intrinsically linked to language ideologies, relations of power, political arrangements, and speakers' identities. Identity options available to individuals at a given moment in history are subject to change, as are the ideologies that legitimise and value particular identities more than others. The shifts and fluctuations in language ideologies and in the range of identities available to individuals have become particularly visible during recent sociopolitical and socioeconomic trends and events, including globalisation, and the postcolonial search for new national identities. The changing social, cultural and linguistic contexts of new regional coalitions, and the dissolution of former coalitions, have led to changing and complex identities. In addition, the repatriation of former colonies, such as Hong Kong, and increased transnational migration, have brought about new and diverse hybridities. These events demonstrate that the links between language and identity are extremely complex – while in some contexts languages may be markers of identity, in others they are a means of social control, and yet in others these two roles may be interconnected. In a number of world contexts the control (or attempts at control) of the languages people use has become a means of symbolically dominating groups in societies. The fact that languages –

and language ideologies – are anything but neutral is especially visible in multilingual societies where some languages and identity options are privileged above others. In contexts of inequality the notion of 'negotiation' comes to the fore (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004a). While some identity options may be negotiable, others are either imposed (and thus non-negotiable) or assumed (and thus not negotiated). In the process of negotiating identities, language users may seek new social and linguistic resources which allow them to resist identities that position them in undesirable ways, produce new identities, and assign alternative meanings to the links between identities and linguistic varieties. The process of negotiating identities may take place between individuals, between majority and minority groups, and, most importantly, between institutions and those they are supposed to serve. In this volume I examine the construction of discursive contexts in which the process of negotiation of identities becomes less and less an option as a dominant discourse of monolingualism is reiterated in increasingly authoritative settings.

'Identities' are here conceptualised as produced and legitimised in discourse and social interaction, and as multiple, dynamic, and subject to change. 'Multiplicity' refers to the notion that identities are socially and discursively constructed in relation to variables such as age, race, class, ethnicity, gender, generation, sexual orientation, and social status. In this paradigm, identities can only be understood when approached in their entirety, rather than through consideration of a single subject position. Another important aspect of this 'poststructuralist' view of identity is an emphasis on identities as constructed and validated through linguistic practices available (or unavailable) to individuals at a particular point in time and place. Since ideologies of identity underpinning particular linguistic practices valorise and legitimise these positions in different ways, individuals may occupy certain positions unproblematically, while they may resist others, and aspire to or claim others.

When discussing negotiation of identities, I differentiate between imposed identities (which are for one reason or another not negotiable), assumed identities (which are accepted and not negotiated), and negotiable identities (which are contested by groups and individuals) (see also Blackledge & Pavlenko 2001; Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004a). Clearly, all three categories acquire a particular status within unique sociohistorical circumstances, and options that are acceptable for and not negotiated by some groups and individuals may be imposed on others, or even on the same groups at a different point in time. Alternatively, assumed identity options that are not negotiated by one group of individuals, may become a battleground for another group that approaches them as negotiable. In this view, then, *imposed* (or non-negotiable) identities

and subject positions are the ones that individuals cannot resist or contest at a particular point in time. In the analysis in this volume, the discourse practice of the Government positions less proficient users and speakers of English as inferior to native speakers. Non-native speakers may resist such a positioning, but when it comes to application for British citizenship, the law demands that a certain (or, as we shall see, an uncertain) proficiency in English is demonstrated in order to acquire citizenship. No amount of negotiation, resistance or self-positioning will change the requirement in law to demonstrate proficiency in English in order to gain the privileges of citizenship.

The concept of 'positioning' (Davies & Harré 1990: 48) is the process by which selves are located in conversation as observably and subjectively coherent participants in jointly produced story lines. Interactive positioning assumes one individual positioning the other, while reflective positioning is the process of positioning oneself. While Davies and Harré (1990) see positioning as largely a conversational phenomenon, Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004a) expanded the meaning of positioning to all discursive practices which may position individuals in particular ways or allow individuals to position themselves. While agency and choice are critical in positioning, instances of reflective positioning may be contested by others and individuals may find themselves in a perpetual tension between self-chosen identities and others' attempts to position them differently.

The study of linguistic ideology provides a bridge between linguistic and social theory, linking considerations of language use, attitudes and beliefs with considerations of power and social inequality (Mertz 1998). These links are visible in discourse practices at macro- and micro-levels (Fairclough 1995a). For example, it has often been the expectation in the United States that immigrants should replace whatever traits make them different with characteristics which make them appear more 'American'. Among these characteristics are spoken and written English. Allowing languages other than English to flourish appears to jeopardise the status quo of the dominance of English and those who speak it. The official-English, or language-restrictionist (Dicker 1996) movement is based on the ideology that immigrants need to change, to (linguistically) conform to American ways, in order to be truly accepted and successful in their new country.

Schieffelin and Doucet (1998) note that language ideologies are often the location of images of 'self/other' or 'us/them'. That is, the 'official-English' debate in the United States is a contest about political identity, about who is allowed to be 'American' and who is not, and about who is 'in' and who is 'out'. Recent research has found that the process of self-translation for sec-

ond language learners is far from straightforward, as identities may have to be re-negotiated, or possibly lost for ever (Pavlenko 2001a, b, c). Grillo (1998) recalls that after mass immigration to the United States in the early twentieth century the 'Americanisation' movement insisted that all immigrants must achieve proficiency in English if they were to be American citizens. Pavlenko (2002) convincingly demonstrates that in the early twentieth century powerful public discourses invested English with superior moral and intellectual values, while linking bilingualism and languages other than English with low moral standards, lack of patriotism, and inferior intelligence. In the process of 'Americanisation' "the hegemonic ideology of English monolingualism as a keystone of Americanness came to dominate public discourses" (Pavlenko 2002: 192). To be a 'good American' required proficiency in English, and language and literacy tests for immigrants were introduced.

In Europe, as in the United States, an ideology of monolingualism as the norm prevails, in spite of considerable evidence of the linguistic heterogeneity of European communities (Gardner-Chloros 1997). European state monolingualism is frequently a cultural construction embedded in broader discourses about the bases of social stratification and the nature of people or groups. Blommaert and Verschueren (1998a) demonstrate that in Germany an apparent acceptance of 'foreignness' is contradicted by an ideology which seeks to deny voting rights to immigrant groups. Blommaert and Verschueren's analysis of the European newspaper press (1998b) finds that in the print media is a theory which "revolves around the impossibility of heterogeneous communities and the naturalness of homogeneous communities" (207). In Belgium, in local elections in Antwerp (October 2000), the ultra-right Vlaams Blok party won 20 of the city council's 50 seats, demonstrating that an explicitly liberal, multilingual nation-state ideology is contested by ideologies of monolingualism which are evident in discourses on the politics of immigration. Verschueren (2005) points out that in Antwerp there is a clear mismatch between the dominant monolingual ideology constructed in political and other elite discourse, and the multilingual practices of the population. Blommaert and Verschueren (1998b) studied the 'rhetoric of tolerance' in public discourse in Belgian newspapers, documents issued by political parties and communications from government agencies. Rather than discover the self-evident ideologies of minority, ultra-Right political groups, the researchers set out to identify the taken-for-granted, common-sense views and attitudes of the majority. Their analysis reveals that in Belgium the non-acceptance of diversity predominates, even among the majority which tends to view itself as the embodiment of openness and tolerance. Blommaert and Verschueren conclude that for (at least partly)

historical reasons, a key aspect of homogeneity and national belonging in Flanders is the Flemish language: "language is the essence of identity" (1998b: 128). This ideology relies on the notion of an immutable unity between language and the cultural identity of a population group.

In the face of hegemonic ideologies of homogenisation, it is not surprising that those who are subject to the 'symbolic violence' of monoglot standardisation appear to comply with their symbolic domination. A process of normalisation occurs, in which it comes to appear natural that one language, or one variety, dominates others, is more legitimate, and provides greater access to symbolic resources. What Bourdieu calls the institutionalised circle of misrecognition develops from this ideology of implicit homogenisation. In multilingual, liberal democratic states this process creates the conditions for social injustice, as those who either refuse, or are unable to conform to the dominant ideology are marginalised, denied access to symbolic resources and, often, excluded (Bourdieu 1998a; Heller 1999). This process can be made visible through close scrutiny of the print media, and in particular through analysis of the creation and reproduction of language ideologies:

> Cultural and linguistic unification is accompanied by the imposition of the dominant language and culture as legitimate and by the rejection of all other languages into indignity. (Bourdieu 1998b: 46)

Bourdieu further characterises the unification of the cultural and linguistic market as contributing to the construction of "national identity", or "legitimate national culture" (1998b: 46). The "homogenisation of all forms of communication" (p. 45) contributes to a national habitus, which implicitly shares common principles of vision and division. That is, division not only by class, but also by gender, race, ethnicity, age, sexuality and linguistic background. Thus, in asking questions about who has access to symbolic and material resources in Britain, about who is 'in' the 'imagined community' (Anderson 1983) of the nation and who is 'out', we need to take account not only of localised linguistic behaviours, attitudes and beliefs; we must also locate them in wider discourses of education, politics and the media.

In Bourdieu's argument, the State contributes to the reproduction of social reality through its legislative process (Bourdieu 2000). In this volume I examine political discourse which appears to normalise a 'common-sense' reality that languages other than English are associated with disorder. Such discourse is endowed with symbolic power, and is the more effective when supported in law:

> The form par excellence of the socially instituted and officially recognised symbolic power of construction is the legal authority, law being the objecti-

> fication of the dominant vision recognised as legitimate, or, to put it another way, of the legitimate vision of the world, the ortho-doxy, guaranteed by the State. (Bourdieu 2000: 186)

The State has the power to distribute identities, through setting criteria for the award of certificates which bring benefits and privileges (for example, the award of citizenship, the award of right of stay for refugees). At the same time, the State has the power to set criteria for the award of such certificates which are exclusionary. The establishment in law of *social frontiers* enables the State to play a part in the social distribution of privileges. Laws are not, of course, either natural or uncontested. As I suggested in Chapter 1, they emerge from chains of political discourse. Such discourse acts hand-in-hand with the law to create 'common-sense' realities which are held to be self-evident. It appears to be 'common-sense' that not all refugees should be allowed entry to a country, so a law is required to prevent this. It is 'self-evident' that people who do not speak the majority language impoverish the nation, so laws are required to ensure that they learn to use the dominant language, or to prevent their naturalisation as citizens. Political discourse and the law act (alongside other discourses) to create a social world which is self-evident, natural, taken for granted, and which reproduces the social order.

Language ideologies and national identity

Nation-states are not founded on 'objective' criteria, such as the possession of a single language. Rather, they have to be 'imagined' as communities (Anderson 1983; Billig 1995). Billig (1995: 29) argues that the creation of a national hegemony often involves a hegemony of language. However, it is not sufficient to say that speakers of the same language belong to the same nation-state. This common-sense understanding of the relationship between language and nation ignores the diversity and variety of the language(s) spoken within many states. As Rampton's (1995) work has made clear, even the notion of a single 'English' language is an over-simplification, as new varieties emerge from different cultural and social contexts.

Discourses contribute to the negotiation of national identities, in formal or informal contexts. One of the major foci of recent research has been construction of national identities (Barbour 2000; May 2001). A relatively recent construct, national identities gained particular importance with the appearance of nation-states, the fundamental unit of world political organisation, since a

nation in a modern sense cannot exist without a shared sense of identity (Anderson 1983). However, even though nation-state boundaries may be clearly defined, national identities are far from unproblematic. Nations are ideological creations, caught up in the historical processes of nationhood (Billig 1995). Billig argues that national identity is constantly being discursively 'flagged', with "banal words, jingling in the ears of the citizens, or passing before their eyes" (1995: 93). Words which reproduce dominant ideologies of nationalism are banal because they are familiar, routine, habitual, and hardly noticed. "Small words" offer constant but hardly conscious reminders of national identity.

The notion of a 'nation' carries the meanings both of the nation-state, and the nation of people living within the state. Of course not all of the people living in a state view themselves as each others' equals. Nor do all inhabitants of a particular nation-state, or a particular state, see themselves – or each other – as a part of the dominant national identity narrative. I have previously (Blackledge 2002a) demonstrated that in Britain the media frequently constructs an oppositional national identity at the expense of some of the country's citizens and non-citizen residents. Further, national identities and narratives may change within the span of one generation when nation-states collapse or redefine their boundaries and political allegiances, as happened in the case of the former Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, or Hong Kong, or when ethnic mobilisation comes into play, as in Canada in the 1960s (Heller 1992). In this case, the inhabitants of a particular place have to struggle with redefining their own allegiances and identities within the new range of options – including linguistic ones – offered to them. In some cases, local, religious, ethnic or alternative national identities may override those offered by the state. For instance, due to the dominance of ideologies steeped in Islam, many citizens of Arab countries may feel they belong to an Arab nation rather than to a nation defined by their state (Barbour 2000). Wodak et al. also emphasise that within the same nation-state different political and ideological orientations provide different – and at times competing – identity options (de Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak 1999; Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, & Liebhart 1999). In their studies of the discursive construction of national identities in the Austrian public media, the researchers found that while official discourses emphasise state-based nationalism, semi-official and quasi-private discourses allow for cultural/linguistic nationalism. Billig points out that "The battle for nationhood is a battle for hegemony, by which a part claims to speak for the whole nation and to represent the national essence" (1995: 27). The achievement of national hegemony is well illustrated by the triumph of official national languages and the suppression of rivals.

While national identities can be negotiated in a variety of ways, current research privileges language and literacy policies as increasingly important means of social control which allow nation-states to define 'who is in' and 'who is out'. Bourdieu argues that the official language is bound up with the state, both in its genesis and in its social uses: "It is in the process of state formation that the conditions are created for constitution of a unified linguistic market, dominated by the official language" (1991:45). In order for one language to impose itself as the only legitimate one, the linguistic market has to be unified and the different languages (and dialects) of the people measured practically against the legitimate language:

> Integration into a single 'linguistic community', which is a product of the political domination that is endlessly reproduced by institutions capable of imposing universal recognition of the dominant language, is the condition for the establishment of relations of linguistic domination. (Bourdieu 1991:46)

This linking of language, literacy, and national identity happens in a number of sites which include language planning, standardisation, educational policy, citizenship testing, and language instruction for immigrants. One way to link language and national identity is through language policy, planning, and standardisation practices which legitimise particular language varieties and link them to specific identities. May (2001) notes that the suppression of minority languages continues to be a common feature of modern nation-state policy. A challenge to such language policies could come through alternative policies and related linguistic practices, as illustrated in Heller's (1992) discussion of the interplay between language policies and national identities in Quebec. In 1977, the new nationalist government in Quebec adopted the Charter of the French language, commonly known as Bill 101, which made French the language of work, both in the private and in the public sector. This policy, a result of ethnic mobilisation of the 1960s and 1970s, engendered new attitudes to language use and code-switching. Some bilingual Francophones felt – and continue to feel – that to challenge the dominance of English it is necessary to insist on speaking French in public places and service encounters, regardless of how much longer or more complicated this encounter may become. In turn, some anglophones are led to internalise the new form of symbolic capital offered by French, which has acquired new value and status in the linguistic marketplace.

Another, related way to impose national identities is through educational policies that decide which languages are to be employed – and thus legitimised – in the public school system. When a language is symbolically linked to national identity, the bureaucratic nation-state faced with a multilingual pop-

ulation may exhibit "monolingualising tendencies" (Heller 1995: 374). Heller's (1995, 1999) study of a Francophone school in Ontario observed tensions between the monolingual ideology of the school, and the language use and ideologies of at least some of its students, and found that some of the students resisted the linguistic ideology of the school. Also, in a school which was concerned with using French to resist the domination of English, students set up their resistance to the school through the very language which was oppressing them. Pavlenko (2002) demonstrates that when monolingualism in English emerged as an emblem of American national identity following World War I, this ideology resulted in laws which delegitimised the use of languages other than English in the public school system in 34 states.

Anderson (1983) finds narrative to be instrumental in the creation of imagined communities and affirmation of national consciousness, in which individual biographies are joined in a common historical narrative. Recent studies of negotiation of national and ethnic identity narratives show how crucial it is to consider competing identity narratives in understanding who is accepted as being in or out of a particular community. In the United States several researchers have examined how different groups construct competing narratives about 'being' and 'becoming' American with a particular focus on the role of standard English in the process (Bigler 1996; Pavlenko 2001a; Villenas 2001). An illuminating example of contesting identity narratives is Bigler's (1996) study of a public debate surrounding bilingual education issues in an upstate New York town. The researcher compared and analysed two types of stories about 'being' and 'becoming' American told in this debate: those by Latino speakers and those by Euro-Americans, many of whom were first or second generation immigrants. She found that the two groups differed significantly in their understanding of what it means to be an American. Euro-American citizens presented a romantic vision of earlier European immigrants as hard working and ready to assimilate and argued that in order to be successful immigrants they should use one language only, English, with other languages contained within the private sphere of the home or ethnic community. In doing so, they positioned the Latino migrants as lazy newcomers who intend to replace English with Spanish and situated all of them, even Puerto-Ricans, as non-citizens who still have to earn their place in American society. In contrast, Latino speakers emphasised the right to difference, and, most importantly, to bilingualism, and pointed to the fact that underlying linguistic intolerance is racism of a kind very different from that experienced by earlier groups of white European arrivals. Schmidt (2002) similarly explores alternative American identity narratives offered by assimilationist and pluralist ideological positions, locating

these language debates firmly in the context of discourse on national identity and race.

Language ideological debates in multilingual contexts

May (2001:58) points out that the notion of nations as linguistically determined is both essentialist and determinist, and even outmoded. However, Blackledge and Pavlenko (2002) argue that language ideologies continue to act as gate-keeping practices to create, maintain and reinforce boundaries between people in a broad range of contexts, including community, nation, nation-state, state and global levels. Such ideologies come into being in discourses which are explicit and implicit, visible and invisible, official and unofficial, long-term and ephemeral, contested and uncontested, negotiable and non-negotiable. They are produced in discourses in news media, in politics, in narratives of national belonging, in advertising, in academic text, and in popular culture, to name but a few of the contexts where ideologies are constructed. Wherever language or languages are discussed and debated, there are implications for speakers of those languages. Such debates almost always occur in the context of relations of power between groups, and are about more than language alone. Where new legislation is put in place to introduce language tests for citizenship applicants in Britain (Blackledge 2004) and Germany (Piller 2001a), a new gate-keeping device is installed to marginalise those who have language proficiencies which are different from the majority. This is not a linguistic issue alone. The legislation keeps out those who either refuse, or are unable, to abide by the rules of the dominant group. When an erudite, apparently liberal voice calls for an end to bilingual education in the United States in the name of equality and national unity, the voice says that which is "the last thing to be said" (Bourdieu 1991:153). That is, the language of racism is often dressed in the clothes of liberal, educated, articulate, common-sense discourse. When a newspaper article supports a call for the prevention of Punjabi street-signs in an English city (Blackledge 2002b), and appends statistics which appear to prove that 'the ethnic minority has become the majority', the debate is about more than language alone. When former president Theodore Roosevelt asserted that 'We have room for but one language here', he was establishing more than a policy for language; rather, he was setting out an ideology of assimilation, based on the superiority of the 'native' English speaker (Pavlenko 2002). In order to understand the production and reproduction of language ideologies, it is necessary to identify how the laws of linguistic price formation

prevent minority speakers from using symbolic capital to gain access to social and economic mobility. That is, we need to recognise the ways in which social arenas are constructed in often nuanced, subtle and barely visible or audible discourse. A good deal of research has identified the difficulties that linguistic minorities can face in gaining entry to domains of power. Rather less research has identified the ways in which such domains are constructed, and the ongoing reinforcement of their borders, as well as ways in which members of the elite appropriate linguistic resources which are devalued when used by minority speakers. Too little is still known about the countless acts of recognition and misrecognition that produce and reproduce the "magical frontier between the dominant and the dominated" (Bourdieu 2000: 169). These magical frontiers become an issue of social justice when some are excluded at the border and denied access to domains of power. The role of linguistic analysis is to make visible:

> the processes which produce and reproduce the social order. . .and offer to perception an abundance of tangible self-evidences, indisputable at first sight, which strongly tend to give to an illusory representation all the appearances of being grounded in reality. (Bourdieu 2000: 181)

In the analysis of political and media discourse in this volume I seek to identify precisely the kind of 'tangible self-evidences' referred to by Bourdieu, as they are reproduced and recontextualised in political and media discourse.

Language and hegemony

Bourdieu's notion of symbolic violence is consistent with the Gramscian notion of *hegemony*, which emphasises that dominant ideas are particularly powerful because they are the assumed, implicit aspects of a more explicit ideology. Gramsci (1971) proposed that state control could not be sustained over time without the consent of the polity through ideological persuasion; that is, through hegemony (Philips 1998). Although Gramsci did not insist that such persuasion was necessarily implicit more than explicit, in post-Gramscian writings the term *hegemony* has come to mean the taken-for-granted, almost invisible discourse practices of symbolic domination. Hegemony is about domination as well as about integration. That is, it is about the process of a dominant group exerting power over society as a whole, but it is also about making alliances, and achieving consent from subordinated groups (Fairclough 1995a). Hegemonic struggle takes place at a range of sites, from local (e.g., family, workplace, community), to national (e.g., education policy, welfare policy,

naturalisation testing) and international (e.g., globalisation). However, while hegemony is a recognisable process, it is neither stable nor monolithic. Rather, it is constantly shifting, being made and re-made, characterised by contradiction and ambiguity, productive of opposing consciousnesses and identities in subordinate populations, and always exposed to the possibility of alternative counter-hegemonies (Blommaert 1999; Gal 1998; Kroskrity 2000; Williams 1977). The achievement of domination through hegemony is always complex and problematic, usually only partially achieved, and often fragile. When a language is linked to national identity, the symbolic status of that language can create identity and discontinuity, and can both unite and divide, as it can become a battleground, an object of oppression and a means of discrimination (Blommaert & Verschueren 1998a). It is more than a simple national symbol, like a national anthem or a national flag (Bokhorst-Heng 1999). Rather, its symbolic status occurs within the larger process of imagining the nation (Anderson 1983).

Anderson (1983) suggests that nations are imagined political communities, imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. In Anderson's analysis, the development of print capitalism led to a literate bourgeoisie who could now *imagine* themselves as part of that (national) community. Thus nations are *imagined* because most of their members will never meet each other, "yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (1983:6). Irvine and Gal (2000) and Silverstein (2000) argue, however, that Anderson's analysis assumes that linguistic homogeneity is a "real-world precondition" (Irvine & Gal 2000:76), rather than a social construction which may have succeeded (and even been a consequence of) print capitalism. Thus Anderson's analysis may ignore the heterogeneity of multilingual states. That is, while nations are imagined as cohesive monolingual communities, speakers of minority languages or varieties may be unable to gain access to membership of such communities (whether 'real' or imagined). Grillo (1998) points out that while modern nation-states were conceived as ideally homogeneous, seeking from their citizens uniformity and loyalty, this ideology was constantly confronted with the reality of social, cultural, and linguistic heterogeneity. This tension between a dominant ideology of national homogeneity and actual heterogeneity has important implications for multilingual identities and social justice in liberal democratic states. In Western democracies the response to diversity in society has often been to unite around the hegemony of the majority, standard language (Hymes 1996). The monolingualising tendencies (Heller 1995, 1999) of state, social, media, and economic institutions produce and reproduce this dominant ideology of homogeneity. Where such monolingualising tendencies

are associated with the symbolic domination of minority groups, they may be interpreted as a feature of symbolic racism.

Language and symbolic racism

Racism does not only consist of white supremacist ideologies of race, or only of aggressive, overt or blatant discriminatory acts. Racism also involves "the everyday, mundane, negative opinions, attitudes and ideologies and the seemingly subtle acts and conditions of discrimination against minorities" (van Dijk 1993: 5). Racist discourse is not the preserve of extremist groups. Rather, argues van Dijk, it is produced and reproduced in the political, educational and media discourses of elite groups. Political discourse is a crucial element of the reproduction of ideologies in contemporary societies. Schmidt (2002) argues that 'racial categories' are social constructs imposed upon biological patterns by the human imagination and through human discourse. Racial groups are just as much 'imagined communities' as are linguistic groups. They are also just as real as nations, but as they are socially constructed their boundaries and meaning are subject to on-going change and re-definition. Schmidt argues that a process of *racialisation* occurs in the discourse of elites, which ascribes to groups certain characteristics which render them so foreign or 'alien' that it is impossible to conceive of them as equal members of the same community as the elite. Schmidt (2002: 158) suggests that "Racialisation is a social process whose point is inequality". Richardson (2004) argues that the reproduction of racism in discourse is pervasive:

> Critical Discourse Analysis assumes that if racism is reproduced through discourse, then racism will be in evidence at all three 'levels' of discursive communication – social practices, discursive practices, and the texts themselves – in ways which are integrated and mutually self-supporting.
>
> (Richardson 2004: 33)

In Britain (as elsewhere since the attack on the World Trade Centre in New York in 2001), there has recently been a consistent discourse which has characterised Muslim people as alien and 'Other'. Even before that, the *Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia* (The Runnymede Trust 1997) reported that anti-Muslim prejudice has grown rapidly and considerably in recent years, and is visibly manifested in the media, public policy, education and law.

Van Dijk (2000a: 87) defines racism as "a system of social inequality in which ethnic minority groups are dominated by a white (European) majority on the basis of origin, ethnicity, or attributed 'racial' characteristics". Essed

(2000:44) suggests that racism is a process fluently integrated in everyday life, and "everyday racism adapts to cultural arrangements, norms and values while operating through the structures of power in society". The greater the status and authority of the perpetrator of common-sense, prejudiced discourse, the more damage results from such discourse. Reisigl and Wodak (2000:275) define racism as follows:

> Racism is based on the hierarchising construction of groups of persons which are characterised as communities of descent and which are attributed specific collective, naturalised or biologised traits that are considered to be almost invariable. These traits are primarily related to biological features, appearance, cultural practices, customs, traditions, language or socially stigmatised ancestors. They are – explicitly or implicitly, directly or indirectly – evaluated negatively, and this judgement is more or less in accord with hegemonic views.

That is, language practices, cultural traits, traditions and customs come to represent 'race' in hegemonic discourse in an "almost invariable pseudo-causal connection" (p. 275) between biological, social and cultural traits. May (2001) points out that the process of racialisation occurs in two ways. First, biologically determined characteristics have been held to distinguish between groups. This process has been associated with the scientific racism of the nineteenth century, but continues in popular 'common-sense' discourse in contemporary societies. Second is a similar process of ascribing cultural practices to groups. This has led to what May (2001:33) calls "new racisms", which often describe groups in cultural terms without specifically mentioning 'race' or overtly racial criteria. Schmidt (2002:154) put this point clearly: "A *new racism* has developed in recent decades in which specific cultural forms have come to signify racialised identities". When discussions of 'race' as the basis of group difference are no longer politically acceptable, metaphors are sought. For example, in the general election campaign of *Front National* leader Jean-Marie Le Pen in France in April 2002, 'securité' was frequently and successfully used as a metaphor for 'immigration'. Symbolic representation such as this can be found in discourse about cultural practices which mark a particular group as alien from the majority. Common-sense public discourse identifies cultural practices which are different from those of the dominant group, and they become symbols of the 'Otherness' of the minority. That is, cultural practices become racialised, and come to represent a minority ethnic group or groups. Schmidt (2002) argues that in the United States a conjunction of the hegemonic position of the dominant English language and the socially constructed normalisation of 'Whiteness' creates an ideological context within which Americans speaking

languages other than English are racialised as outsiders, as 'Others'. Just as authoritative discourses promoting an English-only policy are best understood as maintaining and promoting that racialising ideological context, in this volume I argue that political discourses which insist on language testing for citizenship applicants in Britain are racialised, and emblematic of 'Otherness'. That is, in official, Government discourse, certain language practices do not belong to the 'imagined community' of Britishness.

In Britain during the last ten years or so, the focus of racist discourse has at least partly shifted from people of Black Caribbean heritage to Muslim peoples whose heritage is in Pakistan and Bangladesh (although Indian and other Asian-heritage groups are often conflated with these). In this climate, a number of visible cultural practices have come to represent Muslim Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups as different from the majority, including, *inter alia*, speaking and making visible minority languages, wearing ethnic dress, especially the *hijab*, participating in arranged marriages, building and attending mosques, fasting during religious periods, eating Halal meat, engaging in regular prayer, especially on Fridays, and setting up and attending Islamic schools (Parekh 2000; The Runnymede Trust 1997). All of these practices have been reported in the media in ways which emphasise the difference between Muslims and the majority British group. Richardson points out that in public reports, 'Islam' and 'the West' are often contrasted in oppositional discourse:

> Muslims are identified as 'Other' by virtue of characteristics which they are presumed or perceived to lack: in other words, their 'lack' of 'Britishness' divides 'Them' from 'Us'. The second method of division is an explicit split, where Islam and/or Muslims are identified as the 'Other' by virtue of values or characteristics which they are perceived to have: in short, their 'Islamic-ness' is used to divide 'Them' from 'Us'. (Richardson 2004: 113)

At the same time, such reporting has often characterised 'Muslims' as a homogeneous group, when there is in fact great diversity among British Muslims. These practices, as reported in political and media discourse, become symbols of difference between the 'White' majority and British Muslim groups (see Blackledge 2001, 2002b, 2003 for examples of media, political and educational discourses which locate some of these practices as markers of difference). As such, they are racialised cultural practices, which become metaphors for 'racial' differences which can not now be spoken. Analysis of political and media discourse in this volume suggests that language practices of Muslim Asian groups in Britain are racialised in the same way as other cultural practices.

Language testing for citizenship

While the discussion above deals predominantly with established linguistic minority communities, another important population for contemporary nation-states are new arrivals. In the twentieth century, citizenship language testing emerged as an important means of social control employed by many nation-states to screen potential citizens (Piller 2001a) and impose non-negotiable national identities. Piller's study of recent (1st January 2000) changes to naturalisation legislation in Germany reveals that when the coalition government of Labour and Greens attempted to simplify the naturalisation process, a central plank of the new criteria for acquisition of German citizenship was proof of German language proficiency. Accordingly, the authorities are now required to test whether naturalisation candidates can cope with daily life in their German environment, can conduct a conversation in German, and can read and understand a German text. Piller's analysis demonstrates that the newly-imposed language testing practices lack both democratic and linguistic validity, as knowledge of the German language functions as an exclusionary gate-keeping device. Piller argues that there is a purpose of language testing that is hidden behind explicit ideologies:

> The purpose of language testing in the naturalisation process is not necessarily the establishment of an objective standard of the applicant's proficiency but rather the maintenance of the boundary between nationals and non-nationals and the safeguarding of the privileges of the former. Language testing in these circumstances can serve to weed out non-desirable applicants.
>
> (Piller 2001a: 268)

Piller's study, based on interviews with naturalisation candidates who had been subject to language tests, demonstrated clearly that the tests were administered unevenly and arbitrarily, and that they were used as gate-keeping devices to exclude certain groups (e.g. Turkish Muslims) while allowing others through the test without having to demonstrate German language proficiency. No training in language testing was given to the naturalisation officers responsible for administering the tests, yet these individuals became powerful gatekeepers with the authority to grant or deny citizenship. In Piller's analysis nations are not only 'imagined communities', which allow people to imagine a shared experience and identity; they are also exclusionary domains, to which access is restricted via citizenship. Of course it is not only in Germany that language testing is part of the process of application for naturalisation. The classic immigration countries, Australia, Canada, and USA all demand some profi-

ciency in English from applicants for citizenship (for a detailed discussion, see Piller 2001a).

In Britain the existing language requirement (that is, as the law stood before the introduction to the statute books of the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act*, 2002) for citizenship applicants was laid out in the *British Nationality Act* 1981 as follows:

(1) If, on application for naturalisation as a British citizen made by a person of full age and capacity, the Secretary of State is satisfied that the applicant fulfils the requirements of Schedule 1 for naturalisation as such a citizen under this subsection, he may, if he thinks fit, grant him a certificate of naturalisation as such a citizen.

(2) If, on application for naturalisation as a British citizen made by a person of full age and capacity who on the date of the application is married to a British citizen, the Secretary of State is satisfied that the applicant fulfils the requirements of Schedule 1 for naturalisation as such a citizen under this subsection, he may, if he thinks fit, grant him a certificate of naturalisation as such a citizen.

Schedule 1 states that, in addition to residential requirements (a) and (d):

> The requirements for naturalisation as a British citizen under 6 (1) are, in the case of any person who applies for it –
> (b) that he is of good character; and
> (c) that he has a sufficient knowledge of the English, Welsh or Scottish Gaelic language

It is clear that applicants for naturalisation as British citizens are required to demonstrate *sufficient knowledge* of the English (or other indigenous British) language. The Act did not expand on what is meant by 'sufficient knowledge'. However, Home Office leaflet BN7: *Information about naturalisation as a British citizen* offered the following gloss:

> The person applying must have a good enough knowledge of the language to deal with everyday situations. He or she does not have to be able to read or write the language. The Home Secretary may decide that the person does not have to meet this requirement if he or she is old or physically or mentally disabled.

Home Office Guide AN: *Naturalisation as a British citizen: a guide for applicants* added the following note:

- Your knowledge of the language does not have to be perfect, but it must be sufficient for you to fulfil your duties as a citizen, and to mix easily with the people with whom you work.
- If because of disability you cannot speak the language, it will be sufficient if you can communicate by, for example, writing or using British sign language.
- If you are old or suffer from physical or mental handicap you may not have to meet this requirement.

Whereas the Government department explains 'sufficient knowledge' in terms of 'everyday situations' in leaflet BN7, in AN the requirement is more specifically related to the duties of citizenship, and to the workplace. Guidance AN states that knowledge of the language 'does not have to be perfect'. It would be interesting to speculate about what criteria would be set if applicants' knowledge of the language *did* have to be 'perfect'. Returning to the Act itself, we find the following note appended to *Subs.* (2):

> Note that knowledge of one of English, Welsh or Gaelic is not required of the spouse of a British citizen as a pre-requisite to the acquisition of British citizenship by naturalisation.

As the law stood before November 2002, whereas applicants for naturalisation as British citizens had to satisfy some (vague) requirement to be able to speak and understand English, this did *not* apply when the applicant was already the spouse of a British citizen. The recent *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* legislates to amend this exception. It is here that a language ideological debate has recently been fought in political discourse in the United Kingdom – a language ideological debate which symbolically links language, race, and culture.

The discourse investigated in this volume focuses on ideologies of language testing for citizenship. In particular, I focus on debates about language testing for citizenship as a solution to the threat of social disorder in Britain. Piller (2001a: 273) argues that "national identity is crucially implicated in citizenship". While affiliation through national identity and affiliation through citizenship are not necessarily the same in contexts of migration, where certain rights depend on citizenship, the availability of citizenship to all residents of a country is crucial for democracy and social justice. Where language testing for citizenship is introduced, a new gate-keeping mechanism comes into play, potentially preventing a group of willing residents from participating in the democratic process, and from accessing their rights. The language ideo-

logical debate which is at the centre of this volume is not unusual. It is one which assumes and constructs consensus, and one in which 'common-sense' argument leads ultimately to a change in the law which is discriminatory and unjust. While this is not a simple, linear chain of discourse, and there may have been pre-existing plans to introduce the new legislation, there are clearly identifiable links between political and media discourses which argue a rationale for extending the legislation in this way.

Discriminatory arguments often masquerade as liberal, common-sense discourses, usually presenting themselves as egalitarian and liberating. If everyone is required to take a test to demonstrate their English proficiency, runs the argument, they will learn English, and be able to participate in democratic British society as active citizens. Asian immigrants will no longer be marginalised or socially excluded, they will be able to find employment, be financially secure, and things will be better for them and their families. In addition, all British people will be able to enjoy a society which is more socially cohesive, in which there is less suspicion, and where everyone is able to communicate with everyone else. These are indeed common-sense arguments. However, they neglect to take account of a number of factors. First, there is no simple correlation between requiring someone to learn a language and their being able to learn it. There is a difference between coercion and access, and classes may be neither accessible nor available. Second, there are questions of how someone activates their social and linguistic capital to gain entry to a place of learning which is 'White', middle-class and situated in the English language, when that person comes from a background which is altogether different. This point is neither academic nor impractical – it is often the precise reason why a potential learner does not gain entry to a class which is otherwise available. Third, to suggest that simply gaining some degree of proficiency in English will lead to acceptance and employment by the host community is naïve and simplistic. Racism and discrimination are often based on appearance, dress, cultural practice, accent, to name only some of the factors at work. Learning a language does not make racism disappear. Fourth, the process of citizenship language testing is likely to be variable, and will often be in the hands of untrained notaries and teachers still to achieve qualification. Therefore it may not be accepted as a valid process by the applicants for citizenship status. Fifth, the punitive nature of the process – learn the language or else – extends the gate-keeping mechanism so that it is more socially exclusive than before. The language testing policy is by definition exclusive, despite the recurring Government discourse of inclusion. A gate-keeping practice is designed to keep people out, not to let people in. If the latter was the rationale, the gates would

be thrown open. For all of these reasons, there is a tension between political discourse which argues that new policy and legislation to extend language testing for citizenship is egalitarian, and the practice, which is discriminatory. It is the playing out of these tensions in discourse which are the focus of this volume.

The idealised native speaker

By the end of the analysis of political and media discourse in this volume it will be clear that as new legislation relating to language testing for British citizenship is introduced and implemented, one of the criteria for the award of a certificate to demonstrate sufficient English proficiency is "a command of English as good as the average native speaker" (Home Office 2004). In the guidance to officials designated as competent to certify that candidates are native English speakers or fluent in English, these terms are used unproblematically, as if they were uncontested categories. However, in recent sociolinguistic research the notion of the "idealised native speaker" has been challenged (Leung, Harris, & Rampton 1997). In discussions about linguistic minority groups in multilingual societies there has often been an abstracted notion of an idealised native speaker of English from which ethnic and linguistic minorities are automatically excluded (Leung, Harris, & Rampton 1997: 546). In their discussion of the language expertise of linguistic minority pupils in British schools, Leung, Harris and Rampton argue that there is a common assumption that such children and young people are relative newcomers to English, or at least lack native-speaker expertise, but that 'White' majority group pupils share native-speaker proficiency in an undifferentiated English. However, Rampton (1995) has clearly demonstrated that the simple notion of 'native-speaker expertise' does not reflect the linguistic complexity of multilingual Britain. He argued that as membership of social groups changes over time, so does language. Being born into a language does not necessarily mean being able to speak that group's language proficiently. Many 'native' speakers of English cannot tell stories or write reports, while many 'non-natives' can. Nobody's functional command is total: users of a language are more proficient in some areas than others (Rampton 1995: 337). Rampton challenges the notion that each individual speaker has a single native language: "The idea that people really only have one native language, that really monolingualism is the fundamental linguistic condition, also underlies a widespread failure to recognise *new* and *mixed* linguistic identities" (Rampton 1995: 338).

Rampton argues that the 'native speaker' category should be broken down into a distinction between 'expertise' (skill, proficiency, ability to operate with a language), and 'allegiance' (identification with a language, with the values, meanings and identities that it stands for). If native speaker competence is specified as the target for language learners, as in one version of the certification of language for naturalisation applicants it certainly is, "the goal-posts are being shifted by people they cannot often challenge" (Rampton 1995: 341). The notion of expertise requires a closer specification of the types and levels of knowledge than the category of native speaker competence. 'Allegiance' implies loyalty to a language, both in terms of 'inheritance' and 'affiliation'. However, Rampton's research on 'crossing' provides clear evidence that allegiance to a language is not a matter of straightforward association between cultural/ethnic origin and linguistic belonging:

> In crossing, some white and black kids were accepted by its inheritors as affiliates of Panjabi; young people of Indian and Pakistani descent disclaimed the inheritance of Asian English ascribed to them by white society; affiliates to Creole and Panjabi deferred to the expertise of its inheritors, even though this might be minimal by the standards of their parents; and at the meta-level, the rituals of affiliation themselves developed into a new inheritance. Tied up with a sense of origin and of place, language ability and allegiance were continuously at issue, but the processes of their negotiation would, in contrast, be entirely obscured if we stayed with the 'native speaker'. (Rampton 1995: 343)

Notwithstanding contemporary linguistic research which calls into question the essentialised notion of the native speaker, it remains a powerful category in the consecration and commodification of language in Government discourse. Piller (2001a, b) argues that ideologies of national and linguistic identity commonly converge, and are expressed in linguistic nationalism, and speakers of the official language are granted privileged access to the nation as a result of their status as 'native speakers'.

Multilingualism and society

Before proceeding to analysis of language ideological debate in relation to language testing for citizenship, it is helpful to summarise some of the existing research relating to multilingualism in society. This is important not least because in some of the public pronouncements of senior politicians, there appear to be misunderstandings in this area. Whilst it is not possible to give a com-

prehensive review in this chapter of the literature relating to the effects of multilingualism, it is important to provide a context for debates to come. In this discussion I use the terms 'bilingualism' and 'multilingualism' interchangeably. In an introduction to their recent volume, Dewaele, Housen and Li Wei (2003) point out that bilingualism in itself is innocuous, in the sense that it is the norm for most people in the world. Although at one time it was believed by some to have harmful effects:

> There is now increasing evidence that, *given the right conditions*, bilingualism can confer distinct benefits like intellectual, psychological, social, cultural and economic improvement on the individual. And countries such as Luxembourg, Norway, Switzerland, Belgium, Canada and Singapore stand as compelling reminders that bilingual societies need not be more unstable or disadvantaged than unilingual ones. On the contrary, the number of bi- and multilingual speakers a country produces may be seen as an indicator of its educational standards, economic competitiveness and cultural vibrancy. Clearly, bilingualism may be a condition to be aspired to and cherished, rather than one to be prevented or remedied. (Dewaele, Housen, & Li Wei 2003: 1)

In the discourse surrounding English language testing for British citizenship, bilingualism per se is rarely the subject of contestation. However, it is precisely the issue that lies beneath the surface of the debate. The various authoritative discourses produced by powerful political actors consistently associate negative factors with languages other than English. In the social arena constructed in these discourses, bilingual societies, bilingual families and bilingual individuals are regarded as unstable and disadvantaged. The suppression of minority languages through negative associations in this discourse produces a monolingual language ideology in a multilingual setting. Baetens Beardsmore (2003: 10) concludes, after many years of research, that "there is a deep-seated and widespread fear of bilingualism". This fear is certainly evident in the discourse discussed in this volume. Baetens Beardsmore adds that "Moreover, there is an all-pervading tendency to couple the notion of 'problems' to that of bilingualism" (p. 10). This tendency is also strongly evident in the discourse analysed in this volume, as the use of languages other than English in England is associated with a range of negative outcomes.

Despite this fear of bilingualism, and the association with bilingualism of societal problems, there is general agreement that immigrant groups should have the opportunity to learn the host language, to facilitate their integration into society. However, "This argument puts the cart before the horse since it implies that language is the key to integration when in fact it is integration that is the key to language acquisition" (Baetens Beardsmore 2003: 23). The crucial

question here is not whether immigrant groups should become bilingual – few would argue that immigrants to England should not be allowed to learn English, least of all the immigrants themselves. The key question is rather one of the continuing status of the group's other language(s). Should the immigrant group *replace* their home language with English, so that they become mainly English speakers, and pass on English to their children? Or should they *add* English to their other languages, becoming multilingual, and pass on all of their linguistic resources to their children? That is, should their linguistic practices reflect an assimilationist, monolingual ideology, or a pluralist, multilingual ideology? As this question is at the heart of the debate in this volume, I will briefly introduce each of these language ideological positions.

According to the assimilationist view of immigration, it is better for the immigrant group, and better for the receiving society, that the immigrant group assimilates to the ways, customs and practices of the dominant group in the receiving society as quickly as possible. One of the ways in which this is achieved is through learning the dominant language of the receiving society as quickly and efficiently as possible, and either leaving behind home and community languages, or using them sparingly, in private contexts. In this view, the language of the receiving group (in the context of this volume English) is learned more proficiently and quickly under conditions where the home and community languages do not interfere with the development of the new language. The only language of public discourse should therefore be English. In particular, schooling should be conducted entirely in and through English, as use of other languages at school will only be confusing for children. English is also the language of other public institutions, as this provides motivation for immigrant groups to learn the host language. Bilingualism is accepted as an inevitable stage in the journey to English dominance in the immigrant group, and is tolerated as a linguistic practice in private domains.

In the pluralist view of immigration, it is better for the immigrant group, and better for the receiving society, that the immigrant group continues to engage in the ways, customs and practices of its culture, while learning the customs and practices of the receiving society. In this view there is recognition of the research evidence that active maintenance of the home and community languages has positive effects on linguistic development in the new language. In particular, the level of development of children's mother tongue is a strong predictor of their second language development, and mother tongue promotion in the school helps develop not only the mother tongue but also children's abilities in the majority school language (Cummins 2000, 2003). The research indicates that bilingual and multilingual education programmes are neces-

sary to develop the linguistic resources of children, and therefore of society. In the pluralist view, public discourse should where possible be conducted in the appropriate languages of the communities. The pluralist view recognises and encourages the enormous contribution immigrant groups make to their societies, in terms of linguistic, cultural and intellectual resources. Bilingualism becomes the norm for a large number of people, not only recently arrived groups, but also for people whose families arrived as immigrants three, four and five generations ago. Government at national and local levels provides resources to ensure that the languages of the country and community are fully visible and available.

Both of these ideological positions accept bilingualism as an inevitable feature of immigration. However, they represent very different ideological positions. In the assimilationist view, bilingualism is a negative feature of the minority group, as languages other than English interfere with integration to the host society, and represent the refusal or inability of the group to assimilate. In the pluralist view, bilingualism is a positive feature of the minority group, as languages other than English make a positive contribution to the acquisition of English, and to the cultural and intellectual resources of the host society. The recent legislative change in the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum* Act 2002 in relation to language testing for citizenship does not refer explicitly to bilingualism, or to bilingual practices. However, in the chain of public and political discourse linking the civil disorder in northern England in 2001 with the new legislation, an assimilationist ideology is clearly evident, as languages other than English come to be associated with negative features. As we will see in the discourse discussed in the remainder of the volume, the language debate is not about language alone, but comes to represent an authoritative ideological position in relation to Asian minority groups.

Chapter 3

Discourse and discrimination in the social arena

In this chapter I look back from the 'race riots' of Summer 2001 in an attempt to understand the social and discursive context in which these events occurred. In Chapter 1 we saw that political and media texts can be viewed as links in 'chains of discourse', which may be transformed as they move up the textual chain and become more authoritative. In Chapter 2 I summarised recent research which has demonstrated that discourse is constituted by, and constitutive of, social practices. In using CDA to identify discriminatory discourses it is important to look diachronically as well as synchronically: to understand the historical as well as the contemporary social and discursive context. One of the means of identifying the discursive construction of the social arena in the northern towns where the social disorder occurred is to examine typical examples of the local news media in the months and years leading up to the violence in the streets in the Summer of 2001.

Positioning the researcher in research on multilingualism

Van Dijk (2001) points out that Critical Discourse Analysis situates its analysis both in its social, cultural and historical context, and in the perspective and position of the researcher(s), in particular explicitly defining and defending its own sociopolitical position. Before moving to analysis of discourse in which the violence of 2001 was historically located, therefore, I will set out an overview of the recent history of immigration and multiculturalism in Britain. First, however, I will briefly set out my own position in relation to the language ideological debate at the heart of this volume. Although I had grown up in increasingly multilingual Birmingham in the 1960s and 1970s, my first significant encounter with multilingualism in any real sense was as a primary (elementary) school teacher in inner-city Birmingham in the late 1980s. Almost all of the children I taught were of Pakistani- or Bangladeshi-heritage. Most had been born in Birmingham, to immigrant parents. A small number were newly ar-

rived immigrants themselves. The schools I taught in respected and valued the children's languages, and made efforts to engage with the families' cultural and religious backgrounds. There were some bilingual support staff in the schools, but the curriculum was taught almost exclusively in English. Just as today, there were no bilingual education programmes in state-funded schools in England at that time. Teaching in these communities led me to develop a profound interest in multilingualism in education, and in society more broadly.

My Ph.D. thesis was a study of the home and school literacy practices of Bangladeshi families in Birmingham, conducted with the support of a bilingual Sylheti/English-speaking fieldworker (Blackledge 1998, 2000). In the course of this investigation it became clear that even in schools with a positive orientation to involving linguistic minority parents in their children's education, many Bangladeshi families were unable to perform the kind of partnership role required by the school, and unable to access the support offered by the school. At the same time, the parents engaged in home literacy practices which were unrecognised by the school, including cultural storytelling, and teaching Bengali literacy. There was a clear mismatch between the linguistic resources demanded by the institution and the resources accessible to the parents and families. Despite good will on both sides, some parents and children remained marginalised by the educational process. It seemed clear that the reason for this continuing marginalisation of some families and their children was not the fault of individual teachers, but was situated in broader structures in society. That is, there were political and ideological structures which constantly constructed a social world in which minority Asian languages were not valued as part of England's linguistic landscape, and remained invisible in public, institutional domains. For some families this meant that they were unable to gain access to material resources. It was in this context that I became interested in the structuring structures which create social worlds where minority language speakers may be unable to access their symbolic capital in certain linguistic markets. Investigation of such structures is therefore not divorced from the day-to-day multilingual practices of linguistic minority speakers in England. Rather, it is a means of viewing the ways in which the interactional is structured by the ideological, and the ideological structured by the interactional. There appears to be a dynamic relationship between the public discourse of social elites (e.g. politicians) and the multilingual practices of linguistic minority speakers. In this sense the structural is peopled by practices, as practices are structured by structures.

In terms of my own political allegiances, I have been a member of the Labour Party for twenty-five years. The political standpoint of the critical dis-

course analyst should never be entirely absent, as it may be impossible to analyse political language behaviour unless one exercises one's political intuitions (Chilton 2004). Most of the political discourse (in speeches, interviews, press briefings and articles) discussed in this volume is that of Labour politicians, whether within or outside of the Government. That is, this is the discourse of the political party I have actively supported since I became a voter. At the same time, I am entirely in agreement with van Dijk's (2001) view that the role of Critical Discourse Analysis is to oppose those who abuse text and talk in order to establish, confirm or legitimate their abuse of power. This is not to say that the interpretation of the texts discussed here is presented as the only one available. Rather, the analysis recognises that other interpretations may also be available. Consistent with Weiss and Wodak (2003), the analysis of texts in this volume sets out to avoid simply politicizing by following the principle of triangulation. That is, the analysis focuses on "a variety of different empirical data, as well as background information" (Weiss & Wodak 2003: 22). Rather than focusing simply on linguistic dimensions, the analysis sets out to situate itself in the historical, political and sociological dimensions of the texts. Further, and again in line with Weiss and Wodak's principle of triangulation, the analysis incorporates the historical dimension of discourse "by exploring the ways in which particular genres of discourse are subject to diachronic change, that is, the intertextuality and interdiscursivity" (2003: 22). Of course the analyst, like any other reader, brings his or her own biography, history and political orientation to a reading of the text. Rather than attempting to disguise or remove this aspect of analysis, I account for it by making explicit my own orientation to the language ideological debate discussed here. As suggested in Chapter 3, political discourse is a crucial element of the reproduction of ideologies in contemporary societies. It is therefore important to investigate political and other elite discourse which refers to debates about minority languages in society. While we should not assume that public debates about language necessarily contribute to hegemonic ideologies, detailed analysis of such discourse can frequently reveal the discriminatory in the apparently 'common-sense' and consensual.

Immigration and multiculturalism in Britain

Before beginning analysis of texts which constitute the language ideological debate played out in the political and media arenas surrounding the issue of language testing for British citizenship, I will briefly contextualise these discourses in relation to the recent history of immigration to Britain, and the imagining

of the multilingual nation-state. In the period since the end of World War Two, the extent and rapidity of Britain's transformation from a largely homogeneous nation into a multicultural society was remarkable (Hansen 2000). The British Government's free entry policy on immigration from Commonwealth countries during the fourteen years to 1962 meant that there was an influx of around 500,000 primary migrants, mainly from the Caribbean, Pakistan and India. Immigration controls were introduced in the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, and strengthened in the 1981 British Nationality Act. The latter legislation meant that in less than twenty years Britain had moved from a policy of no immigration restrictions to "one of the strictest migration policies in the Western world" (Hansen 2000: 20). The 2001 U.K. Census found that the majority of the population were 'White' (92.1 per cent). Among the remaining 7.9 per cent (4.6 million), Indians were the largest ethnic group (1,053,411), followed by Pakistanis (747,285), Black Caribbean (565,876), Black African (485,277), Bangladeshis (283,063), Chinese (247,403), and 'other Asian' groups (247,664). A further 677,117 self-identified their ethnicity as 'Mixed' (Office for National Statistics 2004).

During the late 1960s and 1970s, the emphasis in immigration control shifted from workers, whose entry was by then tightly controlled, to the family members of those who had already entered Britain: "Provision for family reunion, involving dubious medical techniques and intrusive questioning, even of small children, were interpreted so as to cast doubt on the paternity of Asian children and the validity of Asian marriages" (Parekh 2000: 208). One of the clearest examples of these measures was the 'primary purpose' marriage rule. Originally this applied to women settled in the U.K. whose right to live in the U.K. with a foreign husband was qualified by the need to show that the marriage was not one of convenience, for immigration reasons. The immediate target of the 'primary purpose' rule was to exclude young men from Bangladesh, India and Pakistan. By 1990 the initial refusal rate for such men had reached 60 per cent of applications. In 1988 the Immigration Act removed the right of Britons to bring spouses to the country of their citizenship. The new requirements to be met before spouses would be allowed to join their husbands or wives in Britain included economic status, home ownership, and intention to live together permanently. Although the current (1997 – present) Labour Government liberalised the previous legislation in respect of the entry of spouses of British citizens by abolishing the primary purpose rule, Britain remains the only European country not to recognise the right of a citizen to have his or her spouse join him or her in the country of his or her citizenship (Hansen 2000: 233). The Parekh Report found that even following the abolition

of the primary purpose rule there are continuing problems, as "The marriage rules are still leading to disproportionate refusals of black and Asian spouses" (Parekh 2000:220).

One of the official responses to the influx of migrants to Britain was "a state-sponsored race relations industry" (Koopmans & Statham 2003:213), which in part reflected fears of U.S.-style 'race riots'. Joppke and Morawska (2003) distinguish between responses to diversity which they characterise as "official multiculturalism" and "*de facto* multiculturalism". Of these *de facto* multiculturalism is the more widespread in European states, and is the pragmatic response of the state to immigration, in the pursuit of its own interests. However, Joppke and Morawska acknowledge that while there have been concessions from liberal states to (for example) religious diversity, attempts to accommodate linguistic diversity have been far less common. Official multiculturalism goes beyond *de facto* multiculturalism in engaging the state in the recognition and protection of immigrants as distinct ethnic groups, and is both less common and more precarious in nature. The Parekh Report (Parekh 2000) on the future of multi-ethnic Britain made a specific recommendation that the Government formally declare the U.K. a multicultural society. However, this recommendation has not so far been implemented.

Koopmans and Statham (2003) propose four models of state response to post-immigration diversity in relation to citizenship. The first, 'ethno-cultural assimilation', makes access to the political community difficult for migrants, and such opportunities as do exist are tied to the precondition that the migrant group assimilates to the host culture. In Europe this model is characterised by Germany. A second model, 'ethno-cultural pluralism', exemplified by Switzerland, shares the ethno-cultural basis of citizenship with Germany, but does not insist that migrants adapt to one specified cultural model. The third type, 'civic assimilation', characterised by France, provides for open access to citizenship through its *jus soli* attribution to French-born children, but imposes a unitary model of public conduct for citizens. Thus ethno-cultural groups are not recognised as such by the state. Finally, Britain, Sweden and the Netherlands belong to the fourth type, 'civic pluralism', in which access to the political community is through *jus soli* and/or an open naturalisation policy. In this model access to citizenship is on the whole not conditional upon assimilation, and new citizens are allowed to retain their cultural identities. Of course these are not impermeable categories, and some states have characteristics of more than one of the four types. In relation to other European states, though, Britain has developed a relatively liberal, 'multicultural' response to mass immigration.

Hansen (2003:101) points out that in Britain recently there has been a "liberal, but thin, definition of citizenship", which dates back to 1981. Until 1948 British people were 'subjects' of the monarch, rather than citizens. From 1948 until 1981 Britons shared an imperial citizenship with citizens of Britain's colonies. Hansen suggests that this history has led to uncertainty about the rights and obligations associated with British citizenship. As we will see later in this volume, this concern has recently been addressed by the British Government, as part of the drive to improve social cohesion which includes an extension of citizenship language testing. Hansen argues that in current political discourse "debates about immigration and integration have become debates about citizenship" (2003:102). In Britain there has in recent times been a revaluation of the notion of citizenship, and an active effort on the part of Government to link citizenship with specific values and obligations. The Parekh Report (2000) found that citizenship does not automatically indicate a sense of belonging to the political/national community. It is not unusual for someone to be a citizen, yet feel that they are not accepted, and do not belong. The experience of being a full citizen yet also a relative outsider can damage the quality of someone's citizenship and the depth of their commitment to the political community:

> Full acceptance is a deeper notion than inclusion. Such inclusion is offered on terms already set by the wider society, it involves assimilation, sharing current norms of what it means to be a British or a good citizen, and demands a heavy cultural entrance fee. Full acceptance, however, involves renegotiating the terms and redefining the current norms of Britishness so as to create secure spaces within them for each person's individual qualities.
>
> (Parekh 2000:55)

In this volume we will see how the revaluation of citizenship has played out in public discourse relating to ideologies of multilingualism and minority Asian languages. In Britain, just as in Germany in 1999 and 2000, a liberalisation of the general requirements for acquisition of citizenship has been accompanied by a tightening of the language requirements (Joppke & Morawska 2003).

Britain as a multilingual nation-state

One effect of mass immigration to Britain has been to alter the linguistic landscape of the nation. Whereas in the period before 1948 England was largely monolingual, with very small numbers of bilingual or multilingual speakers,

immigration from Pakistan, Bangladesh and India in particular introduced new languages to the communities of many urban areas. The most comprehensive study of languages other than English in England, the Linguistic Minorities Project (1985), is already twenty years old. Nevertheless, it stands as an instructive account of the rapid change from a predominantly monolingual to a multilingual society which England enjoyed in the second half of the twentieth century. The largest linguistic groups among the new arrivals to Britain in the 1960s and 1970s were speakers of Gujarati, Punjabi, Urdu, Hindi and Bengali. This is of course a very considerable over-simplification. Individuals who describe themselves as 'Punjabi' speakers may have their origins in the Punjab of North India, or in the Mirpur region of Pakistan, despite the differences between the languages spoken in these two regions. Those who describe themselves as 'Urdu speakers' may do so because Urdu is associated with particular religious, educational and economic status in Pakistan, while their main spoken language may be a non-literate regional variety. Those described as 'Bengali speakers' in the U.K. are mainly speakers of Sylheti, from the Sylhet region of Bangladesh, but like Urdu, Bengali has particular cultural and symbolic associations which often attract a higher status than Sylheti. Also, recent linguistic research (e.g. Rampton 1995, 1999a, b) has demonstrated that not all second or third generation young people speak the language of their cultural and geographical heritage, as in some cases they prefer to associate with other linguistic varieties. There are now more than three hundred languages spoken in London alone, with Turkish, Arabic, Yoruba, Somali, Cantonese and Greek among the most commonly used languages after those listed above. A central argument of this volume is that while the linguistic landscape has certainly changed, the predominant ideology in relation to minority languages other than English remains little altered. That is, in political, media and other public discourse, a monolingual ideology still obtains, despite clear evidence that more than three hundred languages are in regular and robust use in towns and cities across the country. There is a clear mismatch between the multilingualism of the people and the monolingualism of the dominant ideology.

Discriminatory discourse in the local news media

In the remainder of this chapter I begin empirical analysis with discussion of selected examples of articles from local daily newspapers in the Burnley and Oldham area, some months before the social unrest in the Summer of 2001. Fowler (1991) points out that newspapers have no special character among

representational texts. Rather, newspaper discourse is an example of a process found in *all* discourse. However, Fowler argues that newspapers have a particular importance in mediating ideologies because (i) they are able to reach large numbers of people at any one time, and (ii) the newspaper industry has a vested interest in reproducing the status quo through representation of ideas and events which appear to be consensual common-sense. Bourdieu (1998a) goes beyond this in his analysis, suggesting that in its reporting of certain issues the journalistic field responds to the competitive market by over-emphasising negative features and constructing a dramatic and frightening world full of ethnic wars, racist hatred and violent crime.

Van Dijk (2000b) notes that much of the information in news reports is implicit, and supplied by the recipients on the basis of their knowledge of the context and of the world:

> in news and editorials about ethnic affairs, many meanings are merely implied or presupposed and not explicitly stated. Because of social norms, and for reasons of impression management, for instance, many negative things about minorities may not be stated explicitly, and thus are conveyed between the lines. For instance in a sentence like 'The rising crime in the inner city worried the politicians', it is presupposed, and not explicitly stated, that there is rising crime in the inner city, as if this were a known 'fact'. (van Dijk 2000b: 40)

Van Dijk further argues that in news reports which refer to ethnic and linguistic minorities, 'disclaimers' are often introduced. These are semantic moves which appear to offer a liberal orientation to minority groups, while at the same time maintaining a discriminatory message. Common examples of these are apparent denials (e.g. 'we have nothing against immigrants but. . .'), apparent concessions (e.g. 'there are some immigrants who are prepared to learn English, but. . .'), apparent empathy ('it is in their own best interests. . .'), and transfer ('I have nothing against immigrants, but many people feel. . .'). These typical examples are common in news discourse which refers to minority groups.

Caldas-Coulthard (2003) reminds us that newspaper articles are not naturally occurring phenomena, but are socially and culturally determined. News is not the event itself, but the ideologically framed report of the event. Caldas-Coulthard suggests that "People watch or read 'news' because they think 'news' is about reality" (2003: 274). That is, when people encounter an article in a newspaper they may believe that they are encountering the truth, which is passed on as objectively as possible. This may only be partly true, as newspapers (in Britain, at least) are very diverse in register and genre, and most readers will recognise that some 'news' stories are at least partial inventions

created to sell the newspaper. However, Caldas-Coulthard's point suggests that for many people a newspaper report can have a powerful influence on their understanding of, and attitudes to, the social world. The ways in which people are represented have real consequences as far as their lives, rights and position in a society are concerned (Pietikäinen 2003). Representations of minority ethnic groups in news media can validate diversity and solidarity, or contestation and differentiation. Several studies have demonstrated that in the news media, ethnic minorities are frequently represented in relation to social problems, crime and disturbance (Reisigl & Wodak 2001; ter Wal 2002; van Dijk 1991).

Van Dijk (2005) concludes that major and influential forms of institutionalised racism are to be found in the mass media. Stereotypes and prejudices repeatedly find their way into the media, sometimes blatantly, sometimes more subtly. The everyday lives and concerns of minorities are rarely covered. Their negative acts, and especially crime and drugs, are emphasised, while their major contributions to culture and society – except in sports and entertainment – tend to be ignored. Richardson (2004) concluded that for many years British newspapers have represented black and minority ethnic people in terms of conflict, controversy and deviance, and that journalists recurrently use prejudicial stereotypes to represent and characterise Britain's minority communities. Many people's beliefs about immigrants or minorities are based on their representation in the mass media. This means that much 'popular' racism does not have a popular source at all, but is reproduced from various kinds of elite racism articulated by politicians or commentators. Van Dijk (2005) suggests that the process of racism involves control of access to public discourse. The elites who control the most important forms of public discourse, such as the politicians and journalists, bear most responsibility for the ways the public discourses they control contribute to the reproduction of racist beliefs.

Argumentation strategies in discourse of representation

A key discursive strategy in the media texts surrounding the discourse relating to the 'riots' of Summer 2001 is that of argumentation. Reisigl and Wodak (2000) suggest that in analysing discriminatory discourse, *topoi* are powerful and influential discourse strategies. Topoi can be described as parts of argumentation that belong to obligatory, either explicit or inferable, premises. They are the content-related warrants or 'conclusion rules' that connect the argument with the conclusion or claim (Reisigl & Wodak 2001:75). That is, arguments can be identified which have occurred elsewhere in other discrimi-

natory discourses. Van Dijk (2000a: 97) describes topoi as "the common-sense reasoning typical for specific issues" and "the most typical elements of the argumentative and persuasive nature of debates on immigration, integration and the multicultural society" (98). Analysis of typical content-related strategies used in argument for discrimination can be done by categorising topoi in the following way. This list is derived from the texts discussed in the present volume, and does not presume to be exhaustive or comprehensive:

1. topos of advantage/usefulness
2. topos of danger/threat
3. topos of definition/name-interpretation
4. topos of burdening/weighting down
5. topos of law/right
6. topos of culture
7. topos of abuse
8. topos of authority
9. topos of finance
10. topos of equality
11. topos of human rights
12. topos of responsibility

(adapted from Reisigl & Wodak 2000: 278)

1. The *topos of advantage/usefulness* argues that if an action would be useful, then it should be done. That is, in discourse about multicultural societies there is an argument that something should be done because it would be better for the minority group(s). In the local newspaper discourse analysed here, the argument is made that the funding of translation and interpretation services should be stopped because it:

> demeaned the status and self-respect of immigrant communities
> (*Lancashire Evening Telegraph*, 7th September 2000)

   Here an illiberal policy proposal is located in a topos which appears to support the identity of linguistic minority groups.
2. The *topos of danger or threat* argues that if a political action or decision bears dangerous or threatening consequences, it should not be performed; or, put another way, if there are specific dangers or threats, something should be done to prevent this. In the following example from a Parliamentary speech, Ann Cryer M.P. argues that if some people do not speak English, sectarian violence will ensue. Integration will only be achieved when:

> all members of the Asian community have some grasp of English and when whites and Asians recognise that there can be gain only from all sides living together in peace and understanding. The alternative is a Belfast-like situation. (Hansard July 17th 2001)

Here some people's failure to 'grasp' English is represented as a threat to social cohesion.

3. The *topos of definition or name-interpretation* argues that if someone or some thing is allocated a name or definition, then that person or thing shall carry the qualities or attributes contained in that name. An example of this topos in the period leading up to the Summer of 2001 was situated in an ongoing debate about council grants to support the teaching of Asian languages. Conservative councillors' argument that the council should not 'hand over grants to mosques' centred on the use of the term 'mother tongue':

> English is the mother tongue of children born in this country and not Urdu, Punjabi or Gujarati, even though their parents may come from Asia. (*Lancashire Evening Telegraph* 25th July 1997)

In this example the conclusion rule argues that if the language to be supported is named a 'foreign language', and not a 'mother tongue', no additional funding should be allocated, as foreign language teaching is funded through the mainstream budget.

4. The *topos of burdening/weighting down* is a causal topos, a topos of consequence. In the context of discriminatory discourse, this argumentation strategy points to the harm done to others by the presence or actions of the minority group. An example of this conclusion rule appears in an editorial piece in the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* article of September 13th 2000. In its closing point, the editorial insists that translation services should be voluntarily provided, to:

> lift this burden off the taxpayer.
> (*Lancashire Evening Telegraph* 13th September 2000)

Here the editorial is clearly stating that council funding of a translation service does harm to 'the taxpayer', and should therefore be stopped.

5. The *topos of law or right* is based on the conclusion rule that if a law prescribes or forbids specific political action, the action must be performed or omitted. In an example from the British Government White Paper, *Se-*

cure Borders, Safe Haven (2002), an existing law is invoked to argue for the strengthening of legislation on language testing and citizenship:

> There is already a requirement in the British Nationality Act 1981 that applicants for naturalisation should have a sufficient command of a recognised British language, but this is not really enforced in practice.
> (Home Office 2002a)

The *topos of law* here proposes that if there is existing legislation on the statute books, the argument is already won. That is, language testing for naturalisation candidates is necessarily a good thing because a law was previously passed which institutionalised and legitimated the practice.

6. The *topos of culture* is based on the argument that problems arise because a group's culture is as it is. An example of this argumentation strategy comes from one of the official reports into the contexts and causes of the 'race riots' in the north of England in 2001. The report into race relations in Bradford (*Community Pride, Not Prejudice)* stated that:

> Children are taken out of formal education at critical periods for lengthy stays in Pakistan, thus damaging their academic development.
> (Ouseley 2001: 14)

The apparently common-sense conclusion that when children are taken by their families to visit their heritage countries, their academic development is damaged, is unsupported by research evidence (Blackledge 2003). Yet in the common-sense argument here this cultural practice is taken to harm their educational progress.

7. The *topos of abuse* refers to abuse of given rights by minority groups, and argues that such rights should be amended or removed. In an article from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph*, the leader of the Independent group of councillors is reported to have spoken of:

> immigrant communities which had had for generations the advantages of the English education system.
> (*Lancashire Evening Telegraph* September 7th 2000)

The argumentation strategy here proposes that the 'immigrant communities' had already been given more than enough, and so should not be allowed to demand more.

8. The *topos of authority* is based on the argument that if an authoritative figure says that something is right or wrong, then it *is* right or wrong.

In the discourse of the language ideological debate discussed in this volume, the argument pursued states that if other countries do something, then it is right for Britain to do the same. For example, in seeking to argue that language testing for citizenship is the right policy for Britain, the Government's White Paper points out that:

> The administration of language tests as part of the naturalisation process exists in a number of countries, including France, Germany, Australia and Canada. (Home Office 2002a)

The conclusion rule here provides that if language tests are used for citizenship testing in other countries, they must be right for Britain.

9. The *topos of finance* is characterised by the conclusion rule that if a specific action costs too much money, steps should be taken to prevent or diminish that action. In an article from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph*, the translation section of the interpretation unit is said to have:

> spent £485,000, and had an income of £161,000 – a deficit of £324,000 funded by Burnley council taxpayers.
> (*Lancashire Evening Telegraph* September 7th 2000)

The conclusion therefore is that as the translation section of the unit is expensive, it should be closed.

10. The *topos of equality* is based on the principle that all should have equal rights. Thus, if an action or policy brings about inequality or injustice, that action or policy should be prevented. In an article from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* Councillor Brooks argues that closing the translation and interpretation unit of Burnley Borough Council would:

> demonstrate the council's commitment to the principal of equal treatment. (*Lancashire Evening Telegraph* September 7th 2000)

Here an apparently liberal conclusion rule is used to argue an illiberal motion. This is a recurrent topos in the chain of discourse related to English language testing for British citizenship.

11. Similarly, the *topos of human rights* argues that if a policy or action does not uphold human rights, it should be prevented. In arguing for language testing for naturalisation applicants, the British Government White Paper, *Secure Borders, Safe Haven*, argues that:

> The Human Rights Act 1998 can be viewed as a key source of values that British citizens should share. (Home Office 2002a)

The conclusion rule here argues that as it is the basic human right of all to be able to speak English, all citizenship applicants should be tested for their proficiency in English.

12. The *topos of responsibility* argues that because a group or person is responsible for the way things are, that group or person should act to put things right. For example, in an editorial from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* analysed in this chapter, the following argument is made:

> surely the Asian community has sufficient English speakers to provide voluntary translation services.
>
> (*Lancashire Evening Telegraph* 13th September 2000)

This argument proposes that as it is the 'Asians' who want the service, it is they who should provide it.

The argumentation strategies outlined here recur with regularity throughout discriminatory discourses on issues of immigration, asylum-seekers and refugees, and minority language policy. The recontextualisation of these topoi in different discursive contexts and genres allows their reproduction and transformation in chains of discourse which can be tracked across increasingly authoritative semiotic domains.

Representation in news discourse

Fairclough (1995a) distinguishes between 'primary discourse' (the representing or reporting discourse) and 'secondary discourse' (the discourse being represented or reported). Within these distinctions, 'direct discourse' is discourse which is reported in quotation marks as (purportedly) the actual words used, while 'indirect discourse' summarises what was said or written, with no quotation marks, and with a shift in tense and deixis. Thus, whilst:

> "They are no longer immigrants", he said

is an example of direct discourse, the following is an example of the same utterance represented in indirect discourse:

> He said that they were no longer immigrants

Fairclough suggests (1995a, 2003a) that intermediate between direct and indirect reporting is 'free indirect reporting', which has some of the tense and deixis shifts typical of indirect speech, but without a reporting clause. A more

significant contrast for the examples at the centre of this chapter, however, is demarcation between the voice of the reporter/article and the voice of the person whose discourse is being represented. This distinction is often indicated by quotation marks, which may serve to maintain the boundary between primary and secondary discourse. This process of boundary maintenance can have important ideological effects, as speech which is reported in indirect discourse may be more closely aligned with the voice of the reporter/article, whereas speech which clearly belongs to another, and is bounded by quotation marks, is less likely to be aligned with the voice of the reporter/article. We will see as the analysis develops that the picture is in fact more complex than this, as a single utterance may be shaped not only by identifiable other utterances, but also by historical and anticipated discourse.

Discourse and discrimination in the local press

In this section I will use the framework outlined above as a means of investigating discriminatory discourse in two related articles from the news media in the discourse-historical context of the violence on the streets of northern England. In addition to analysis of the argumentation strategies at work in the texts, I will attend to the more detailed analysis of the linguistic means and realisations by which discriminatory discourse is achieved. The two articles I have selected for detailed analysis are from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* of September 7th and September 13th 2000 (Appendix 3.1 and 3.2). I selected these articles because they provide a historical dimension to the analysis of media and political discourse surrounding the 'race riots' of Summer 2001, without being so temporally divorced from the primary events that they become irrelevant. The articles are more-or-less typical in their tone of other articles from the same publication. They were also selected because they deal with a language ideological debate in the local political arena. This debate was not new in September 2000: in fact similar stories were reported in the same newspaper on, *inter alia*, 25th July 1997, 27th July 1998, and 5th March 1999. The first of the articles reports proceedings from a meeting of Burnley Borough Council. The article relates a debate between Councillor Harry Brooks, the leader of the Independent Group on Burnley Council, and Councillor Mozaquir Ali. The debate centres on the necessity and cost-effectiveness of funding Asian-language translation and interpretation services in Burnley. It is clear that taking an analysis of just two articles selected from a corpus of daily newspapers over five years does not allow for generalisation. The articles were not selected to be rep-

resentative, but to offer a sense of the discursive and ideological context within which the events of Summer 2001 unfolded. That is, the articles presented here enable us to gain some sense of the political temperature in the years leading up to Summer 2001, and to understand that the oppositions which flared at that time had been evident in public discourse over an extended period.

Here I adopt Reisigl and Wodak's (2001) three-dimensional approach to the analysis of political and media discourse. After having established the contents or topics of a specific discourse, the discursive strategies may be investigated, followed by the linguistic means and realisations through which the discourse is presented. The content of the article is identifiably a representation of a language ideological debate. In fact it is both a representation of the language ideological debate which occurred in the council chamber, and an expansion of that debate. This involves a process of recontextualisation of the original discourse, which necessarily transforms what was said by the councillors into a newly framed discourse. I will return to the notion of recontextualisation in comparing the two articles from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph*. The main discursive strategy evident in the first of these articles is that of argumentation. The two articles report a language ideological debate which was ongoing in the local news media in the Lancashire towns of Burnley and Oldham during the period leading up to the 'race riots' in the summer of 2001. The first of the articles (Appendix 3.1) is a news report, while the second (Appendix 3.2) is an editorial, published six days later, commenting on the original story. The news article reports a council motion proposed by Councillor Brooks, Independent Group Leader, that the translation and interpretation unit, funded by Burnley Borough Council, had been guilty of overspending its budget, and should therefore be closed down. This argument relies on the conclusion rule that if something costs too much, action should be taken to avoid that financial loss. The topos of finance is here closely linked to the topos of burden, as the deficit figure is one which is 'funded by Burnley council taxpayers'.

The headline of the news article is immediately notable in ideological terms:

> 'Racism' slur on councillor

The processes of 'racism' and 'slur' are both nominalised (Fairclough 1989: 124), that is, converted into a noun, and reduced so that some of the meaning of the sentence is missing. While the object, or patient, of the 'slur' is evident ('councillor'), the agent, or cause, is absent from the headline. Omission of the agent ensures that no attribution of causality is made clear, and ambiguity remains about the perpetrator of the 'slur'. The word 'slur' is value-laden here.

While 'slur' can be taken to mean any criticism, its predominant sense is that the criticism is unjustified and unfounded. Taken together with the dramatic and serious term 'racism', the omission of the agent leaves sympathy entirely with the (as yet unnamed) councillor. If the elected representative is accused, then perhaps the people themselves are subject to the same accusation. A further contributory dimension of the headline here is the use of scare quotes to enclose the word 'racism', creating a distance between the voice of the article and the voice of the (absent) agent making the accusation. The effect of the scare quotes here dissociates the headline writer, and therefore the voice of the article, from the accusation, and makes it clear that it belongs to someone else (Fairclough 1989: 89). While the scare quotes may be regarded simply as speech marks, the word 'racism' does not occur elsewhere in the reported speech of the article (although 'racist' does). Even in this analysis, however, speech marks maintain clear boundaries between the voice of the headline writer and the voice of the absent accuser. In either case the accusation of 'racism' does not seem to belong to the discourse of the newspaper. The headline therefore appears to position the councillor as the victim of a false accusation of racism.

The first word of the first paragraph, 'IMMIGRANTS', appears in upper case. In the salient initial position in the article, this word establishes the voice of the article in relation to the reported debate. A little later in the article Mozaquir Ali, the councillor opposing Councillor Brooks in the debate, is reported as saying that he took exception to Brooks' use of the word 'immigrants' in this debate about translation and interpretation services. While the article reports this in an apparently fair and balanced way, the use of precisely this word in the salient initial position in the article immediately appears to align the voice of the article in opposition to that of Councillor Ali. Another interpretation here would be that Councillor Ali's words are accurately reported, and are therefore allowed to frame the debate. At the same time, however, the selection of this quotation reproduces an oppositional discourse between 'immigrants' and 'others':

> IMMIGRANTS who came to this country 40 years ago, took on the dirty, low paid jobs others "did not have the guts to do" and made Burnley what it was today, Coun Mozaquir Ali told Burnley Council.

Most of this sentence is reported as indirect discourse, but the report slips into direct discourse to report the councillor's view that the people of Burnley "'did not have the guts to do"' the dirty, low paid jobs which immigrants were prepared to tackle. At the end of the article it is clear that another councillor, Peter Kenyon, also described Brooks' motion as racist. Positioning the

statement by Councillor Ali in the first paragraph of the article seems to create an oppositional discourse based on a Muslim/non-Muslim dichotomy. This is most clearly understood in relation to the local historical context of politics in Burnley, which was often understood as an ideological battleground where (minority) Muslim and (majority) non-Muslim groups engaged in oppositional discourse. In this discourse-historical context, Councillor Ali's reported statement, apparently made in support of the positive contribution to society of immigrant groups, is represented as an implied criticism of indigenous Burnley people.

'Voice' and represented discourse

In the course of analysing the discourse of argument in newspaper reports and editorials, a key question relates to perspective. That is, whose voice predominates? Is it the voice of the newspaper, or the voices of the social actors concerned with the story being reported? Is more than one voice evident at one time? How closely aligned are the perspectives of the newspaper and of the social actors? In the analysis of articles in which the same story is recontextualised in an editorial piece, how is the discourse of the initial article transformed? The next section of the news report is notable for the ways in which the boundaries between the voices of the newspaper, and of the social agents involved, are maintained or removed. Once again, here, the word "'racist"' is in speech marks, maintaining the boundary between the voice of the article and the voice of the councillor. In the first sentence of this section, although ostensibly Councillor Ali's remarks are being reported, in fact most of the sentence is devoted to summarising Councillor Brooks' views:

> He attacked as "racist" Independent Group leader Harry Brooks, who said council taxpayers should no longer be asked to fund foreign language translation services and called for the council's interpretation unit to be wound up as soon as possible.

Only the first clause here reports Councillor Ali's remarks, and even then only in a way that is undermined by the preceding headline and first paragraph. The remainder of the sentence sets out a summary of the argument made by Councillor Brooks. Oppositional discourse is here maintained by lexical cohesion. First Councillor Brooks is indirectly reported to have referred to 'foreign language translation services'. Three sentences later Councillor Ali is directly reported to have said that the languages in question were not 'foreign languages', and services were not being provided for 'foreigners'. In reporting Councillor

Brooks' use of this term in indirect discourse, the voice of the item is closer to the voice of Councillor Brooks than to that of Councillor Ali. The speech marks surrounding the word attributed to Councillor Ali keep him at a distance from the voice of the news item, while the indirect reporting of discourse attributed to Councillor Brooks brings him closer to the voice of the news item. Similarly, the repetition of 'immigrants' continues to undermine Councillor Ali's objection to this word.

While the boundaries between the voice of the news item and the voice of Councillor Brooks are eroded, the opposite appears to be true in the case of the voice of Councillor Ali:

> He said he took exception to Coun Brooks' use of the word "immigrants". "They are no longer immigrants – they are fully contributing citizens of this borough and this country," he said.

In this section there appears to be demarcation between the 'voice' of the reporter or the newspaper, and the 'voice' of the person whose discourse is being represented. In contrast, where the discourse of the social agent is represented in indirect discourse, the voices of the newspaper and of the agent do not seem to be so clearly demarcated. In the news article the voice of Councillor Ali is very largely represented through either direct discourse, or through indirect discourse which 'slips' into direct discourse, while the voice of Councillor Brooks is entirely represented through indirect discourse. It appears that whereas there are robust and intact boundaries between the perspective of the newspaper and the perspective of Councillor Ali, these boundaries are blurred and ambiguous in the case of the discourse of Councillor Brooks. That is, the perspective of the newspaper appears to be more aligned with the voice of Councillor Brooks than with that of Councillor Ali. At the same time, this analysis does not suggest that all readers will interpret the article as one which is clearly sharing the perspective of Councillor Brooks rather than Councillors Ali and Kenyon. An alternative analysis suggests that the representation of the Labour councillors' views allows them to develop their point in a debate which is relatively fair and balanced. In this analysis it is the recontextualised editorial version of the story (Appendix 3.2) that is more closely aligned to the perspective of the Independent councillor.

The 'already-said-elsewhere'

In the next section the newspaper article adopts a structure typical of the genre of political reporting, as the discourse of both protagonists is represented in turn:

> And he rejected Coun Brooks' view that there should be no permanent council subsidy for services to Asians who continued to rely on languages such as Urdu, Pushto and Bengali as their principal means of communication.
> Said Coun Ali: "I do not think they are foreign languages – they are spoken by citizens of this borough. We are not providing services to foreigners, but to members of our own community," he added.
> And he told the Independent Group leader: "For a racist, there is no room in this chamber or this town."
> In his motion to the council Coun Brooks said that since taking over the funding of the translation section in 1993, the unit had spent £485,000 and had an income of £161,000 – a deficit of £324,000 funded by Burnley council taxpayers.

Although the first sentence apparently represents the voice of Councillor Ali in indirect discourse, the argument presented here seems to mainly belong to Councillor Brooks. Thus the use of indirect discourse continues to align the voice of Councillor Brooks with that of the newspaper, while the voice of Councillor Ali, represented in direct discourse, is oppositional to both. The phrases "council subsidy", "continued to rely on", and "their principal means of communication" connect the article to arguments which have been previously made, discourses which are presupposed, and which have been "already said elsewhere" (Fairclough 1995a: 6). In terms of the argumentation strategies outlined above, the phrase 'council subsidy' is associated with the topos of finance which suggests that if something has a cost to the public purse, it should be stopped. Here the newspaper/journalist appears to take upon itself the role of defender of the public purse, a position commonly adopted in local newspaper discourse. The spending of the translation unit is said to be over budget, and would perhaps have been criticised by the newspaper whether it had a 'racialised' element or not (that is, over-spend on other kinds of services not principally used by 'Asian' groups may also have been criticised). However, it is clear that the phrase 'continued to rely on', linked with 'their principal means of communication', belong to the topos of abuse, which argues that the Asian group have already been given enough, and should not continue to demand

more. In this sense the argument is racialised. Councillor Ali's point is set out without mediation or explicit framing. Here the Labour councillor's perspective is directly represented by the newspaper, apparently without evaluation. As we will see, this directly reported discourse would be recontextualised in the editorial account of the story the following week. The final sentence of this section restates the topos of finance, arguing that no more money should be spent on the translation and interpretation unit, as its deficit was funded by 'council taxpayers'. There is an implication here that it is acceptable for 'Asians' to speak their home languages for a while, but if they continue to do so they should not be supported. It can be argued that the article is not discriminatory, so much as situated in a specific genre, as it is at least partly acting as the protector of public spending. However, the question of the 'intention' of the article is not the most important issue here. The intention of the reporter, or sub-editor, is in the end unknowable – what we have is the text, and the text has many of the characteristics of other discriminatory discourses which emerge in debates about minority groups. Here Asian languages appear to be associated with certain groups' failure to assimilate into the host society (Irvine & Gal 2000). Reported in a voice almost indistinguishable from that of the news item as a whole, this indexical association will appear in recontextualised forms in the editorial article, and in the various political and media discourses analysed in subsequent chapters.

Double voiced discourse

Most of the second half of the article is devoted to Councillor Brooks' views on the funding of the translation and interpretation unit in Burnley. Further argumentation strategies can be identified here:

> He said the special financial favours were resented by those who paid for them but got no benefit and they also demeaned the status and self respect of immigrant communities which had for generations the advantages of the English education system and who should themselves be able to meet any translation needs without special welfare treatment.

Here the topoi of burden ('special financial favours were resented by those who paid for them'), advantage ('demeaned the status and self respect of immigrant communities'), abuse ('which had for generations the advantages of the English education system') and responsibility ('should themselves be able to meet any translation needs without special welfare treatment') are all invoked in a single sentence. Councillor Brooks' reported argument is that the grant to the

translation and interpretation unit should be cut because (i) it burdens those who pay taxes, (ii) it diminishes the status of linguistic minority communities, (iii) those who benefit from the council-funded service have already been given enough, and (iv) anyone who does want to preserve a translation and interpretation service should provide this from their own resources. Here the phrase 'special financial favours' implies corruption, as if Asian residents of Burnley were being accorded an under-the-counter bonus to which they were not entitled. These special favours were 'resented' by the tax-payers who did not gain any benefit from the service. The implication of the oppositional discourse here is that 'Asians' are resented by 'non-Asians', who are also tax-payers, because they are given money by the Council which is not their due. Less than a year after this article appeared in the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph*, exactly this kind of resentment would be widely cited as one of the causes of rioting on the streets of Burnley, Oldham and Bradford (indeed, on 25th June, following the violence on the streets of Burnley, Councillor Brooks was interviewed on the BBC TV *Newsnight* programme, where he reiterated his point that the translation unit meant that 'Asians' in Burnley were given 'preferential treatment'). The newspaper article goes on to report Councillor Brooks' view that the funding of translation services 'demeaned the status and self respect of immigrant communities'. In an example of what Bakhtin (1994: 106) calls "double voicing", the discourse of the councillor (and perhaps at least partly of the news item) appears to empathise with 'immigrant communities', showing concern for their status and self-respect, through the topos of advantage. However, the repetition of 'immigrant' refers cohesively to Councillor Ali's objection to its use in this context. The apparently liberal attitude here merely gives the sentence a respectable, conventional veneer, allowing the news item to say, in Bourdieu's terms, "the last thing to be said" (1991: 153). The illiberal discourse of the Independent group leader adopts the discourse of common-sense, and is able to masquerade as a "consensual ideology" (Fowler 1991: 52). This means of representing illiberal discourse in liberal terms will become a familiar strategy as we move through the chain of discourse relating to English language testing for citizenship.

Councillor Brooks is here reported to have referred to the 'advantages of the English education system', from which generations of 'immigrant communities' have benefited. This is again oppositional discourse, pitching 'immigrants' against 'the English', and implying that the former must be lazy and unmotivated if they still require support after 'generations' of English education. Again the topos of abuse comes into play here, with the implication that 'immigrant communities' have had quite enough support from the (im-

plicitly) non-immigrant tax-payer, and should ask for no more. The phrase 'special welfare treatment' refers back to 'special financial favours', and forward to 'equal treatment'. In British political and media discourse 'welfare' often implies scroungers off the state: that is, people who cost money to the tax-payer, without making a contribution themselves. There is a cohesive reference here to the topos of abuse as it appeared earlier in the article. Through the topos of abuse, there is a clear implication that Asian people are being given special treatment unnecessarily, and are avoiding meeting their responsibilities. In this single sentence Asian languages are linked to corruption, diminution of status, low self-respect, idleness, failure to meet responsibilities, and over-reliance on state benefits. Although the sentence begins with the reporting phrase 'He said', the boundary between the primary discourse of the news item and the secondary discourse of the councillor's motion appears to be blurred. Whereas much of Councillor Ali's discourse is separated from the primary discourse of the news story by speech marks, the statements of Councillor Brooks are reported as indirect discourse, making less distinct the boundaries between the voices of the news item and the Independent councillor.

The principle of equal treatment

In the next two sentences firstly common-sense, and then unimpeachable values, are invoked to support the illiberal views of Councillor Brooks:

> He expected the knee-jerk, politically correct, party hack accusations of racism which a motion like his would provoke. But he added that in truth the move provided councillors with the opportunity to restore sanity into the situation and demonstrate the council's commitment to the principal of equal treatment.

In the first sentence here Brooks' reported words are intensely dialogic, sharply sensing the anticipated objections, evaluations, and points of view of their audience (Bakhtin 1994: 108). The three compound adjectives which precede 'accusations of racism' serve to diminish and dismiss Councillor Ali's own accusation of the same. 'Knee-jerk' and 'party hack' are both colloquial in tone, and represent responses which are, respectively, instinctive and thoughtless, and biased and unbalanced. The colloquial tone here invites the reader to recognise the voice of common-sense, and of the common man. It is worth dwelling on 'politically correct', as this phrase is in itself intensely dialogic. This is an intertextual reference to popular discourse about the role of 'political correctness' as a barrier to social reform. Adopted by most political parties in Britain, from the

Labour Government to the Conservative opposition and even the ultra-Right British National Party, this has become one of the scapegoats for policy failure. Official reports into race relations in Britain have also criticised a 'politically-correct' approach to policy-making (e.g. Cantle 2002: 18; Ouseley 2001: 1). The salient point here is that the term 'politically correct' relies on a presupposition that any argument described as 'politically correct' can be dismissed without further argument. The voice of the councillor and of the newspaper run alongside each other here, anticipating objections, and at the same time dealing with them. This is discourse "with a sideward glance at someone else's hostile word" (Bakhtin 1994: 108), which argues against a response to its own argument which is only present because it has been previously made in other contexts. I will return to the notion of 'political correctness' in an expanded discussion in Chapter 7. Having dealt with its detractors, the next sentence of the story invokes values of 'truth', 'sanity' and 'commitment to the principal of equal treatment' to support the argument of Councillor Brooks and, perhaps, the newspaper itself. Through the topos of equality, these unimpeachable values propose that if Councillor Brooks' motion is passed, the world will be a more equal and sane place. Here illiberal discourse masquerades as liberalism. Having dismissed any accusation of racism, the discourse of Brooks, and perhaps of the news story, now stands for high principals. The illiberal motion to cut a service which supports linguistic minority residents in Burnley is, almost perversely but quite convincingly, represented as the epitome of equality, fairness and liberalism.

Recontextualisation of political argument: Claiming authority

The second newspaper article I will discuss is an editorial piece from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* of 13th September 2000 (Appendix 3.2), six days after the publication of the news article. Newspaper editorials on the whole adopt discursive strategies which suggest a distinctive 'voice' of the newspaper. This is often based on the political orientation of the newspaper, and is especially true of the national daily press. In local newspapers, aimed at a readership which has a sense of local issues, the editorial voice is often more forthright than the voice of the news stories on which it comments. What is distinctive about newspaper editorials is that they employ discursive strategies which foreground values and beliefs (Fowler 1991) (although I have already suggested that apparently 'neutral' news stories also articulate values and beliefs in less explicit ways). Modality is often more insistent in editorials than in news stories,

stating what 'should' or 'ought' to be done about a particular issue or policy. However, Fowler (1991: 208) points out that the distinctiveness of newspaper editorials lies not in their insistence on particular values and beliefs, but in that they employ textual strategies which foreground the speech act of offering values and beliefs. Editorials are generally more argumentative than news stories, and tend to adopt a more rhetorical style. Perhaps most importantly for the present volume, editorials often recontextualise an existing news story, in the process transforming it, evaluating it, adding some elements, deleting others, and rearranging some elements, while substituting others (Wodak 2000: 198).

The headline of the editorial piece appears to express support for Councillor Brooks in its evaluation of the language ideological debate reported six days earlier:

> Plain-speaking Harry makes a lot of sense

'Plain-speaking' is a quality which is assumed to be highly valued, and the use of Councillor Brooks' forename introduces an informal, conversational tone, "giving an illusion of conversation in which common-sense is spoken about matters on which there is consensus" (Fowler 1991: 47). The second half of the headline refers semantically to the appeal for 'sanity' in the news article, and leads into a generic statement in the first sentence here:

> AT the very mention of the word 'racist' heads duck below the parapet these days.

This statement makes reference to Councillor Brooks' reported dialogic engagement with 'political correctness' in the earlier article, and assumes the ideal reader's agreement with its point of view. The informal, conversational tone of the headline is continued here ('AT the very mention'), establishing an editorial tone which speaks with the voice of the implied reader. The first of several idiomatic phrases ('heads duck below the parapet'), typical of newspaper editorials (Elspass 2002), maintains the apparently colloquial voice, while the phrase 'these days' presupposes agreement that things are not as good as they were in days gone by. Here the editorial engages dialogically with the assumed response (or non-response) of those who fail to engage in argument about racism. In an example of what Bakhtin calls "hidden dialogicality", the presupposed words of the politically correct lobby are only present invisibly, as each word "responds and reacts with its every fibre to the invisible speaker, points to something outside itself, beyond its own limits, to the unspoken words of another person" (Bakhtin 1994: 108–109). In hidden dialogicality the voice of the editorial is able to dispense with the liberal voice of those who fail to engage in argument

about racism. In doing so this first sentence sets up a tone for the remainder of the article which is at once robust and informal.

Idioms of 'common-sense'

The beginning of the next sentence ('So') implies a logical progression from what has gone before:

> So does Burnley Council's Independent Group leader, Councillor Harry Brooks, not deserve a bravery award for not wilting under such charges when he questions the council's interpretation unit spending £485,000 since 1993 on translation services – and, in the process, clocking up a £324,000 overspend that the town's council tax payers have to fork out for?

The introductory word ('So') here is a powerful cue which implies logical argument, and which allows almost no response other than agreement. The topos of finance is repeated from the first article, but lexical changes provide a conversational tone in its recontextualised editorial form. Now 'had spent' from the news article becomes the more robust and informal 'clocking up'; 'funded by' is transformed in the editorial version to 'fork out for', while 'deficit' becomes 'overspend'. Here metaphorical turns of phrase create a "familiar, matter-of-fact rhetoric" (Fowler 1991:217) which is plain-speaking, sensible, and authoritative. Two idiomatic phraseological units create a tone and style which evoke old-fashioned values and impermeable ideology. Idiomatic phrases are not necessarily the rhetoric of the people, but are more frequently found in carefully considered written texts (Elspass 2002). If the examples here are not idiomatic turns of phrase which are actually used by the reader, the important thing is that they have connotations of reliable, trustworthy values (and are constructed in order to connote these values). In this sense they are semantically linked to the earlier idiom ('heads duck below the parapet'), and to the phrase 'these days', maintaining a consistent tone which values conservative beliefs. The rhetorical question, one of two in this short piece, is characteristic of newspaper editorials. Rhetorical questions allow "argumentative engagement with the imagined points of view of those referred to by the text, and those who read it" (Fowler 1991:218). Voloshinov suggests that rhetorical questions in text are "situated on the very boundary between authorial and reported speech", and

> may be interpreted as a question or exclamation on the part of the author or, equally, as a question or exclamation on the part of the hero, addressed to himself. (Voloshinov 1973: 137)

In this instance the argumentation strategy of Councillor Brooks is incorporated into the rhetorical question, so that the editorial seems to speak for the councillor. The continuing cohesive link to Brooks' reported dialogic engagement with 'accusations of racism' in the first article contributes to the solidarity between the editorial voice and the voice of Councillor Brooks, and, in Voloshinov's terms, the editor stands in for Brooks, says for him what needs to be said, and their voices are "both running in the same direction" (1973: 138). Here the rhetorical question has the effect of seeking and implying the complicity of the assumed reader.

'Show concessions' and ambiguity

The next paragraph of the editorial piece repeats a section of the original article almost verbatim, only substituting 'Coun Brooks' view that' with 'Coun Brooks maintains'. This substitution supports the dialogic rhetoric of the piece: to say that Brooks 'maintains' his position is to imply that he does so in the face of argument:

> Coun Brooks maintains that there should be no permanent council subsidy for services to Asians who continue to rely on languages such as Urdu, Pushto and Bengali as their principal means of communication.

Here the reported speech of Councillor Brooks is recreated from the original piece in indirect discourse, ensuring continuing consistency of voice between the newspaper and the Independent councillor. The editorial genre dictates that a balanced structure should interact with the rhetorical and didactic form of address. The following paragraph therefore introduces Councillor Ali's response to Councillor Brooks' motion, apparently restoring balance to the editorial:

> In response, quite rightly, Coun Mozaquir Ali points out that the immigrants who came to Britain 40 years ago and took on the dirty, low-paid jobs that 'others did not have the guts to do' made Burnley what it is today. And, equally fairly, he takes exception to Coun Brooks' use of the word 'immigrants', saying that these people are no longer immigrants, but fully contributing citizens of the Borough and the country.

Two evaluative phrases are particularly notable here: 'quite rightly', and 'equally fairly'. Here the editorial claims the authority to evaluate Councillor Ali's argument, recontextualising reports of his speech in the first article. This paragraph has all the appearance of being liberal in its treatment of Councillor Ali's views, picking up two of his points and stating approval of them. However, these two points are more or less tangential to the real debate about the need for, and cost of, translation and interpretation services for linguistic minority people in Burnley. In a similar way to the original news story, a minor point made by Councillor Ali is foregrounded and emphasised at the expense of his main argument. The argument of Councillor Ali is "filtered" (Fairclough 2003a: 139), and given little prominence, just as it was in the news article. Also, these two points, typically introduced by the concessionary marker 'quite rightly' and 'equally fairly', are examples of what Antaki and Wetherell (1999) describe as "show concessions" (van Dijk 2000b: 40 uses the term "apparent concessions"). That is, they are arguments that orient to an opposing claim by first conceding to it and then countering it. The reprise, which finally debunks the concession, comes in the final three sentences of the editorial piece. The phrase 'these people' is introduced in the editorial version of Councillor Ali's objection to the use of the word 'immigrants'. The ambiguity and inexplicitness of this phrase appears to diminish the status of linguistic minority communities in Burnley.

Consensus and the rhetorical question

The beginning of the next sentence claims further authority, through use of the first person pronoun: 'I agree'. The deictic 'I' assumes editorial authority, which is the more convincing in the wake of the apparent liberalism of the preceding paragraph. In a third 'show concession', the editorial voice appears to be in agreement with the position of Councillor Ali. However, the reprise is introduced by the connective, 'but', which changes the apparent direction of the editorial, asserting a position of rebuttal, while 'would have thought' introduces an argument that 'the majority of the Asian community' should have 'become complete citizens in terms of learning the language too'. The reference here to 'the majority' had not been rehearsed in the first article: there is no previous suggestion that a majority of linguistic minority speakers require support from the interpretation and translation unit. The phrase 'complete citizens' refers back to, and clashes with, Councillor Ali's reported statement that Asian people in Burnley are not immigrants but 'fully contributing citizens'. Having once agreed that Asian people are fully contributing citizens, the editorial voice now implies that their citizenship is incomplete if they fail to learn 'the

language'. In Bakhtin's terms, the editorial reference to citizenship here is 'hidden polemic', as "a polemical blow is struck at the other's discourse on the same theme, at the other's statement about the same subject" (1994: 107). The view of the editorial is clearly articulated: proficiency in English is a pre-requisite for becoming a 'complete citizen'. A second rhetorical question emphasises the point, serving to assert consensus, and implicate the reader in this view. Although the deictic 'I' is in evidence here rather than the more inclusive 'we', the rhetorical question serves the same purpose, assuming that the reader will share the ideology of the editorial. The rhetorical question is oppositional, implying 'Surely *we* ('White', English-speaking) are not asking too much of *them* ('Asian', non-English-speaking)?'. The rhetorical question speaks not only for the voice of the newspaper, but also for the assumed reader. Consensus is assumed, and the discourses of the editorial and reader appear to be travelling in the same direction (Voloshinov 1973: 138). The rhetorical question here presupposes the response of the audience: No, it really is not asking too much that these people should become complete citizens by learning the English language. Implicit here is an ideology which favours assimilation, and which demands that if 'they' want to live in 'our' country, they should learn our language. The rhetorical question links the English language with broader assimilation and integration into British society.

The final sentence of the editorial appears to allow for the possibility that the rhetorical question could be answered differently. However, the initial phrase here may be no more than a further masquerade of balance. Here the *topos of burden* is repeated from the first article, but recontextualised in more explicit terms, and in the voice of the editorial. The modal adverb 'surely' lends authority to the editorial voice, implying that this is an incontrovertible argument. It is worth looking closely at the way in which Councillor Brooks' motion becomes the considered editorial opinion of the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph*. In the original news story the following was attributed to Councillor Brooks in secondary discourse:

> and who should be able to meet any translation needs without special welfare treatment.

In the editorial version a similar view is represented as the opinion of the newspaper:

> surely the Asian community has sufficient English speakers to provide voluntary translation services and lift this burden off the taxpayer.

The views of the Independent councillor have now become the views of the newspaper, as the secondary discourse of the original story is fully incorporated in the primary discourse of the editorial. The phrase 'special welfare treatment' becomes 'this burden off the taxpayer', while 'translation needs' become 'translation services'. Whereas in an earlier paragraph of the editorial Councillor Brooks' words, reported as indirect discourse, were prefaced with 'Councillor Brooks maintains', here there is no explicit sense that the words in the final paragraph are his. The objectification between the voice of the article and the voice of the councillor is decreased, and even disappears, and there is what Bakhtin calls "a merging of the author's and the other person's voice; the distance between the two is lost" (1994: 109), as both voices are present in the same discourse. The ideological basis for the argument is clear: support for Asian languages is unnecessary, and is a burden to the (English-speaking) tax-payer. If 'they' want to become complete citizens of 'our' country, they must learn English. If they do not do so, they will not become complete British citizens.

Language ideological debate in a local context

In these two articles a language ideological debate is reported and played out. Of course, debates about language are rarely about language alone (Woolard 1998). Rather, they are almost always socially situated in and tied to questions of identity and power in societies. Linguistic features are often seen as reflecting and expressing broader cultural images of people and activities:

> Participants' ideologies about language locate linguistic phenomena as part of, and evidence for, what they believe to be systematic behavioural, aesthetic, affective, and moral contrasts among the social groups indexed.
>
> (Irvine & Gal 2000: 37)

Irvine and Gal propose a semiotic process of *iconisation*, which involves a transformation of sign relationships between linguistic features (or varieties) and the social images to which they are linked. Linguistic features that index social groups appear to be iconic representations of them, as if a linguistic feature somehow depicted or displayed a social group's inherent nature or essence. In the dominant ideology represented in the two articles from the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph*, this process of iconisation is clearly visible, as maintenance of Asian languages is iconically linked to moral, cultural and character deficiencies. A lack of commitment to linguistic assimilation on the part of linguistic minority people is interpreted as a lack of commitment to cultural and so-

cial assimilation. Similarly, support for, and investment in, Asian languages is linked to corruption, in the form of 'special financial favours', and to inequality of treatment. To continue to speak Asian languages is to scrounge off the state, to be dependent, to lose one's self-respect, and to diminish one's status. Finally, maintenance of the language of the home is linked with incomplete citizenship. That is, to be fully English (or British) is to speak English. To speak other languages is to be incompletely English (or British). The English-speaker/non-English-speaker dichotomy is persistent and recurrent, even in such a small set of data, and positions non-English speakers negatively. Frequently, discourse positions speakers of languages other than English in opposition to the English-speaking group. In both of the newspaper articles, three languages are named as those which are still relied on by 'immigrants' (Urdu, Pushto and Bengali). As these are principally languages of Pakistan and Bangladesh, it is clear that this discourse contributes to the construction of a process of 'racialisation' (Schmidt 2000, 2002) of language, in which the language comes to represent the non-white, Muslim minority. The dominant ideology seeks to remove support for Asian languages, and therefore to remove support for Asian people in Burnley. This ideology is convincingly argued through argumentation strategies which make the case that Asian languages are a burden on the tax-payer, are financially unviable, and are bad for the self-respect of Asian people. A further argument is that anyway Asian people have had a great deal from the 'English', and should not be asking for more. The dominant ideology is one of monolingualism, but a monolingualism which is actively hostile to other languages, and seeks to remove them from the linguistic landscape. Heller (1999) has referred to 'monolingualising tendencies', which seek to remove minority languages, and ensure the domination of a standard, majority language. The monolingualising tendencies in these newspaper articles are about more than language, however. In association with other 'acts of misrecognition', they are examples of symbolic racism, in which arguments against the languages of linguistic minority groups are racialised. In the relatively liberal, multicultural climate of twenty-first century Britain, it is not acceptable to argue that ethnic and racial minorities are unwelcome. Instead, arguments about language come to take on a symbolic status, and represent those thinly-veiled discriminatory discourses.

Of course it is not possible to read off ideologies from two short newspaper articles. The discourses which create the conditions for violent disorder between different ethnic groups are complex and diverse. We should be wary of confusing newspaper editorials with public opinion (Blommaert & Verschueren 1998b). However, detailed analysis of newspaper text can provide

a glimpse into the ways in which public discourses both constitute and are constitutive of discriminatory ideologies which come to appear natural and inevitable. Newspapers often produce nation-imagining language, and they contribute to the cultural hegemony of the nation-state by virtue of such nation-imagining (Philips 1998). In the imagining of the nation a core element of belonging is the dominant language. In Britain the official language, English, is bound up with the state, and with a sense of national identity. The official language is constantly reproduced by institutions, and is repeatedly measured against unofficial, minority languages. When minority languages are found to be in opposition to the sense of national belonging associated with the dominant language, the conditions are created for the "establishment of relations of linguistic domination" (Bourdieu 1991:45). The linguistic market does not start out equal – there are monopolies, power relations and laws of linguistic price formation which prevent minority speakers from using symbolic capital to gain access to social and economic mobility. Heller (1999:273) asks what are the sources of the definition of the value of linguistic capital, and how do those sources articulate with institutional processes. Too little is still known about the countless acts of recognition and misrecogntion (Bourdieu 1990:68), ceaselessly generated, which create these values, and which serve to produce and reproduce established power relations in the linguistic market. We require more detailed analysis of the ways in which the social arena is produced and reproduced through the "illusion of unanimity" (Bourdieu 2000) represented in media, education and politics. Only in this close scrutiny will we understand how linguistic power relations operate to discriminate against linguistic minority individuals and groups, and to prevent their participation in the process of belonging, national or otherwise.

In this chapter we have seen that discursive strategies and linguistic means and realisations have significant roles in contributing to the construction of the social world. Familiar, apparently liberal arguments are rehearsed to rationalise and justify discriminatory policy. The discourse of social actors is represented in ways which either maintain or erode the boundaries between the perspective of the newspaper and the perspective of the agent, so that in an apparently liberal, balanced argument discriminatory discourse prevails. This snapshot of the discourse-historical context in which the social disorder of the Summer of 2001 occurred provides an insight into the kind of commonplace, everyday debate which contributed to the racialisation of a language ideological debate. In Chapter 4 I turn to the recontextualisation of such debates in increasingly authoritative contexts.

3.1 Appendix

'Racism' slur on councillor

IMMIGRANTS who came to this country 40 years ago, took on the dirty, low paid jobs others "did not have the guts to do" and made Burnley what it was today, Coun Mozaquir Ali told Burnley Council.

He attacked as "racist" Independent Group Leader Harry Brooks who said council taxpayers should no longer be asked to fund foreign language translation services and called for the council's interpretation service to be wound up as soon as possible.

He said he took exception to Coun Brooks' use of the word "immigrants". "They are no longer immigrants – they are fully contributing citizens of this borough and of this country", he said.

And he rejected Coun Brooks' view that there should be no permanent council subsidy for services to Asians who continued to rely on languages such as Urdu, Pushto and Bengali as their principal means of communication.

Said Coun Ali: "I do not think they are foreign languages – they are spoken by citizens of this borough. We are not providing services to foreigners, but to members of our own community," he added.

And he told the Independent Group leader: "For a racist, there is no room in this chamber or this town."

In his motion to the council Coun Brooks said that since taking over the funding of the translation section in 1993, the unit had spent £485,000 and had an income of £161,000 – a deficit of £324,000 funded by Burnley council taxpayers.

He said the special financial favours were resented by those who paid for them but got no benefit and they also demeaned the status and self respect of immigrant communities which had for generations the advantages of the English education system and who should themselves be able to meet any translation needs without special welfare treatment.

He expected the knee-jerk, politically correct, party hack accusations of racism which a motion like his would provoke.

But he added that in truth the move provided councillors with the opportunity to restore sanity into the situation and demonstrate the council's commitment to the principal of equal treatment.

Labour's Peter Kenyon said he had no doubt that Coun Brooks' motivation was racist.

"He is consistently attacking Asian heritage communities of this town and that is racist."
Coun Brooks' motion was lost by 26 votes to 10, with four abstentions.
(*Lancashire Evening Telegraph* 7th September 2000)

3.2 Appendix

Plain-speaking Harry makes a lot of sense

AT the very mention of the word 'racist' heads duck below the parapet these days.
So does Burnley Council's Independent Group leader, Councillor Harry Brooks, not deserve a bravery award for not wilting under such charges when he questions the council's interpretation unit spending £485,000 since 1993 on translation services – and, in the process, clocking up a £324,000 overspend that the town's council tax payers have to fork out for?
Coun Brooks maintains that there should be no permanent council subsidy for services to Asians who continue to rely on languages such as Urdu, Pushto and Bengali as their principal means of communication.
In response, quite rightly, Coun Mozaquir Ali points out that the immigrants who came to Britain 40 years ago and took on the dirty, low-paid jobs that 'others did not have the guts to do' made Burnley what it is today.
And, equally fairly, he takes exception to Coun Brooks' use of the word 'immigrants', saying that these people are no longer immigrants, but fully contributing citizens of the Borough and the country.
I agree – but would have thought that, even in half that timescale, the majority of the Asian community would have become complete citizens in terms of learning the language too. Is that really asking too much?
But if so, surely the Asian community has sufficient English speakers to provide voluntary translation services and lift this burden off the taxpayer.
(*Lancashire EveningTelegraph* 13th September 2000)

Chapter 4

Political discourse and the rhetoric of discrimination

Discourses about immigration almost inevitably draw on pre-existing discourses. Often the discourses to which a particular text alludes may be in a different context, or 'field of action'. In this way similar discourses cross-fertilize and spread between genres and fields, linking to form what Fairclough calls textual chains: "There are more or less settled chains of discursive practices within and between orders of discourse across which texts are shifted and transformed in systematic ways" (1995a: 13). Communicative events are transformed as they move along the political and media chain. In analysing such chains of discourse we can ask how one type of event recontextualises others (Fairclough 1995b). This is not to say that textual chains are necessarily linear or hierarchical. Although the analysis in this volume charts the progress of discourse as it becomes increasingly legitimate and authoritative, this trajectory is neither inevitable nor the most common. Political discourse may be recontextualised and transformed in a diverse and centrifugal pattern, at times gaining legitimacy, but at other times becoming less authoritative as it travels. In the present volume, we are able to trace the recontextualisation of arguments across realms which include newspaper reports and editorials at local and national levels, political speeches and interviews, official national and local government reports, a Government White Paper, the text of an Act of Parliament, and implementation strategy documents arising from the new legislation. In this chapter I provide a detailed analysis of a political speech made by a labour Member of Parliament in Westminster Hall shortly after the so-called 'race riots' which occurred in the north of England during June and July 2001. The data are from *Hansard* transcripts (the text of Parliamentary debates in the British Parliament in London) of the M.P.'s statement to Parliament (Appendix 4.1). Chilton (2004) notes that rather than being a verbatim record of the proceedings of the Houses of Parliament, *Hansard* 'corrects' the form of certain linguistic features to produce an idealised model of the session. That is, the hesitations, pauses and repetitions which are characteristic of most speech, to say nothing of the shouted interruptions, mockery and laughter which are

peculiar to the British House of Commons, are omitted from the transcribed version. However, notwithstanding these 'repairs' to the transcribed version, *Hansard* provides a sufficiently accurate record of Westminster proceedings for the purposes of the analysis presented here.

The discourse of political speeches

Parliamentary debates in Britain are characterised by a particular discourse situation (Elspass 2002: 84). A Member of Parliament speaks not only to other politicians present in the debating chamber, but also to other people present in the House, including journalists, members of the public, and viewers of, and listeners to, television and radio broadcasts, and the internet. In addition to being recorded in *Hansard*, the official record of parliamentary proceedings, speeches may be summarised, paraphrased and otherwise recontextualised in a range of media contexts in the period following the actual speech. Typical of parliamentary speeches are gambits such as 'I thank the honourable member', 'Honourable members', and 'I would like to take the opportunity' (Elspass 2002). Political speeches are characteristically structured according to the 'problem-solution' relation. In setting out the problem to be solved (for example: 'What were the causes of the violence on the streets of English towns?'), it is assumed that a solution will be forthcoming. This is not always a straightforward relationship in political speeches, as there may be ambiguity about the initial question, and about the relevance of the solutions proposed. However, the problem-solution structure is a feature of much political discourse.

A further typical characteristic structure of political speeches is that in making an argument, they anticipate and counter a possible opposition argument. In so doing, they are dialogic, undermining potential opposition before an opposing position is even articulated. This structure is often employed to block alternative views to the argument being proposed. By this method, "the views of others are placed into the contents of the speech and in this way play a role in jointly constructing its contents" (Muntigl 2002: 52). While the discourse of political speeches is therefore often intensely dialogic, this construction of the opposition voice within the speech is merely the speaker's own construction of that voice. It does not mean that the alternative view or action is necessarily considered to be viable; in fact it is more likely that the alternative is introduced only in order to be dismissed. That is, opposition may be represented precisely in order to stifle it (Muntigl 2002: 65). Political speeches may be complex and heterogeneous in incorporating diverse genres,

language forms, and arguments from other, associated texts (Sauer 2002). As such, speeches may include allusions to, and recontextualisations of, different discourses. As we saw in Chapter 3, political discourse may rely on familiar argumentation strategies which are reproduced elsewhere. If the audience recognises the allusions to which the speech refers, certain presuppositions will be at their disposal. This recognition of discourses which have already been rehearsed elsewhere functions as a context for the reception of the speech, and as a source of implicit understandings.

The 'intention' of political discourse

The question of 'intention' in political discourse is a complex one. Speech act theory adopted the Gricean co-operative principle to discuss the linked notions of sincerity, credibility, and intention in discourse (Grice 1975). This model allowed for analysis of the difference between 'what is said' and 'what is meant' in speech acts. While speakers may represent their communications literally (by 'saying what they mean'), other speakers may not mean what they are saying. In speech act theory, utterances are conventionally performed rationally, intentionally and sincerely. Yet, as Fetzer (2002: 173) points out, "rationality, intentionality and sincerity are not only valid with regard to the speaker's domain, but they are also of crucial importance in a hearer-oriented approach to communication". Further, as Chilton (2004: 42) notes, language is inherently ambivalent. If we need to take account of the 'intention' of a speech act in political discourse, it is unlikely that it will be a single or straightforward intention. Chilton proposes three categories to describe the strategic use of language when conditions constrain or distort communication: (i) Coercion (ii) Legitimisation and delegitimisation and (iii) Representation and misrepresentation. Political actors often act coercively in discourse, claiming access to resources and power, and controlling others' use of language. Legitimisation is linked to coercion, establishing power through the discursive claim to legitimacy. Delegitimisation manifests itself (notably in the discourse analysed in this volume) in negative other-presentation, attaching negative features to a particular group or groups. Representation and misrepresentation is a powerful means of control through discourse. In this model, the question is less that of what does the speaker 'intend', than of how the speaker's discourse relates to other discourses, what is its social and discursive context, and what are its ideological effects. Rogers (2003b: 8) puts this succinctly:

> The task of the analyst is to figure out all of the possibilities between texts, ways of representing, and ways of being, and to look for and discover the relationships between texts and ways of being and why certain people take up certain positions vis-à-vis situated uses of language.

Rogers argues that rather than representing a single intention or voice, the speaker is comprised of multiple voices, which draw on the various discursive contexts of which they are a part. Thus, in the present volume, rather than asking whether Labour politicians 'intend' to discriminate against the communities which they purport to defend, it is more important to investigate the discourse-historical contexts which have contributed to the construction of their discourse. A further dimension of analysis is to ask how discourse links with discourses which succeed it, and in what ways discourse is transformed in the process of recontextualisation.

Absences, allusions and assumptions in political discourse

Political speeches, like other texts, inevitably make assumptions about the 'common ground' between speaker and audience: "What is 'said' in a text is 'said' against a background of what is 'unsaid', but taken as given" (Fairclough 2003a: 40). Assumptions connect a text with other texts, or at least to the discourse of other texts which have become familiar through what Bourdieu calls "an abundance of tangible self-evidences" (2000: 181). That is, assumptions connect texts with other texts which have said similar things in similar ways, and have contributed to the construction of an ideological world which is now reproduced in the first text. The difference between intertextuality and assumption is that while a text may be intertextually linked to a specific other text (or texts), it may be linked by assumption to a "world of texts" (Fairclough 2003: 40) which is non-specific, but is nonetheless a source of the implicit understandings and common knowledge between author and reader. In the political speech to be analysed in this chapter, both linguistic features will be evident: I will suggest that we should look for both intertextual links to specific other texts, and for assumptions which rely on a broader, non-specific knowledge gained from an abundance of familiar discourses.

Implicitness is an important feature of political texts, but also one which is easily overlooked. Fairclough (2003a: 56) distinguishes between three types of assumptions – (i) existential assumptions: assumptions about what exists, (ii) propositional assumptions: assumptions about what is or can be the case, and (iii) value assumptions: assumptions about what is good or desirable. In

the speech of Ann Cryer M.P. analysed in this chapter, the following statement proposes that:

> When possible, English should be used and encouraged in the home in addition to Punjabi and Bangla.

Here are propositional assumptions (i) that some families do not use English at home, and (ii) that some families are not encouraged to do so (agency is absent, so there is no clue to the identity of the potential encourager). The modal 'should' indicates the value assumption that speaking English in the home in addition to Punjabi and Bangla is a good and desirable thing. Although there is no explicit intertextual link here to specific texts which have previously stated that children attain better grades at school when they speak English at home, Ann Cryer relies on this being 'common ground' which she shares with her audience. This 'common-sense' (if false, in any sense supported by research evidence) assumption has certainly been stated before, and it would not take any great amount of detective work to locate examples of the same. However, Ann Cryer is not relying on her audience engaging in such resourcefulness. Rather, the validity of her assumption resides in its apparent good sense, and in the audience accepting it as true because it has been implicitly stated to be so. Thus propositional and value assumptions here contribute to the naturalisation of the argument. Analysing the process of naturalisation in text makes visible the ways in which ideologies are embedded in discursive practices and made more effective by becoming naturalised. When this happens, ideologies and discourse practices attain the same status of common sense and become difficult to recognise or resist (Woodside-Jiron 2003).

Illiberal discourse in a liberal setting

On July 17th, 2001, in the aftermath of a period of social unrest in the towns of Bradford, Oldham, and Burnley, Ann Cryer, Labour M.P. for Keighley (the constituency of Keighley is a neighbour of Bradford in Yorkshire, and close to Oldham and Burnley – Ann Cryer is therefore speaking as a local representative), made a speech in the House of Commons during the Westminster Hall debate on Urban Community Relations. Ann Cryer was the second speaker in the debate, following the Liberal Member for Southwark North and Bermondsey, Simon Hughes. As before, I adopt here the three-dimensional analysis proposed by Reisigl and Wodak (2001), identifying first the content and topic of the speech, and then discursive strategies and linguistic means and realisations. In selecting liberal, or quasi-liberal, texts for analysis, the question of

content and topic is less straightforward than in the analysis of illiberal, explicitly racist discourses. Here Ann Cryer consistently claims her liberal credentials in setting out what she sees as the 'causes' of, and 'remedies' for, the social disorder on the streets of three urban areas of northern England. Some of the examples in her speech of this self-positioning as a liberal spokesperson are as follows:

> I have had many anxieties about the under-achievement of the Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities.
>
> I would be the last person to suggest that they sever their links with the sub-continent.
>
> Those who have not had the good fortune of a good relationship with our Pakistani and Bangladeshi constituents as I have.

In establishing herself as a liberal spokesperson here, Ann Cryer is achieving a second function of positioning herself as a legitimate speaker on issues of concern to Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities in Britain. In addition to the above examples, she uses the length of time during which she has been involved with these communities as her credentials: 'My comments follow 30 years of work and friendship with the Asian community', 'over many years', and 'many of us who have worked with the Asian community over the past 30 years'. Ann Cryer clearly establishes her legitimacy in the course of her speech. Thus, in identifying for analysis discriminatory texts, it is not sufficient to look in only those places where we most expect to find them. Here a Labour M.P, well-known as a staunch defender of British Asian communities, discursively establishes a liberal context in which to make illiberal statements.

'The time has come'

At the beginning of her speech, Ann Cryer makes reference to a report, *Community Pride, Not Prejudice: Making diversity work in Bradford*, which had been published six days earlier. The report (also known as 'The Bradford Race Review'), authored by Lord Ouseley and his working party, was set up to investigate 'community fragmentation' in Bradford. I will focus on this report in some detail in Chapter 6, alongside other reports into the social conditions of the northern towns and cities in which the violence of 2001 occurred. Ann Cryer welcomes the report, and places on record her appreciation of the work done by Lord Ouseley. Following this introduction, Ann Cryer makes a statement about her concerns relating to the academic and economic under-

achievement of 'the Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities', and concludes this introductory section with a rhetorical statement:

> "The time has come to ask why"

Two presuppositions are evident in this statement: first, that there is a shared agreement that 'the time' has been coming, and has been expected, and has now arrived. The metaphor of temporality nominalises the process of political debate about the economic status and educational achievement of particular minority groups, reducing it to a simple noun, and omitting any sense of causality or responsibility. The arrival of the moment has an air of inevitability. A second presupposition here is that the question 'why' (Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities are 'massively underachieving') has not previously been asked. This is very far from being the case, as such questions have been asked by politicians and educational and social researchers for more than thirty years in Britain.

Defining the criminal minority

In the next section of the speech Ann Cryer sets out her view of who was responsible for the recent violence on the streets:

> After lengthy discussions, my view is that the riots were led by a criminal minority responding to fascist taunts. The criminals were supported by hundreds of young Asian men hellbent on causing havoc, mainly for their own community. It is always their own community that suffers. Those young men were also determined to punish police officers and prevent them from carrying out their legitimate duties.

Here Ann Cryer introduces her opinion of the social disorder, with the gambit, typical of the genre of political speech: 'my view is'. The definite pronoun (*the* riots) presupposes general agreement that the social disorder amounted to 'riots': "existential assumptions are triggered by markers of definite reference such as definite articles" (Fairclough 2003a: 56). This may be an allusion to populist tabloid newspaper headlines of that week, which repeatedly invoked the collocation 'race riots'. In Ann Cryer's view the 'riots' were led by 'a criminal minority responding to fascist taunts'. It is not certain who was responsible for what the M.P. calls 'fascist taunts'. However, it is likely that Ann Cryer was responding to suggestions (perhaps made in her 'lengthy discussions' and elsewhere) that the ultra-Right wing British National Party was active in the area at the time of the violence, and had fomented the violence by taunting young

Asian men in the area in racist terms. Here responsibility for the 'riots' appears to lie both with the 'criminal minority' and with whoever was responsible for 'fascist taunts', as Ann Cryer apportions blame for the violence. The topos of definition here determines that if the 'minority' is designated as 'criminal', then it must be so. This argument gains authority at the beginning of the next sentence, as the indefinite article is replaced with the definite article, in an existential assumption: '*The* criminals'. The salient role of 'criminals' rather than 'fascists' in the events of the previous week-end is re-emphasised at the beginning of the next section of the speech, when the violent events are referred to as 'the criminal activity'. The cohesive repetition of 'criminal', together with the repetition of the definite pronoun, clearly positions the 'criminal minority' as the cause of the 'riots'. The criminals were 'supported by hundreds of young Asian men'. That is to say, the young Asian men were also agents of the riots, and indeed were 'hellbent on causing havoc'. 'Hellbent', with its sense of reckless determination, introduces a colloquial tone into the speech. The effect of this forceful word is less to appeal to the audience with a conversational style than to indicate the strong disapproval with which Ann Cryer regards the role of the young men. Although there are no explicit markers of evaluative statement here, it is clear that there is an implicit evaluation of the 'young Asian men', in the association of 'hellbent' and 'havoc'. Here, rather than explicit evaluation, assumed values are deeply embedded in the text (Fairclough 2003a: 173). The havoc was 'mainly for their own community'. Ann Cryer introduces a new presupposition here: 'It is always their own community that suffers'. This statement presumes that violence and social disorder in the communities of 'young Asian men' in Britain are frequent and commonplace. In fact social disorder of the kind that occurred in Burnley, Oldham and Bradford in 2001 is very rare in British towns and cities.

Rhetorical questions as dialogic discourse

The next section of the speech calls for an examination of the causes of the violence:

> We need to examine why those young Asian men were so keen to join in the criminal activity. Was it because they had little to lose, little else to do and therefore felt that such activity was a way of making their presence felt, as they had not impressed the world or Bradford with anything else? Do they and many other young Asian males in Bradford feel that they

> have little, if any, stake in the United Kingdom's growing prosperity, which was created by the Government I support? Do those young men feel disaffected, disenfranchised and let down by their country of birth? Do they ask why all the qualifications, good jobs, nice houses and powerful cars seem to go to the whites? That is a rough guide to the attitudes that I have encountered over many years.

The deictic 'We' is context-specific here, and is inclusive of the Members of Parliament, but probably exclusive of the wider community. In fact 'We need to examine' makes semantic reference to the earlier 'The time has come to ask why', and acts less as an exhortation to inquiry than as a platform for Ann Cryer to articulate her own views. This section of the speech begins by constructing an opposition between the apparently inclusive 'We' (in 'We need to examine'), and 'those young Asian men'. It is not immediately clear to whom the inclusive 'We' refers, although it seems to exclude young Asian men in the north of England. The social context of the speech, made in the House of Commons, implies that 'We' includes other Members of Parliament; but it may also include the broader liberal establishment, policy-making bodies, and, perhaps, all 'right-thinking' people who want to remove social disorder from the streets. Thus 'We' here also implies 'you'. Again there is repetition here of 'young Asian men' and 'the criminal activity', which by now becomes naturalised *as* criminal activity through the topos of definition and over-lexicalisation. A key word here is 'keen', with its predominant sense of intense enthusiasm. The adjective is evaluative, making the assumption that the young Asian men were acutely willing to engage in 'the criminal activity'. Full of exaggeration, this prepares the ground for a set of four rhetorical questions. The questions render this section of the speech intensely dialogic, as each of them proposes a liberal argument to account for why the young men were 'so keen' to engage in violence. In fact the questions seem to establish a liberal explanation for the 'riots', as each of them alludes to arguments which have been made previously, both within and beyond Parliament. The questions can be conceptualised as the following explanatory statements relating to 'why those young men were so keen to join in the criminal activity':

– they had little to lose
– they had little to do
– they wanted to make their presence felt
– they wanted to impress the world
– they wanted to impress Bradford
– they have little stake in the United Kingdom's growing prosperity

– they have little stake in the Government
– they feel disaffected and disenfranchised
– they feel let down by the country of their birth
– they want to know why all the qualifications seem to go to the whites
– they want to know why all the good jobs go to the whites
– they want to know why all the nice houses go to the whites
– they want to know why all the powerful cars go to the whites

This list of explanations for 'the criminal activity' is dialogic because it re-contextualises the kind of rationalisations which either had been, or may be, advanced by political commentators. That is, while they may not be allusions to specific texts which had emerged in the days following the riots, they recognisably belong to the genre of liberal explanation of social problems. The speaker here presupposes her audience's pre-existing knowledge of the genre, and is therefore able to incorporate it into her speech (Sauer 2002). In asking these questions Ann Cryer is making use of someone else's discourse for her own purposes, "inserting a new semantic intention into a discourse which already has, and retains, an intention of its own" (Bakhtin 1994: 105). The discourse of the (assumed) liberal commentator is "perceived as belonging to someone else". In one discourse are two semantic intentions: that of the liberal voice, and that of Ann Cryer. Thus the discourse becomes 'double-voiced':

> Someone else's words introduced into our own speech inevitably assume a new (our own) interpretation and become subject to our evaluation of them; that is, they become double-voiced. All that can vary is the interrelationship between these two voices. The transmission of someone else's statement in the form of a question already leads to a clash of two intentions within a single discourse: for in doing so we not only ask a question, but make someone else's statement problematical. (Bakhtin 1994: 106)

Here Ann Cryer's intention clashes with the generic discourse which she represents in the form of questions, and that discourse becomes subject to her (and her audience's) evaluation. In the sentence immediately following the questions, Ann Cryer helps out anyone in her audience who may be in doubt that they are indeed dialogic, and are a 'rough guide' to 'the attitudes' she has encountered over many years. That is, these questions/statements are representations of generic liberal attitudes which she has heard before, and which she now debunks. The represented liberal attitudes clash with her own views, and in doing so become the expression of her own intentions. She is now able to proceed to her own account of the causes of the violence on the streets.

'Let us consider the causes'

In the following section of the speech Ann Cryer addresses what she saw as the causes of the social unrest in the areas neighbouring her constituency:

> Let us consider the causes. There is little point in blaming the situation simply on racism and Islamophobia. We must instead consider in detail what causes the under-achievement that I have mentioned. The main cause is the lack of a good level of English, which stems directly from the established tradition of bringing wives and husbands from the sub-continent who have often had no education and have no English. As a result, the vast majority of Keighley households have only one parent with any English and children go to school speaking only Punjabi or Bangla. That frequently gets children off to a slow start, which can damage their progress and mean that they leave school with few, if any, qualifications. Many cannot get paid work or find only poorly paid jobs.

The imperative 'Let us' here implies an instruction, and is endowed with some authority and gravitas. The word 'cause' or 'causes' appears three times here, to emphasise the politician's view of cause and effect in the background to the riots. Between the first and second 'causes' is the following sentence:

> There is little point in blaming the situation simply on racism and Islamophobia.

In an intensely dialogic assertion, Ann Cryer responds to an assumed argument which 'simply' blames racism and Islamophobia for the rioting. This argument is presupposed to come from beyond, as well as from within, the House of Commons. Ann Cryer appears to accept that racism and Islamophobia may have contributed to the violence. In refusing to discuss these points further she perhaps accepts them as self-evident explanations which do not need further debate. Instead of dwelling on them she looks beyond this for a more complex explanation, asking whether there may be factors within the Asian community which also contributed to the problems.

In what follows, Ann Cryer identifies eight causes of the rioting. Continuing the link between violence and under-achievement, she lists the following as reasons for young Asian men to join in 'criminal activity':

(i) the lack of a good level of English
(ii) the tradition of bringing wives and husbands from the sub-continent
(iii) only one parent with any English
(iv) children go to school speaking only Punjabi or Bangla
(v) children off to a slow start

(vi) which can damage their progress
(vii) few, if any, qualifications
(viii) cannot get paid work or find only poorly paid jobs

Each of these apparent causes of criminal activity is linked to language ideological debates about the role of minority languages in Britain. Fairclough (1989: 188) suggests that "Where one has lists, one has things placed in connection, but without any indication of the precise nature of the connection". These 'causes' of (both) underachievement and violence can be related to the argumentation strategies (topoi) outlined in Chapter 3. The first of these is articulated as follows:

> The main cause is the lack of a good level of English

Here the topos of danger or threat co-exists alongside the topos of (dis)advantage. If people continue to live in Britain while being unable to speak and understand 'a good level of English', runs the argument, there will be a danger of underachievement at school, resulting in violence on the streets, and steps should be taken to prevent this situation. Ann Cryer indicates how this problem arises, as the 'lack of a good level of English':

> stems directly from the established tradition of bringing wives and husbands from the sub-continent who have often had no education and have no English.

Here the topos of culture is invoked to reach the conclusion that 'the established tradition' stems from the cultural practice of the Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups, and causes problems. While Ann Cryer suggests a 'commonsense' logic to support her argument that the violence of young Asian men is caused by their (or their parents' or their wives') inability to speak English, this is little more than a list of apparently connected factors. The speaker suggests a logical progression in her argument with logical connectors, which "cue ideological assumptions" (Fairclough 1989: 131). The logical connectors here ('which stems directly', 'As a result', 'That frequently gets', 'which can', 'and mean that') assume causal or commonsensical relationships between the lack of a good level of English, the tradition of marrying a spouse from Pakistan or Bangladesh, children going to school speaking only their home language, children suffering 'damage' to their education, and young people leaving school with few qualifications. This persuasive generational narrative is sustained by the ideological power of logical connectors which almost imperceptibly val-

idate assumptions about the link between minority languages, educational failure, and violence.

All of Ann Cryer's stated causes of the rioting identify linguistic features that index the (so-called) Asian group, and "appear to be iconic representations of them" (Irvine & Gal 2000: 37), as if linguistic features could depict or display a social group's inherent nature or essence. The list of causes of the riots creates an ideological context which privileges English above other languages in society. This ideology is not only linguistic, however. In maintaining established traditions, in speaking languages other than English, in allowing a situation where only one parent speaks English, in sending children to school as speakers of other languages, Asian people are regarded as being 'to blame' for the disorder in the streets.

'Some remedies': Language as iconic representation

In the next section of Ann Cryer's speech, she proposes 'remedies' to the problems she has identified. The metaphor here does ideological work: that which requires a 'remedy' must be a disease. Fairclough (1989: 120) points out that the metaphorical representation of social problems as diseases is not uncommon. Ann Cryer's 'remedies' can be listed in six sections. The first of them is outlined as follows:

> I should like to suggest some remedies, which I know will be regarded as controversial by many of the self-styled Asian leaders in Bradford. Asian parents should consider arranging marriages for their children with Asian Muslims brought up and educated in the United Kingdom. That would avoid the present importation of poverty into their families and the problems that I mentioned for the next generation when the children go to school, and would also stop the increasing number of cases of young men and women having extremely unhappy and difficult marriages with spouses from the sub-continent with whom they have nothing in common. I have dealt with such cases, and they are a growing problem in Keighley.

Ann Cryer prefaces her list of 'remedies' with an acknowledgement that her views will be 'regarded as controversial by many of the self-styled Asian leaders in Bradford'. Here the back-bench M.P. recognises the probable (or perhaps pre-existing) opposition to her views, clashes with that opposition, and dismisses it before it can be heard. The linguistic means by which she does so is in her use of the phrase 'self-styled', which undermines the authority of the Asian

leaders, and positions them as self-important and worthless. Having dismissed those who may disagree with her, Ann Cryer continues to identify what should be done to remedy the current situation. In each case the modal auxiliary verb 'should' emphasises the authority of the speech, and the logical basis of the solutions proposed. In the first proposed remedy Ann Cryer refers back to what she sees as the major cause of under-achievement, and therefore rioting, which is 'bringing wives and husbands from the sub-continent'. In a topos of advantage and topos of culture, Asian parents are here asked to consider arranging marriages with British Asian Muslims, which would avoid the 'importation of poverty'. It is not clear how poverty is imported into families in this way. The immediate implication is that Asian languages are associated with economic poverty. However, as Ann Cryer's point was about the lack of a good level of English, it is possible that she is also implying 'linguistic poverty' here. At the same time, the ambiguity of this phrase could be interpreted as an iconic association between lack of English and social, cultural, or even moral poverty. Although the 'causes' of the riots had been identified in linguistic terms, this first 'remedy' for these perceived linguistic difficulties seems to pay little attention to language. Instead, Ann Cryer's focus is on inter-continental arranged marriages. Here the M.P. reiterates her credentials by saying 'I have dealt with such cases, and they are a growing problem in Keighley'. It may be that the M.P. is being opportunistic here – she was well known for campaigning against inter-continental arranged marriages, and although they are largely irrelevant to the debate about social disorder, she introduces the subject to the agenda.

Ann Cryer's second 'remedy' is as follows:

> Months off school for extended holidays in the sub-continent should be avoided. At the moment, there seems to be little regard for the problems that this can cause. Instead, people in the Asian community could add a week before and after the long summer holiday, because I would be the last person to suggest that they sever their links with the sub-continent.

None of the eight 'causes' of under-achievement and criminal activity identified by Ann Cryer refer to the practice of taking extended holidays in the sub-continent. Yet the second of the proposed 'remedies' suggests that such holidays 'should be avoided' because of 'the problems this can cause'. Once again the topoi of advantage and of culture underpin the argument for the proposed 'remedy': extended holidays in the sub-continent cause problems, and should therefore not be permitted. There is a presupposition here that the cultural practice of taking extended holidays with families in Pakistan and Bangladesh causes problems in children's learning of English. This does not

need to be said explicitly, because it has been said elsewhere (for example, the *Office for Standards in Education* 1999; Margaret Eaton, leader of Bradford City Council, quoted in *The Guardian*, July 13th, 2001; former Bradford head teacher Ray Honeyford 1988; Herman Ouseley, *Community Pride, Not Prejudice*, 2001: 14 – see Blackledge 2003, for a more detailed analysis). Intertextual understanding, what Fairclough calls "the already-said-elsewhere" (1995a: 6), shapes the discourse, implying that visits abroad will lead to linguistic and academic problems of the sort that will cause under-achievement and, perhaps, violence. Despite lack of support from linguistic or social research, discourse is here dialogically penetrated by a presupposition which appears to be 'common-sense'. It is notable that Ann Cryer once again re-states her liberal status here, saying that she 'would be the last person to suggest that they sever links with the sub-continent'.

Ann Cryer's third 'remedy' for the social unrest in the north of England refers more explicitly to language ideological debates:

> When possible, English should be used and encouraged in the home in addition to Punjabi and Bangla.

Notable here is the absence of agency in Ann Cryer's statement. It is not clear who should be using English, or whether those who should be using English at home are the same as those who should be encouraging the use of English. There is a cohesive link here to the earlier sentence beginning 'As a result', which suggests that households in which only one parent has 'any English' lead to children going to school speaking 'only Punjabi or Bangla'. The cohesive link (through repetition of 'Punjabi and Bangla') has two ideological functions: first, the implication is that parents should both speak English at home and encourage their children to do so; second, the apparently positive 'in addition to Punjabi and Bangla' is less positive when set alongside the earlier 'only Punjabi and Bangla'. Whereas in the second instance Asian languages seem to be equal to English, in the first example they are not sufficient. This sentence implies blame of Asian families for failing to speak sufficient English (although a failure to 'encourage' English-speaking in the home may also be directed at professionals).

The fourth 'remedy' proposed by Ann Cryer is as follows:

> Much more should be provided in further education colleges and community centres for non-English speakers by way of high-quality teaching of English as a second language. That should include crèche provision, with the funding coming from both central and local government. Such

> projects would be much better than channelling finance towards extra policing, as we have seen over the past few weekends.

It is not clear who should provide the services Ann Cryer calls for, although the sentence which refers to funding suggests that the audience for this section is central or local government, rather than Asian families. However, in the context of this section of the speech as a whole, it may be that the fourth 'remedy' is doing no more than paving the way for the fifth 'remedy':

> Sponsors should be encouraged to enrol husbands and wives who enter from the sub-continent in full-time English courses.

The ideological function of this proposal appears to be to directly tell Asian people to enrol their newly-arrived husbands and wives in full-time English courses. Notable here is the lack of agency accorded to the newly-arrived husbands and wives, semantically as well as syntactically. There is no sense in which they may choose to enrol themselves in English courses: the fact that they cannot speak English seems to imply that they do not have the right to choose.

This fifth 'remedy' links cohesively with the sixth and final proposal from Ann Cryer

> My most controversial point is one that I have made previously. It has not gone down terribly well, although I have had support from hon. Members. I will repeat what I said, so that I place on record precisely what I mean. If, after possibly five years, we are no nearer to achieving the solutions and ambitions, and the deprivation with all that flows from it continues, the Government should consider having an element of English as an entry clearance requirement for husbands and wives who seek permanent settlement. There should be a further requirement for them to take a full-time English course to reach a reasonable level. The conditions should apply to all applicants outside the European Union. My proposals are in line with immigration requirements in many countries, including the United States of America, Canada and the Netherlands.

Ann Cryer prefaces this proposal by saying that it is her 'most controversial point'. In doing so, she makes a cohesive link (through repetition of the word 'controversial') to the 'self-styled Asian leaders' to whom she referred earlier. The effect of this is to position as extremist any criticism of her view. Here discourse is intertextual, as Ann Cryer refers to her previously made proposals, and to the responses of those who opposed them. Although her point may not have gone down terribly well in some quarters, she claims validity in the topos of authority here by stating that she has 'had some support from hon. ('hon-

ourable') Members'. Playing to her audience, she includes the present members of the House in her discourse. When she proposes her remedy, the deictic 'we' ('if. . .we are no nearer') reappears for the first time in the 'remedies' section of the speech. The apparently inclusive 'we' is ambiguous here: it refers to the Members of the House of Commons, and at the same time it includes a wider audience of policy-makers and concerned people, who would in due course read reports of the speech in the broadsheet newspapers.

In the next clause, 'deprivation' is linked to 'poverty', and implies that if the importation of (linguistic, cultural, moral, economic) poverty cannot be stopped, the Government should prevent the permanent settlement of those who do not have 'a reasonable level' of English. The proposed demand for 'a reasonable level' of English echoes the existing requirement in law for general applicants for naturalisation to have 'sufficient knowledge' of English. Here, though, Ann Cryer exhorts the government to introduce English language tests 'as an entry clearance requirement'. Ann Cryer appears to be calling for language tests at the port of entry, so that only those who can already speak 'an element of English' should be allowed into Britain, with a requirement then for them 'to reach a reasonable level' if they are granted leave to remain in Britain. Such a requirement could only be invoked after entry to the country if a test of some sort were introduced, for example a test for British citizenship applicants. It appears that the M.P. is making two proposals here: (i) that the Government should introduce new language tests at the port of entry (or perhaps in the country of origin), to reject any new immigrants who do not have 'an element of English', and (ii) a further test at some later date for those granted entry, to ensure that they have reached 'a reasonable level of English'. It is not clear who decides what constitutes a 'reasonable level' of English, or according to what criteria such a judgement is made, but the implication must be that it is a greater level of proficiency (however defined) than 'an element of English', as it involves a requirement 'to take a full-time English course'. It may be that this is political kite-flying, setting out an extreme position from which to negotiate policy. The first of these proposals has not currently been adopted by the British Government. The second was already included in existing legislation. However, it is the second of Ann Cryer's implicit demands (that there should be extension to, and more rigorous implementation of, English language testing of citizenship applicants) that the Government would pick up and introduce into new legislation within sixteen months of this speech. Ann Cryer concludes this section of the speech with a topos of authority, claiming validity and status for her proposals by stating that they are consistent with 'immigration requirements in many countries'. It is not clear which of her proposals are claimed to be con-

sistent with the language testing requirements in the United States of America, Canada and the Netherlands. Ambiguity here allows the more radical proposal to test new arrivals at or before the port of entry for 'an element of English' to be conflated and included with the (also illiberal) proposal to test existing immigrants for 'a reasonable level of English'. Here authority is claimed through the "fallacy of ambiguity" (Reisigl & Wodak 2001: 74), as the politician strengthens her standpoint with reference to authorities which can only be said to support half of her argument.

'A Belfast-like situation'

The next sentences of the speech refer to Lord Ouseley's report into social segregation in Bradford, *Community Pride, Not Prejudice*. Here Ann Cryer reiterates her thanks to Lord Ouseley. I will return to this report in Chapter 6. Ann Cryer comments on it as follows:

> Lord Ouseley's report remarks on the need for understanding between communities, and the fact that everyone must take on board the advantages of integration, for the Asian community in particular. That will be easier to achieve when all members of the Asian community have some grasp of English and when whites and Asians recognise that there can be gain only from all sides living together in peace and understanding. The alternative is a Belfast-like situation in which we will all be the losers, including whites. I have been encouraged to express my views by Lord Ouseley's comments on the "fear of talking openly and honestly about problems".
>
> He has helped me to overcome my fear of verbal abuse from the so-called leaders among the Asian community and the politically correct whites. Following my experiences in the past few days, I can say that the thought police are alive and well in Bradford.

The first sentence here appears to be an argument based on the topos of advantage. If 'everyone' recognises the advantages of 'integration', runs the argument, it will be particularly beneficial to 'the Asian community'. In the first clause of the next sentence the responsibility for progress seems to shift to members of the Asian community who do not have 'some grasp of English'. The initial pronoun ('That') is ambiguous, as it may refer to 'understanding between communities' or 'the advantages of integration'. As before, both senses are therefore present. In either or both cases, the responsibility for achieving understanding and integration now lies firmly with members of the Asian community who do

not have 'some grasp of English'. It is not clear whether the level of proficiency implied by 'some grasp' is consistent with 'some element', or with 'a reasonable level'. The remainder of the sentence accords responsibility to 'whites and Asians' to recognise the benefits of 'peace and understanding'. This liberal sentiment is firmly located in a context of oppositional discourse, so that while liberal values are clearly desirable, the phrase 'whites and Asians' creates a hostile opposition between groups. At the same time, by stating that the main factor in achieving 'integration' is a language issue, the crude opposition of 'whites and Asians' racialises the debate. Within the same sentence, language and race are invoked as aspects of the debate. The process of racialisation works by rendering others having certain cultural characteristics, one of which may be language, as foreign, alien, and 'other'. Here 'integration' of 'whites and Asians', is the very opposite of throwing bricks and stones in the street. The responsibility to bring about the peace lies with those who do not have 'some grasp of English'. The next sentence only emphasises this interpretation. In a topos of danger and threat, Ann Cryer argues that the alternative to integration by means of all members of the Asian community gaining some grasp of English is 'a Belfast-like situation'. The connotations of 'a Belfast-like situation' are clear: the result of members of the Asian community failing to gain some grasp of English will be a society which is divided along sectarian lines, where bombing and murder are commonplace, and where fear and violence are part of daily life.[1]

Having made this alarming association between lack of English proficiency and sectarian violence, Ann Cryer uses the topos of authority to support her views. She has been encouraged to speak her mind by Lord Ouseley's report, which identified 'fear of talking openly' as a major source of Bradford's problems. In another cohesive link to the 'self-styled Asian leaders', Ann Cryer states that she has had to overcome her 'fear of verbal abuse from the so-called leaders among the Asian community'. Here 'so-called' does the same ideological work as 'self-styled', marginalising the views of the community leaders, and dismissing their criticisms. Ann Cryer has also had to overcome fear of verbal abuse from 'the politically correct whites'. In an intertextual link to the discourse of Councillor Harry Brooks, Independent group leader of Burnley Council (see Chapter 3), Ann Cryer dismisses liberal views which are in opposition to hers. The definite pronoun here accords validity to the referential categorisation of 'politically correct whites'. The M.P. makes a further intertextual reference to George Orwell's notion of the 'thought police' in his novel *'Nineteen Eighty Four'*. Here she implies that anyone who does not agree that some people's failure to learn English will lead to further violence are either Asian leaders with

dubious credentials, woolly-thinking liberals, or a security force determined to prevent freedom of speech and thought. In doing so she effectively dismisses her opposition, before concluding her speech with further references to 'whites and Asians', while accepting that 'all is not doom and gloom'.

It is possible to identify in Ann Cryer's proposals ideological representations of linguistic differences. These can be further analysed with reference to the semiotic processes outlined by Irvine and Gal (2000: 37). In this section of the speech, when taken together with the earlier section in which *causes* of rioting are identified, linguistic features are iconically associated with elements of Muslim Asian cultural, moral, and social characteristics which are to be 'remedied'. A lack of 'good' English is iconically linked to the cultural practices of inter-continental arranged marriages and extended holidays to the sub-continent, and to the importation of poverty. Linguistic features represent cultural features, and *both* are to be remedied. Similarly, monolingual (or at least non-English-speaking) speakers of Asian languages in the home are positioned as deficient. The linguistic ideology expounded here is one which does not accept non-English speakers. This ideology 'erases' (Irvine & Gal 2000: 37) the possibility of monolingualism in an Asian language in Britain, insisting that such speakers transform themselves into bilingual, multilingual or monolingual speakers of English. This process of erasure underlies the call for compulsory enrolment in English classes, and the demand for language testing of new arrivals, and naturalisation language testing for those who seek permanent settlement in Britain. The linguistic ideology which is proposed and expounded by Ann Cryer appears to erase any possibility of social inclusion for non-English-speakers in Britain.

Political discourse and the construction of the social world

It seems clear that in the chain of discourses which emerged in the wake of the riots in northern England, 'understanding English' is iconically linked with 'good race relations', even at the highest level of government. The opposite of good race relations is perceived to be the kind of rioting witnessed during the summer of 2001. In the linguistic ideology emerging in these discourses, 'good English' has become a pre-condition for social cohesion. Proficiency in Asian languages, on the other hand, is linked with a predisposition to violence and social disorder. This language ideological debate is about more than language: it appears to be about the viability of the multicultural state. In Bourdieu's terms, the debate which links the lack of English proficiency of the spouses of British

citizens with social disorder creates a natural, self-evident discourse which is "the foundation of a logical conformism and a moral conformism" (2000:172). The social world is experienced as a common-sense reality in which it is accepted (by dominant and dominated groups alike) that all citizens of Britain must have sufficient knowledge (defined by Ann Cryer as 'some grasp', 'an element', and 'a reasonable level') of the indigenous language. In this logical, moral discourse, common-sense dictates that immigrant wives and husbands who wish to apply for British citizenship must learn sufficient English to engage in everyday work and social practices (neither of which necessarily require use of English), and to fulfil their duties as citizens.

In her speech Ann Cryer constructs the social world as one which is assimilationist and homogeneous. Her discourse contributes to the production of a social arena in which it is sensible to assume that the best means of ensuring social inclusion is to diminish the value of minority languages. This is a discourse which reproduces a world in which the English language is the means to liberation, while minority languages other than English are linked to social disorder and family disharmony. The economy of the field constructed in this discourse is based on one language alone, and "everything here seems sensible: full of sense and objectively directed in a judicious direction" (Bourdieu 1990:66). That is, the consensual world produced in this political discourse creates (in Bourdieu's illuminating metaphor) a set of rules for the game, played out in the social world, which are beyond those who do not have 'some grasp of English'. Despite the possibility of suspending commitment to the game for long enough to recognise the "absurdity" (Bourdieu 1990:67) of its rules, it is no less powerful for such knowledge. Nor is this a 'game' which can be quickly or easily learned. Rather, those who have greatest mastery over the game are those who were born to it, so that they no longer have to think about its rules. Those who enter the game at a late stage and have to learn the rules are less likely to succeed, "very much as the acquisition of the mother tongue is to the learning of a foreign language" (Bourdieu 1990:67). Here Ann Cryer appears to act as referee or umpire, able to determine who should succeed in the game, and who should fail. The game is robust enough not only to sanction and debar those who would seek to destroy it, but also to arrange things in practice so that means of selecting and shaping new (would-be) players are established – in this case, new criteria for entry to Britain, and an extension to language testing requirements for citizenship applicants. This process of selection and shaping of new players of the game is such as to "obtain from them that undisputed, pre-reflexive, naïve, native compliance with the fundamental presuppositions of the field" (Bourdieu 1990:68).

These misrecognitions of the superior value of the English language, and the diminution and subjugation of minority languages, both constitute and reproduce the functioning of the field. Whilst the effect of such discourse is not ultimately knowable, it extends in two ways. First, in its ultimate form, as it moves up the chain of authority, the argument central to Ann Cryer's speech gains the authority of the law, and imposes a non-negotiable subject position on those non-native English speakers who would apply for British citizenship. In subsequent chapters I will discuss the authority of law and legislative discourse in the construction of coercive social arenas. Second, Ann Cryer's argument extends in discursive chains which are produced and reproduced in the media and elsewhere, contributing to the reproduction of a language ideology which misrecognises English as the only language of social inclusion. In itself the speech may not have a great effect on speakers of languages other than English in Britain. However, Bourdieu reminds us that it is not the individual example of discriminatory discourse that reproduces an iniquitous social world, but the "countless acts of recognition which are the small change of the compliance inseparable from belonging to the field, and in which collective misrecognition is ceaselessly generated" (Bourdieu 1990: 68). The constant and collective misrecognition of the legitimacy of the rules of the game constructs a social world in which speakers of languages other than English are unlikely to be comfortable using their languages in public arenas. The misrecognition of minority languages as indexical of social problems, and of English as the solution to such problems, becomes "inscribed in the obviousness of ordinary experience" (Bourdieu 1998b: 36), and contributes to the imposition of the dominant language and culture.

The construction of a social world which discriminates against speakers of some languages and favours speakers of the dominant language occurs almost unnoticed. Indeed, such is the power and stealth of the process of symbolic violence that those unto whom violence is done may not notice that such a world has been produced. In what Bourdieu (1998b: 102) refers to as a "quasi-magical" and often invisible process, prior and continuous work produces the dispositions necessary for dominated groups to feel that they have obeyed the dominant group without ever realising that there was even a question of obedience. That is, if speakers of minority languages themselves believe that their languages are inferior to English, it is not because it is the case, but because this has been a dominant and largely unchallenged ideology for some time, producing an unquestioning submission on the part of minority language speakers. Of course this model should be investigated and examined in detailed linguistic ethnographic research to fully understand the responses of minority language

speakers at first hand. It is in the combination of linguistic ethnography and critical discourse analysis that we can make visible the effect of the structural on identities performed in interaction (for example see the contributions to recent volumes edited by Creese & Martin 2003; Rogers 2003b; Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004b). The purpose of this volume, however, is to identify the ways in which political and other public discourse contributes to a process of symbolic violence which may discriminate against minority language speakers. In this regard it is worth quoting Bourdieu's explanation of the power of symbolic violence:

> Symbolic violence rests on the adjustment between the structures constitutive of the habitus of the dominated and the structure of the relation of domination to which they apply: the dominated perceive the dominant through the categories that the relation of domination has produced and which are thus identical to the interests of the dominant. (Bourdieu 1998b: 121)

For the dominant group there is no conflict involved in the reproduction of the common-sense ideology that minority languages are of little worth in England. For speakers of such languages, however, the process of symbolic violence potentially reduces them to silence in public settings, as they unintentionally collude in their symbolic domination.

This language ideological debate is a struggle not over language alone, but over the kind of society that Britain imagines itself to be: either multilingual, pluralist, and diverse, or ultimately English-speaking, assimilationist, and homogeneous. In the debate reported here, the strongest voices represent the most powerful institutions, and belong to those who see the future of Britain as a homogeneous, monolingual state. In Chapter 5 I will consider the ways in which this debate was recontextualised in the liberal broadsheet press in the days following Ann Cryer's speech.

4.1 Appendix

> **Mrs. Ann Cryer** (Keighley): I associate with all the comments made by the hon. Member for Southwark, North and Bermondsey (Simon Hughes). Clearly, I could not put things better myself because I do not know his area, but his speech also applies to the situations in Bradford and my constituency. Most of my comments will relate to the riots on 7 July in Bradford, which took place within a few miles of my home.
>
> I welcome the report that was published on 11 July by the team led by

Lord Ouseley: "Community Pride not Prejudice, making diversity work in Bradford". I should like to place on record my appreciation for Lord Ouseley's work. He has delved into areas of Bradford that had previously been untouched, and I hope that his work has inspired many discussions there. My comments follow 30 years of work and friendship with the Asian community in Keighley, which constitutes a fifth of the Bradford district. Since I was elected in 1997, I have had many anxieties about the under-achievement of the Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities in my constituency. Last year, Warwick University published a report confirming my worst fears: the Sikh and Hindu communities are doing extremely well, but the indigenous population is not doing so well and the Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities are massively underachieving, both academically and economically. The time has come to ask why.

After lengthy discussions, my view is that the riots were led by a criminal minority responding to fascist taunts. The criminals were supported by hundreds of young Asian men hellbent on causing havoc, mainly for their own community. It is always their own community that suffers. Those young men were also determined to punish police officers and prevent them from carrying out their legitimate duties.

We need to examine why those young Asian men were so keen to join in the criminal activity. Was it because they had little to lose, little else to do and therefore felt that such activity was a way of making their presence felt, as they had not impressed the world or Bradford with anything else? Do they and many other young Asian males in Bradford feel that they have little, if any, stake in the United Kingdom's growing prosperity, which was created by the Government I support? Do those young men feel disaffected, disenfranchised and let down by their country of birth? Do they ask why all the qualifications, good jobs, nice houses and powerful cars seem to go to the whites? That is a rough guide to the attitudes that I have encountered over many years.

Let us consider the causes. There is little point in blaming the situation simply on racism and Islamophobia. We must instead consider in detail what causes the under-achievement that I have mentioned. The main cause is the lack of a good level of English, which stems directly from the established tradition of bringing wives and husbands from the subcontinent who have often had no education and have no English. As a result, the vast majority of Keighley households have only one parent with any English and children go to school speaking only Punjabi or Bangla. That frequently gets children off to a slow start, which can damage their progress and mean that they leave school with few, if any, qualifications.

Many cannot get paid work or find only poorly paid jobs.

I should like to suggest some remedies, which I know will be regarded as controversial by many of the self-styled Asian leaders in Bradford. Asian parents should consider arranging marriages for their children with Asian Muslims brought up and educated in the United Kingdom. That would avoid the present importation of poverty into their families and the problems that I mentioned for the next generation when the children go to school, and would also stop the increasing number of cases of young men and women having extremely unhappy and difficult marriages with spouses from the sub-continent with whom they have nothing in common. I have dealt with such cases, and they are a growing problem in Keighley.

Months off school for extended holidays in the sub-continent should be avoided. At the moment, there seems to be little regard for the problems that this can cause. Instead, people in the Asian community could add a week before and after the long summer holiday, because I would be the last person to suggest that they sever their links with the sub-continent.

When possible, English should be used and encouraged in the home in addition to Punjabi and Bangla. Much more should be provided in further education colleges and community centres for non-English speakers by way of high-quality teaching of English as a second language. That should include crèche provision, with the funding coming from both central and local government. Such projects would be much better than channelling finance towards extra policing, as we have seen over the past few weekends. Sponsors should be encouraged to enrol husbands and wives who enter from the sub-continent in full-time English courses.

My most controversial point is one that I have made previously. It has not gone down terribly well, although I have had support from hon. Members. I will repeat what I said, so that I place on record precisely what I mean. If, after possibly five years, we are no nearer to achieving the solutions and ambitions, and the deprivation, with all that flows from it, continues, the Government should consider having an element of English as an entry clearance requirement for husbands and wives who seek permanent settlement. There should be a further requirement for them to take a full-time English course to reach a reasonable level. The conditions should apply to all applicants outside the European Union. My proposals are in line with immigration requirements in many countries, including the United States of America, Canada and the Netherlands.

I should like to examine the "Community Pride not Prejudice" report by Lord Ouseley. I am pleased that he has written that report, which is excel-

lent. Many of his recommendations dovetail into my previous comments, including, for example, his remarks on pages 13 and 14 about other education concerns. Although many of us who have worked with the Asian community over the past 30 years may claim that he says nothing new, it is good to see the comments in print. I hope that it will enlighten debate, particularly for those who have not had the good fortune of a good relationship with our Pakistani and Bangladeshi constituents during the years as I have.

Lord Ouseley's report remarks on the need for understanding between communities, and the fact that everyone must take on board the advantages of integration, for the Asian community in particular. That will be easier to achieve when all members of the Asian community have some grasp of English and when whites and Asians recognise that there can be gain only from all sides living together in peace and understanding. The alternative is a Belfast-like situation in which we will all be the losers, including whites. I have been encouraged to express my views by Lord Ouseley's comments on the

"fear of talking openly and honestly about problems".

He has helped me to overcome my fear of verbal abuse from the so-called leaders among the Asian community and the politically correct whites. Following my experiences in the past few days, I can say that the thought police are alive and well in Bradford.

I should like to finish on a silver lining. The Asian women and children's group in my constituency is doing wonderful things for the women and children of Keighley. Many women who worked with that group are now taking a leading part in their community, and not before time. The Sure Start experiment is working so well with whites and Asians, especially at Guardhouse in Keighley, to bring together white and Asian children and young mothers – fathers, too. Unfortunately, too little effort is being made in the Bradford district to get whites and Asians to work together.

I visited Greenhead comprehensive school – formerly Greenhead Grammar School – in my constituency just before the election, where I met many young, capable Asian women who were completing their A-level courses. They were going on to universities with their parents' approval and enthusiasm.

I mention those aspects of the silver lining, because, as the hon. Member for Southwark, North and Bermondsey said, it is not all doom and gloom. We are moving in the right direction, especially in respect of the projects that I mentioned in Keighley. I apologise for being so parochial, but I only

know about the situation in Keighley and, to a certain extent, in Bradford. There is a south-north divide on these issues, with difficulties especially in West Yorkshire.

Chapter 5

Political discourse and the media

The proposals of a single Member of Parliament are fascinating as an example of the way in which illiberal ideology often masquerades as liberal discourse in a public setting. However, as a single text such a speech may be dismissed as the maverick view of an individual. In order to understand the 'life' of such a discourse it is necessary to identify how it connects to other discourses in the textual chain. Here the concept of 'recontextualisation' is useful, as it can be used "to chart shifts of meanings either within one genre – as in different versions of a specific written text – or across semiotic dimensions" (Wodak 2000: 192). When a social event is represented, it is incorporated within the context of another social event, and recontextualised (Fairclough 2003a). In this process of recontextualisation, representations of events are not merely repeated. Rather, they are transformed in their new setting, perhaps through the addition of new elements, or through the deletion of others. The arrangement of events may change in the new context, or some elements may be substituted for others. The argumentation strategies identified in local news text and political discourse (in Chapters 3 and 4) may recur in a new setting, incorporating new 'voices' as they go. Such arguments may be transformed across genres, and yet remain identifiable as links in the chain of discourse. In the exploration of political discourses, the recontextualisation of arguments and topoi is pursued from one genre to the next, and from one public domain to the next. This "life of arguments" illustrates the power struggle about specific opinions, beliefs or ideologies (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, & Vetter 2000: 156). While recontextualisation often involves the suppression and filtering of some meaning potentials of a discourse (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999), it is also a process which may expand meaning potential, through additions to, and elaborations upon, the previous text. I am here using the term 'recontextualisation' to mean the process of reformulating a previous utterance in a new generic context, so that its potential meaning and interpretation is affected, rather than in the more specific sense of the assimilation of elements of another genre in a dominant text (Chilton & Schäffner 2002).

Recontextualisation always involves transformation, and that transformation is dependent on the goals, values and interests of the context into which the discursive practice is being recontextualised (Van Leeuwen & Wodak 1999: 96). In the context of discourses surrounding proposals for language testing for British citizenship in this volume, discourses are linked synchronically and diachronically, making connections with related discourses in the past, present and future. Discourses are further linked across a range of genres: in this case, Ann Cryer's speech in Westminster Hall, with its typical characteristics of the political speech, is related diachronically to the history of oppositional discourse in local news media in the north of England. As demonstrated in the examples in Chapter 3, news stories and editorial leads are related, but different, genres. Ann Cryer's speech is further linked to comments on the speech by government ministers, and by national broadsheet newspapers, both of which discourses are characteristic of their genre or genres. However, the recontextualisation of discourse does not end with the explicit links between, and commentary upon, other discourses. When official reports into the social disorder in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham reach their conclusions, they do so in the context of the genre of 'official reports', but the arguments and presuppositions which underlie them are recognisable from other types of discourse which have gone before. As we will see in Chapter 6, even the traditionally staid genre of the official report incorporates many 'voices', in the Bakhtinian sense. That is, the recontextualisation of arguments across genres invariably includes allusions to, and implicatures of, the many voices influencing the debate, both liberal and illiberal.

Recontextualisation and authoritative discourse

In Chapter 1 I suggested that in the recontextualisation of argument, discourse may become increasingly powerful and authoritative as it is restated and transformed in increasingly legitimate contexts. When a discriminatory argument is made in a conversation between individuals, it is a discourse which has a life, and which may or may not influence the values, beliefs and ideologies of those present. However, in itself such an argument has limited power to affect policy (although I would certainly not want to underplay the significance of 'everyday' discourse in reproducing discriminatory practice). When illiberal discourse appears in the editorial lead of a local newspaper like the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph*, the effect of the text is still unknown, but in this more public context it has the potential to reach a greater audience. When discriminatory

discourse is uttered in a speech in the Houses of Parliament, it is broadcast on television. However, this is not necessarily its most powerful context. Rather, it is when such speeches are picked up, restated and transformed in new contexts and genres that they gain new life and, often, new authority. In the case of the recontextualised chains of discourse analysed in this volume, a speech by a back-bench Member of Parliament is endorsed, in a new setting, by a Home Office minister. This transformation of the argument immediately lends it greater authority. When similar arguments emerge in official, government and local-government reports into the 'race riots', again they gain authority. In the course of such chains of official discourse, ministers are interviewed, and Secretaries of State invited to make statements. The hierarchical stratification of government accords greater authority to the discourse of those located closer to the centre of power. When the familiar arguments are transformed in the genre of a Government White Paper, they are endowed with increased authority. Subsequent to the White Paper, a new Act of Parliament introduces legislation which is perhaps the most powerful (if not, of course, the final) link in the chain of discourse. Bourdieu (2000) points out that discourse is at its most powerful when supported in law. Laws are not, of course, either natural or uncontested. In democratic societies they emerge from, or are the ultimate consecration of, chains of political discourses (Wodak 2000). Such discourses act hand-in-hand with the law to create 'common-sense' realities which are held to be self-evident. If it is common sense that people who do not speak the majority language impoverish the nation, laws are required to ensure that they learn to use the dominant language, or to prevent their naturalisation as citizens. Political discourse and the law act (alongside other discourses) to create a social world which is self-evident, natural, taken for granted, and which reproduces the social order. But the chain of discourse reaches no end. In the context of language testing for naturalisation in Britain, new legislation is followed by a Government working party's report, and by Home Office guidance to the implementation of the legislation. All of these discourses incorporate, allude to, and run alongside other 'voices' from other discourses, both liberal and illiberal. What unites them is a content, a discursive strategy and a linguistic means of realisation which is both recurring and transformed across genres.

Van Dijk (1997) makes the point that politicians and their sustaining bureaucracies play a central role in the production and reproduction of ideologies relating to minority groups. Although politicians are supposed to base their policies on popular opinion, in fact it is more likely that policy is based on the dynamics of chains of discourse between politicians and the media. Political cognition is a result of elite discourses in the media, in politics, and

(perhaps to a lesser extent) the academy. Analysis of political discourse about minority groups in society should therefore include analysis of the discourse of elite groups in a range of contexts. In fact Van Dijk (1997) argues that it is more likely that politicians influence public opinion, rather than the reverse. Represented by the media, their views enter into the public domain, often coming to be understood as common-sense arguments. The views and opinions of politicians are perhaps most influential when they reproduce negative representations of minority groups in "subtle and indirect ways" (Van Dijk 1997:36). That is, while there may be little enthusiasm in Britain for explicitly discriminatory expressions of racial hatred, racist discourse which at the same time constructs itself as liberal and egalitarian goes almost unchallenged: "It may well be that more subtle and indirect expression of seemingly reasonable, humane, or tolerant beliefs or arguments are much more insidious and influential in persuasion" (Van Dijk 1997:41). For this reason the analysis of discriminatory discourse should look for such discourse in the places where it is least expected.

Recontextualisation of political discourse

Ann Cryer's Westminster Hall speech on 17th July 2001 was widely reported in the national print media, and two days later, the Minister of State for the Home Office, Lord Rooker, supported her in the House of Lords (*Hansard* 19th July 2001). Lord Rooker also made a statement relating to Ann Cryer's speech during an interview for the political website *ePolitix.com* (Appendix 5.1) on 17th August 2001, in response to the question: 'Do you agree with Ann Cryer that new citizens should learn to speak English?'. Lord Rooker's interview provides exemplification of some aspects of recontextualisation in political discourse.

Van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999:96) suggest that transformations characteristic of recontextualisation of political discourse include: (i) deletion (ii) rearrangement (iii) substitution and (iv) addition. They describe these categories as follows:

Deletion. Social practice is rarely represented exactly as in other contexts. One of the questions here is: what has been deleted from the original or previous account? In Lord Rooker's response to a question about Ann Cryer's speech relating to English language tests for 'new citizens', he makes no mention of one of Ann Cryer's main proposals: that there should be a language test which

has 'an element of English as an entry clearance requirement'. As this appears not to be part of official government thinking, it is carefully omitted.

Rearrangement. Represented social practices may not be recontextualised in the order in which they occurred or were previously represented. Emphasis may be altered if a particular aspect of social practice is located in the salient initial or final position as a headline or closing point, although it was previously backgrounded. An example of this occurs in the news report from *The Independent* newspaper (18th August 2001, Appendix 5.3) following Lord Rooker's interview with *ePolitix.com*. Lord Rooker's response to a question about Ann Cryer's speech to Parliament is here rearranged so that his point about civil rights moves from the middle of the text to the salient final position.

Substitution. In represented discourse, social actors will often be accorded new nominations. Even where there are close similarities between discourse represented in the first and second text, the context itself transforms the potential meanings and interpretation of the discourse practice. Often, though, there will be a clear substitution of one thing for another, through linguistic means such as nominalisation, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and personalisation. In a report in *The Observer* newspaper (August 19th 2001, Appendix 5.5) of Lord Rooker's *ePolitix.com* interview, the Home Office minister is represented as being 'widely regarded as a safe pair of hands'. The metaphorical representation of the politician creates new potential meanings.

Addition. Recontextualisation not only involves the representation of social practices through alterations to existing discourses. It also involves adding new elements to that representation. Additions may include reactions, purposes and legitimations. *Reactions* represent the inner feelings of social actors. In the report in *The Observer* newspaper (August 19th 2001) of Lord Rooker's *ePolitix.com* interview, analysed below, his comments are represented as having 'prompted outrage from refugee groups'. This speculative statement, which represents the (potential) feelings of groups of social actors, is an addition to Lord Rooker's discourse. The *purpose* of social practices may be construed differently in different recontextualisations by addition. In a report in *The Guardian* newspaper (August 18th 2001, Appendix 5.2) of Lord Rooker's interview, he is represented as having said that Ann Cryer's proposal for English language tests for citizenship applicants 'could be useful'. This recontextualisation adds the word 'useful' (which was not used in the *ePolitix.com* account of the interview), and in doing so attaches a purpose to Ann Cryer's proposals. In this way 'chains of discourses' can extend across genres, and become

transformed through recontextualisation (that is: *The Guardian* says that Lord Rooker says that Ann Cryer says. . .). Also, 'legitimation' of social practices accounts for why they must be as they are. The legitimation of texts can be gained through reference to authority, rationalisation, or moral evaluation. Authority may be established through reference to the law, or to the discourse of some person or institution in a highly respected position. In the report on Lord Rooker's interview in *The Independent* newspaper (18th August 2001), the minister is accorded authority in the following addition: 'Lord Rooker, whose former constituency of Birmingham, Perry Barr has a large Asian community'. Here the addition of Lord Rooker's credentials, only alluded to in his interview, endow his views with greater credibility. Legitimation through rationalisation refers to the introduction of the logic of common or academic sense, definitions or explanations. A third form of legitimation occurs through the addition in recontextualised discourse of moral evaluation. Such an addition may not refer to a narrowly-defined notion of morality, but to a discourse of presupposed values, including health, hygiene, economics and leadership. In Lord Rooker's interview Ann Cryer's speech is recontextualised in the following discourse: 'it's people being denied their civil rights'. Here a moral evaluation of the presupposed cultural practices of the Asian group supports Ann Cryer's proposals.

Recontextualisation and the authoritative voice

Recontextualisation of social practice is inevitably realised in discursive strategies and linguistic means, including argumentation strategies, referential strategies, representation of discourse, deixis, and tropological constructions such as metonymy, synecdoche and personalisation. Among the most salient discursive strategies in the recontextualisation of political discourse are topoi, or argumentation strategies.

In his interview with *ePolitix.com*, which mainly focused on government policy relating to asylum seekers, Lord Rooker was asked only one question relating to language testing for citizenship: 'Do you agree with Ann Cryer that new citizens should learn to speak English?' His brief reply (Appendix 5.1) began as follows:

> I am on record in the House of Lords of supporting exactly what Ann Cryer said about this issue, based on constituency experience.

Here Lord Rooker makes a cohesive reference to Ann Cryer's speech, incorporating the phrase 'on record', which appears in Ann Cryer's Westminster Hall speech as 'so that I place on record'. This phrase is characteristic of the genre of political speech, and makes a cohesive tie between the discourse of Ann Cryer and Lord Rooker. In stating 'I am on record in the House of Lords', Lord Rooker claims authority for his views. Here the topos of authority claims that if something has been stated in the Houses of Parliament, it is held to be true. The final clause of the sentence ('based on constituency experience') has a similar effect, making a cohesive tie to Ann Cryer's several statements about having worked in the Asian community for over 30 years, and for having had a good relationship with her Pakistani and Bangladeshi constituents. Here again the topos of authority claims legitimacy for his views. Lord Rooker states that in the House of Lords he supported 'exactly' what Ann Cryer said about this issue. However, in the House of Lords speech he acknowledged that he had not read the details of Ann Cryer's speech, but had only heard her give a radio interview. The deletion of this detail from the *ePolitix.com* answer makes a small transformation. The pronoun here ('this issue') is ambiguous. 'This' can only refer to the interviewer's question, which asks 'Do you agree with Ann Cryer that new citizens should learn to speak English?' However, as we saw in Chapter 4, in addition to the requirement to reach a 'reasonable level' of English to be granted citizenship status, a further proposal from Ann Cryer was that there should be an entry clearance requirement of 'an element of English'. Although the beginning of Lord Rooker's answer does not specify whether he is 'supporting' both proposals, the second half of his answer refers only to learning English for citizenship applications. The previous discourse is transformed by deletion of unwanted elements in its recontextualised form.

'The men say "They don't need it"'

In the next section of his reply to the question, Lord Rooker seems to become less certain of his ground:

> There are situations, this has got nothing to do with asylum seekers, where sometimes people are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English by their family.

The modality of this sentence initially appears to be of the same order as the previous one, as 'There are' mirrors the categorical 'There is'. However, 'sometimes' appears to qualify the minister's assertion, repeating the sense of 'There

are situations'. The minister's discourse here takes "a sideward glance at someone else's hostile word" (Bakhtin 1994: 108). In what Bakhtin calls "internally polemic discourse" the sentence senses its opposition, and repudiates itself in advance:

> Such speech literally cringes in the presence or the anticipation of someone else's word, reply, objection. The individual manner in which a person structures his own speech is determined to a significant degree by his peculiar awareness of another's words. (Bakhtin 1994: 108)

Whereas Ann Cryer anticipates someone else's hostile reply more explicitly, referring to 'so-called leaders' and 'politically correct whites', Lord Rooker only senses his potential critic. In the remainder of the sentence Lord Rooker makes cohesive reference to Ann Cryer's speech through repetition of the word 'encouraged' (among Ann Cyer's 'remedies' were recommendations that 'English should be encouraged in the home', and 'Sponsors should be encouraged to enroll husbands and wives. . .in full-time English courses'). Here we see the first of four instances of the word 'people' in Lord Rooker's short interview response. In this first example 'people' appear to be non-English-speaking, while 'their family' appear to be English-speaking. It is worth comparing Ann Cryer's recommendation with Lord Rooker's recontextualised version:

> English should be used and encouraged in the home (Ann Cryer)
>
> People are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English by their family (Lord Rooker)

Ann Cryer's 'remedy' is more assertive than Lord Rooker's statement, marked as it is by the modal verb 'should'. In Ann Cryer's example the responsibility to encourage English in the home is ambiguous, while in Lord Rooker's recontextualised form responsibility lies squarely with 'the family'. The substitution of the main verb relating to 'English' is another element of transformation between Ann Cryer's recommendation and Lord Rooker's statement, as 'used' becomes 'learn'. This is not an insignificant recontextualisation: no doubt briefed by Home Office staff, Lord Rooker is aware that it is very difficult to conduct a test which measures whether English is being *used* in people's homes. A more straightforward matter for the State is to test whether people have been able to *learn* English.

The following two sentences of Lord Rooker's response are intensely dialogic:

> The men say 'they don't need it'. I don't accept that because it's people being denied their civil rights.

Here 'The men' are oppositional to 'people' in the subsequent sentence and, by cohesive reference, in the previous sentence. It therefore becomes clear that the 'people' who are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English by their family are women, and 'their family' are likely to be men. The definite pronoun ('*The* men') does ideological work here, presupposing that all men, or all Asian men (or even all Muslim Asian men in the north of England) are a homogeneous group who are responsible for the discourse which appears in speech marks: 'they don't need it'. Here 'they' must be assumed to be women, by implication in opposition to men. This recontextualisation of Ann Cryer's speech transforms it by explicitly adding that which was otherwise only implicit: those who should be encouraged to use English in the home are women, and those who should be encouraging them to do so are men. Here Lord Rooker engages intertextually with a discourse which appears not to be specific (he does not mention the source of the quotation in speech marks), but is the assumed common-ground of presupposition. Lord Rooker's point here appears to rely on the presumed common knowledge which resides in a presupposed ideology along the lines of: 'Asian men don't allow their women to learn English, because they want to keep them at home to be good, submissive wives'.[1] The Minister of State here recovers his authoritative voice, perhaps more certain that his view will gain general support: 'I don't accept that'. In a topos of humanitarianism Lord Rooker explains that 'it's people being denied their civil rights'. The invocation of 'civil rights' accords the argument an unimpeachable quality – civil rights are a good thing, which should be defended at all costs, and any practice which denies them should be stopped or changed. This argumentation strategy is an addition to those invoked by Ann Cryer, and appears to strengthen the argument by appealing to the sense of right and justice in the audience. However, all discourse is dialogic, and the reference to 'civil rights' here makes cohesive reference to Lord Rooker's speech in the House of Lords two days after Ann Cryer's speech in the House of Commons. In his speech Lord Rooker used the phrase 'civil rights' three times: first in relation to forced marriages of teenage Asian girls ('It is a tragedy. It is a question of civil rights'), then in relation to Asian girls who are not allowed swimming lessons ('That is a denial of civil rights'), and thirdly in relation to domestic violence ('People's individual civil rights'). Each of these issues is familiar ground in the oppositional discourse surrounding services to, and treatment of, Asian, and in particular Muslim, communities in Britain. While 'men' are not referred to

in the House of Lords speech, their responsibility for these oppressive practices can be assumed as part of the common-ground of this discourse. The cohesive lexical link to the phrase 'civil rights' in relation to learning English seems to associate a failure to learn English to a range of other oppressive and, in some cases, illegal practices. The assumption, as much reshaped and reconstituted here as merely reproduced, is that if these other cultural practices are wrong and should be stopped, therefore so should the practice of remaining a (perhaps multilingual) non-English speaker in Britain be stopped. In Lord Rooker's recontextualised version of the argument, Asian men are very much to blame.

In the following sentence is a third reference to 'people', as Lord Rooker begins to discuss policy:

> The question arises do we require people to learn English as a consequence of applying for nationality, which you've got to do in English anyway.

The passive construction here implies that the 'question' has agency of its own, and is therefore both inevitable and right. This rhetorical question arises from the assumed values which follow from the apparent denial of Asian women's civil rights by Asian men. If this is a problem (as, in this argument, it surely is), the question that arises is likely to be one that has the potential to solve that problem. However, here the question that arises is one that relates to language testing as an aspect of application for British citizenship. In the logic pursued here, women are denied their civil rights because men prevent them from learning English, so there should be language tests as part of the application for British citizenship. In this sentence 'people' probably again refers to women, in a cohesive repetition of its previous usage. The construction 'as a consequence' seems misplaced here, and perhaps Lord Rooker meant to say something like 'as part of'. The final clause of this sentence appears to be something of an afterthought – the argumentation strategy employed here concludes that since that is the way things already are, they might as well be that way. However, the background to this sentence is a little more complex: there is, and has been for many years, a language testing requirement as part of the criteria for successful application for British citizenship. As we have seen, an exception to that rule applied to spouses of British citizens, who at the time of the speeches by Lord Rooker and Ann Cryer were not required to satisfy this criterion. In this context, Lord Rooker's rhetorical question seems to be either redundant, or to refer only to applicants for citizenship who are spouses (and, in the context of his remarks about 'The men', probably only wives) of existing British citizens. As such, Lord Rooker's remarks are more plainly a recontextualisation of Ann Cryer's speech, which identified as a major problem 'The established tradition

of bringing wives and husbands from the sub-continent', and recommended an end to inter-continental marriage. Whereas Ann Cryer uses the phrase 'wives and husbands', and then twice 'husbands and wives', Lord Rooker recontextualises by substitution, transforming Ann Cryer's phrase to the nomination 'people', but 'people' who are oppositional to 'The men'. In Ann Cryer's version the phrase 'husbands and wives' refers to the language testing of spouses of British citizens. In Lord Rooker's version the term 'people' is more ambiguous, but in the light of his criticism of 'The men' his reference appears to be to language testing for wives of British citizens. Both of these discourses use unwieldy and even spurious logic to suggest that English language testing for spouses of British citizens is desirable and necessary for a just and socially cohesive society.

The issue of citizenship

In the final section of Lord Rooker's response to the question 'Do you agree with Ann Cryer that new citizens should learn to speak English?', the word 'people' makes a fourth appearance:

> We're looking at this. We're looking at the issue of citizenship. People must maintain their culture, maintain their religion and live in peace and tranquillity but they must not be denied their opportunity to participate properly particularly in the employment market.

Here the deictic 'we' is not inclusive, but seems to speak for the Government, and as such claims authority. The definite pronoun ('*the* issue') implies a presupposition that there *is* an issue or problem in relation to the process of applications for citizenship. The repetition of 'People' here probably still refers to people who are not 'The men', but the word is ambiguous, perhaps also referring to all Asian people (in my view the former is the predominant sense, although both are present). In this discourse what people (probably Asian women) *must* do is to maintain their culture and religion and live in peace and tranquillity. This is a recontextualisation by substitution of Ann Cryer's exhortation to all sides to 'live together in peace and understanding'. In Ann Cryer's version it was part of a topos of threat and danger (live together in peace, as the alternative is a Belfast-like situation). In Lord Rooker's version there is a similarly oppositional construction, as the first 'must' seems to imply 'must be allowed to', and therefore appears to address dominant-culture institutions which would have the power to deny Asian people their culture and religion. Although it could also suggest that responsibility lies with the immigrant herself, the second 'must' ('must not') appears to address Asian men, as

'denied' is a cohesive reference to 'civil rights'. That is, the interview appears to conclude with the point that Asian men must not deny Asian women their civil rights, their opportunity to participate, and their job opportunities. The logical conclusion here, carried in topoi of advantage and equality, is that Asian men would do this by preventing Asian women from learning English. In Lord Rooker's brief recontextualisation of Ann Cryer's speech, a liberal framework is established, in which he argues for equality, justice and civil rights for all. The euphemistic and ambiguous use of 'people' on four occasions creates an oppositional discourse, in which women are oppressed by 'The men', who are discriminatory in their practices and discourses. These oppressive social practices are presupposed to be true, and part of the consensual common-ground. Within this apparently liberal framework, and even an integral part of the framework, sits the illiberal proposal to extend language testing for citizenship to spouses of British citizens. In this sense Lord Rooker's discourse here is 'double-voiced' (Bakhtin 1994), as liberal and illiberal consciousnesses co-exist in a single utterance. Another way to view this is that in Lord Rooker's interview response, illiberal discourse *masquerades* as liberal discourse, transforming an existing discourse in its new context so that it is sanitised for consumption by the liberal elite. Lord Rooker's recontextualisation of Ann Cryer's arguments extends their authority not merely through discursive strategies and linguistic means and realisations. They also gain authority through their re-statement by a member of the House of Lords and, more importantly, a Minister of State for the Home Office. Recontextualisation involves transformation through discursive means, but here also involves the restatement of argument in a more authoritative context and voice.

The familiar arguments made legitimate

On the day following the publication on *ePolitix.com* of Lord Rooker's interview, there was a good deal of national press coverage of his response. On the same day a statement was issued by a spokesman for the Home Office:

> The Home Secretary supports Lord Rooker in seeking a debate on the important and central part an understanding of English plays in developing good community and race relations and the chance of obtaining both education and employment. (Home Office, 18th August 2001)

In this statement the Home Secretary, David Blunkett (the question of whether he authored the statement himself is a moot one, as with any statement from a politician's official office), transforms Lord Rooker's 'live in peace and under-

standing', which is only contextually tied to the question of English language testing, by substituting it with 'good community and race relations'. This phrase implies that a failure to understand English may lead to a breakdown in race relations and (in the context of the Summer of 2001), to further social unrest. This topos of danger or threat is more closely related to the rhetoric of Ann Cryer than to the statement made by Lord Rooker. David Blunkett's point about understanding English as a means to 'obtaining education' again seems to be more consistent with Ann Cryer than Lord Rooker. In a transformation through deletion, David Blunkett's recontextualisation of Lord Rooker's argument about participation in the employment market omits any reference to the 'civil rights' of linguistic minority women, or to the suggestion that men prevent them from gaining access to English. It is also noteworthy here that the Home Office statement speaks of 'understanding of English', whereas the debate had hitherto referred to 'learn English' (Lord Rooker), 'some grasp of English', 'a good level of English', 'a reasonable level' (Ann Cryer), 'a working knowledge of English' (*The Guardian*, 18th August), and 'English lessons' (*The Independent*, 18th August). The vagueness of these terms is reflected in the 1981 *British Nationality Act*, with its requirement for citizenship applicants to provide evidence that they can speak "sufficient English". The recontextualisations of Lord Rooker's statement in the Home Office press briefing are important in themselves, but it is the status of the (apparent) speaker that is most significant. If David Blunkett had repeated *precisely* what Lord Rooker said (assuming that this would be possible in the different genre of the press briefing compared to political interview), the fact of this discourse being reiterated in the more authoritative voice of the Secretary of State would still have endowed it with greater significance. The discourse takes a step up, moving ever closer to the centre of Government and the legislative machine. In the Home Office statement David Blunkett reiterates the topoi which by now are becoming familiar:

– failure to learn, understand and use English threatens community relations
– failure to learn, understand and use English threatens race relations
– failure to learn, understand and use English threatens education
– failure to learn, understand and use English threatens employment

When these arguments are made by town councillors, local newspaper editors and even backbench Members of Parliament, they may be ignored, or contested in local debate. When they are recontextualised in the voice of one of the three or four most powerful politicians in Britain, debate is open, and discourse gains

authority. At the same time, such discourse will continue to grow organically, as it is recontextualised in the news media.

Recontextualisation of political discourse in liberal news media

A crucial aspect of the recontextualisation of political discourse is its representation in the national print media. It is unlikely that the speeches and interviews of politicians would make an impact in the public consciousness without their representation in the news media, except perhaps following legislative change. The media provide many of the links in the textual chains which hold discursive arguments together. In the political discourse relating to government policies on immigration and citizenship, it would be a straightforward matter to identify illiberal perspectives in the British print media. National newspapers such as *The Daily Mail*, for example, have maintained a consistently anti-immigrant editorial line for some years now. However, in line with Blommaert and Verschueren (1998b), my focus in this volume is on the elements of the media which are more likely to engage in a 'rhetoric of tolerance'. That is, I focus on the liberal, 'quality' national broadsheet newspapers, *The Guardian*, *The Independent*, *The Observer*, and *The Independent on Sunday*. The articles I selected for analysis are from *The Guardian* and *The Independent* on Saturday August 18th 2001 (the day after Lord Rooker's interview was posted on *ePolitix.com*), and from *The Observer* and *The Independent on Sunday* on Sunday August 19th 2001 (two days, and the first Sunday, following the publication of Lord Rooker's interview, and one day after the release of the Secretary of State's Home Office press briefing). In looking closely at the articles in these newspapers, further elements of the 'textual chain' relating to language testing for citizenship become visible. I do not attempt here a comprehensive analysis of all of the linguistic features evident in the four texts. Rather, in keeping with the orientation of the volume, I pursue the direction proposed by Fowler:

> Critical analysis should pay particular attention to how what people say is transformed: there are clearly conventions for rendering speech newsworthy, for bestowing significance on it. Such conventions are little understood at the moment. (Fowler 1991: 231)

My analysis here pays attention to the transformations in discourse as it is recontextualised in the four articles. These transformations include the aspects of recontextualisation outlined by Van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999), as set out earlier in this chapter.

Headlines

The headlines of the four articles were similar but different. Although only one day had passed between the two articles published on Saturday 18th August and the two published on Sunday 19th, there is a notable change in the agency of the headlines:

> English lessons may become condition of UK citizenship.
> (*The Independent*, August 18th 2001)
>
> Working knowledge of English could become compulsory for immigrants.
> (*The Guardian,* August 18th 2001)
>
> Blunkett fuels English lessons row.
> (*The Observer*, August 19th 2001)
>
> Blunkett 'English for passports' plan.
> (*The Independent on Sunday*, August 19th 2001)

In the headlines of the two articles published on Saturday 18th, agency is backgrounded (Reisigl & Wodak 2001:47). That is, it is not clear from the headline how 'English lessons' may become a condition of citizenship, or how a 'working knowledge of English' may become 'compulsory'. In both cases the modal auxiliary verb ('may become', 'could become') indicates that the headlines are less than wholly committed to the facts of the story about English language tests. The passive construction obfuscates agency and recontextualises Lord Rooker's interview response without mentioning him. Lord Rooker's 'learn English' is substituted by 'English lessons' and 'Working knowledge of English'. The sense of 'lessons' is associated with diminishing the status of citizenship applicants, and treating them like school-children, while 'working knowledge' seems to be a cohesive reference to 'sufficient knowledge', which is the existing language requirement. Lord Rooker's 'require' here is substituted by 'compulsory' and 'condition', the latter making cohesive reference to Ann Cryer's 'The conditions should apply to all applicants'. The headline in *The Guardian* (and, to an extent, *The Independent*) backgrounds the fact that 'knowledge of English' was already a criterion for successful application for British citizenship. It also substitutes Lord Rooker's 'people' with the more attention-grabbing, but still imprecise, 'immigrants'. Lord Rooker's statement did not propose or suggest English tests for all immigrants, but for citizenship applicants. In fact the headline in *The Guardian* is closer to Ann Cryer's proposal for 'English as an entry clearance requirement', than to Lord Rooker's statement. In these two headlines, then, Lord

Rooker's voice is represented in a way which renders the minister's message more eye-catching for the reader.

The headlines of the following day's Sunday newspapers are of a different order. Whereas Home Office minister Lord Rooker was not considered important enough to feature in the headlines of the previous day, now 'Blunkett' (Home Secretary David Blunkett) is the agent in both headlines. This follows the press briefing from the Home Office on Saturday 18th. In both cases here the headline is 'conversationalised', that is, the newspapers' versions of the public idiom is adopted, to narrow the gap between newspaper and reader, "giving the illusion of conversation in which common sense is spoken about matters on which there is consensus" (Fowler 1991:47). The headline from *The Observer* adopts an inflammatory metaphor ('fuels') to highlight the combustible nature of the argument. In the phrase 'English lessons row', nominalisation of the process of debate with a noun ('row') creates ambiguity, offering no sense of who (other than David Blunkett) is involved in the 'row'. That is, the various voices represented in the news reports of the previous day (and, in fact, the presupposed oppositional voices engaged by Ann Cryer) are now compressed into the simple noun. In the headline from *The Independent on Sunday*, again David Blunkett is the agent, while again there is no visible patient. As in the headline from *The Observer*, a noun represents a process, but here 'plan' compresses the political thinking of the Home Secretary and his advisors. 'Plan' has a sinister as well as a functional sense, as it includes the potential sense of the Government planning to force people to do something against their will. 'English for passports' is enclosed in what look like speech marks. However, the Home Office press briefing did not use this phrase. This is therefore a further transformation, substituting the Home Secretary's support for Lord Rooker's interview in the conversational voice. The speech marks may in effect be scare quotes, indicating that this is not a phrase that belongs to, or is owned by, this newspaper, but one which has been appropriated from the more populist end of the press spectrum. Taken together, the headlines represent and transform the voices of Lord Rooker and David Blunkett, simplifying the argument and adopting the conversational voice of assumed consensus.

Liberal representation of political discourse

Having looked at the headlines, I will now examine in turn each of the four articles from the liberal broadsheet press. Rather than analysing each one in great detail, I focus on recontextualisation and transformation of the central argu-

ments in the representation of the discourse of Lord Rooker and the Home Secretary David Blunkett. The first of the articles is from *The Guardian* of Saturday 18th August (Appendix 5.2). In the first sentence of the article the imprecise, indeed incorrect, statement of the headline is corrected, as 'immigrants' now becomes 'people applying for British citizenship'. At this point in the article there is no reference to the spouses of existing citizens, although of course the *existing* law already required most people applying for British citizenship to take a language test. The choice of reporting verb is significant in the article from *The Guardian*: 'the Home Office minister Lord Rooker revealed'. The statement that the minister 'revealed' (compare with 'suggested', 'endorsed' and 'claimed' in the other newspapers) these plans for compulsory English classes appears to imply that the government was engaged in covert planning of the policy. The article continues with a direct quotation from Lord Rooker's interview, framed in the following way:

> In a move likely to provoke a storm of protest, Lord Rooker said: "The question arises do we require people to learn English as a consequence of applying for nationality, which you've got to do anyway. We're looking at this. We're looking at the issue of citizenship."

Here the voice of the newspaper maintains its distance from the represented speech of Lord Rooker, as it is reported entirely in direct discourse. The reported discourse is framed by authorial commentary, which describes Lord Rooker's remark as a 'move likely to provoke a storm of protest', the authorial voice introducing Lord Rooker's discourse with an evaluative statement which recontextualises it, anticipating voices raised in opposition. The metaphor ('storm') renders Lord Rooker's words now less confident and more contestable than they were in their original context, even though they are linguistically unchanged. In the next part of the article 'it has emerged' links semantically to the earlier 'revealed', while 'a requirement to learn English' makes cohesive reference to the discourse of Lord Rooker ('require') and of Ann Cryer ('requirement'). In this section of the speech *The Guardian* recontextualises Lord Rooker's statement by locating the issue of citizenship language testing in the broader political context of immigration and asylum policy (and in so doing engaging dialogically with Lord Rooker's parenthetical 'and this has got nothing to do with asylum seekers'). Characteristically in the genre of liberal news reporting, voices are heard on each side of the debate. Here, firstly the view of Habib Rahman of the *Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants* is represented, and then a further quotation from Lord Rooker. Habib Rahman's voice

collides with, and responds to, the discourses of Lord Rooker, Ann Cryer and David Blunkett:

> It would be very damaging to race relations, and to diversity. Of course people should be encouraged to learn languages – but that's different from making it a requirement.

In the phrase 'race relations' Habib Rahman's discourse responds to that of Ann Cryer, and anticipates that of David Blunkett (and of course David Blunkett's statement of the same day may have been responding to *The Guardian*'s representation of Habib Rahman's discourse). Habib Rahman picks up the discourses of Ann Cryer and Lord Rooker here, clashing with them in the words 'encouraged' and 'requirement'. The authorial voice of the news article now picks up Habib Rahman's suggestion that the idea of a requirement to learn English would be damaging to 'diversity':

> the minister for citizenship and immigration denied it was an attempt to stifle diversity

In what appears to be a representation of indirect discourse, the voice of the article renders the oppositional discourse more cohesive here by assuming (in fact inventing) the minister's denial of Habib Rahman's charge (in fact Habib Rahman's remark post-dated the Rooker interview anyway). In an example of what we might term 'pseudo-indirect discourse', Lord Rooker's interview is recontextualised with the addition of a denial which Lord Rooker might have made, but did not, to a question which might have been asked by *ePolitix.com*, but was not.

Expanding the debate

The next section of the article adds legitimacy to Lord Rooker's position, transforming his 'based on constituency experience' to the more fulsome 'his experience as a constituency M.P. in Birmingham' (Birmingham is well known as a multicultural city). In this section of the article multiple voices are identifiable. While the voices of Lord Rooker and Ann Cryer are certainly evident, the recontextualisation in the authorial voice of Lord Rooker's statement to include the phrase 'the idea. . .could be useful' renders these voices less credible and powerful. Later in the article the voice of Ann Cryer is again represented in indirect discourse:

> Ann Cryer's original suggestion also prompted a storm of protest. Speaking in the wake of the Bradford riots, she argued that a lack of competent English led to failure at school and a struggle to find work, and ultimately alienation.

Here Lord Rooker's statement is cohesively linked to that of Ann Cryer (in the phrase 'storm of protest'). In this recontextualisation of Ann Cryer's speech the central notion that a lack of English proficiency leads to violence on the streets is deleted. The remainder of the article continues to give voice to the various social actors in the debate over language testing for citizenship. Although most British newspapers do not frequently quote the views of minority groups, the liberal orientation of *The Guardian* here creates an oppositional discourse, variously representing the *Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants*, the *Commission for Racial Equality*, Labour's national executive, a former chairwoman of education in Bradford, and Ann Cryer. It is clear that in this article the recontextualisation of statements by Ann Cryer, Lord Rooker and David Blunkett expanded the debate about language testing for citizenship.

Substitution: People, spouses, and husbands and wives

The article from *The Independent* of Saturday August 18th (Appendix 5.3) also recontextualises Lord Rooker's statement:

> All immigrants could be asked to learn English as a condition of taking on UK citizenship, Lord Rooker, the Home Office minister has suggested. The Home Office was considering imposing such a rule as a means of ensuring that the wives of new citizens had proper access to mainstream society and the labour market, he said yesterday.

Here the collective pronoun 'All' appears to refer to the fact that most immigrants who applied for citizenship would previously have been subject to language tests, but not those who were married to British citizens. As we have seen, in the discourses of Lord Rooker and Ann Cryer there was a proposal to amend the legislation so that spouses of British citizens were also required to demonstrate their English proficiency. In this version of Lord Rooker's interview, 'require people to learn English' is mitigated with the less coercive 'asked'. The non-threatening nature of the recontextualised version here is emphasised in 'the minister has suggested'. The more emphatic 'imposing' introduces a more forceful and apparently illiberal tone, but this is in the context of the

recontextualisation of the topos of equality which endures from Lord Rooker's statement. This imposition will be to ensure that 'wives of new citizens' are accorded equal rights. Here Lord Rooker's 'participate properly' is recontextualised as 'access to mainstream society', while 'particularly in the employment market' becomes 'the labour market'. These substitutions have the effect of incorporating into the voice of the newspaper the voice of the politician. Although the reporting verb keeps them distinct to some extent, the politician and the newspaper appear to be speaking with one voice. The collective pronoun in Lord Rooker's 'We're looking at this' is here recontextualised as the metonymic 'The Home Office', the title of the institution linguistically representing the actions of Lord Rooker and the Home Secretary (and/or their advisers), creating ambiguity and obfuscating agency. The backgrounding of the reporting verb at the end of the sentence here contributes to the permeability of the boundary between the voice of the newspaper article and the voice of Lord Rooker/the Home Office. The recontextualisation of Lord Rooker's discourse involves transformation by explanation and rationalisation. Whereas the Home Office minister adopted the euphemistic 'people' to refer to the immigrant wives of British citizens, the voice of the newspaper is not so coy (although 'wives of new citizens' is not accurate: the proposed change in the law refers to spouses of existing British citizens, but not necessarily of *new* citizens). Lord Rooker sharply senses the potential criticism of his detractors, whereas *The Independent* has no such concern. That is, the voice of the newspaper expands and explains, saying for Lord Rooker that which he may have said himself if he were less constrained by the rules of the political game.

The sense of the key phrase in the explanation and rationalisation of the proposed legislative change ('a means of ensuring' becomes 'one way of ensuring') is repeated later in the article:

> Moves to force immigrants to learn English would be highly controversial among some refugee groups. New citizens currently have to prove they have a "grasp of English", but when their spouses join them later they often arrive with virtually no working knowledge of the language.
>
> Making English mandatory for those seeking citizenship would be one way of ensuring that ethnic minority women were not denied their civil rights by their own menfolk, said Lord Rooker.

The proposed policy change is legitimated through the nominalisation of the process in the noun, 'Moves'. This section of the article dialogically introduces the assumed voice of the opposition, as Lord Rooker's 'require' now becomes 'force', and the presupposed response of 'some refugee groups' is implied. How-

ever, no actual argument is attributed to the 'refugee groups' (and of course this is not specifically a refugee issue). Instead, the transformation of Lord Rooker's argument through explanation and moral evaluation continues. The explanatory clause beginning 'New citizens' introduces 'grasp of English' in speech marks, as if it is a quotation from the existing legislation. However, the *British Nationality Act 1981* refers to 'sufficient knowledge', and the need for immigrants to acquire a 'grasp of English' was previously demanded by Ann Cryer, in her argument that the alternative was a 'Belfast-like situation'. Thus the newspaper's explanation of Lord Rooker's statement here incorporates the language of Ann Cryer, and, implicitly, the topos of threat in her Westminster Hall speech. The connective ('but') shifts the argument here, implicitly rationalising and legitimating Lord Rooker's argument. The following sentence is consequent upon this legitimation by explanation and moral evaluation of Lord Rooker's statement. The legitimation of the argument through the verb 'ensuring' frames the presupposition that 'ethnic minority women' are 'denied their civil rights by their own menfolk'. The representation of the statement in indirect discourse again erodes the boundaries between the voice of the politician and the voice of the newspaper. Lord Rooker did not mention 'ethnic minority women', but *The Independent* explains that this is what he meant. Legitimacy is accorded to Lord Rooker's statement in a topos of equality which appears to accord more authority to an illiberal proposal.

In the final two sentences of the article Lord Rooker's legitimacy to speak on these matters is emphasised, as it was in *The Guardian*, but in more explicit terms:

> Lord Rooker, whose former constituency of Birmingham Perry Barr has a large Asian community, said: "People must maintain their culture, maintain their religion and live in peace and tranquillity, but they must not be denied their opportunity to participate properly, particularly in the employment market.
>
> There are situations. . .where, sometimes, people are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English by their family. The men say they don't need it. I don't accept that, because it's people being denied their civil rights."

Here Lord Rooker's statement in the interview with *ePolitix.com* is transformed by rearrangement, as the third sentence in his response to the original questions now gains status in its new, salient final position. Lord Rooker here has the last word, in an article which is largely uncritical of the implicit proposal to extend the existing language testing for citizenship legislation. The recontextualisation of Lord Rooker's statement in *The Independent* adds authority and moral legit-

imacy to the proposal, and reproduces the presupposition that 'ethnic minority women' are denied their civil rights by 'their menfolk'.

Anticipating voices in opposition

As we have seen, by the time the Sunday papers were published late in the evening of Saturday August 18th, the Home Office had released a statement in support of Lord Rooker. The liberal broadsheet Sunday newspapers therefore made reference to both Lord Rooker's interview and the Home Office statement. *The Independent on Sunday* (Appendix 5.4) represented these discourses as follows:

> David Blunkett, the Home Secretary, has confirmed he is considering a controversial change to the citizenship rules which would require immigrants to learn English as a condition of gaining a British passport.
> Despite the risk of a backlash from M.P.s in his own party, Mr. Blunkett said he supported his immigration minister, Lord Rooker, who claimed on Friday that compulsory English lessons would help immigrants find work and improve race relations.

Here the reporting verb ('confirmed') refers both to David Blunkett's statement itself and to the report in the previous day's edition of *The Independent* that 'English lessons may become condition of UK citizenship'. While the report appears to refer only to the Home Office statement, the recontextualisation of David Blunkett's statement incorporates Lord Rooker's interview and, implicitly, Ann Cryer's parliamentary speech. *The Independent on Sunday* transforms David Blunkett's statement in its report, adding a summary explanation, and at the same time making cohesive reference to Lord Rooker's statement. Although the agent of the first sentence is 'David Blunkett', it is Lord Rooker's discourse that is recontextualised by the newspaper report :

> require people to learn English as a consequence of applying for nationality. (Lord Rooker, *ePolitix.com*):
>
> require immigrants to learn English as a condition of gaining a British passport. (*The Independent on Sunday*)

The parallel construction, together with substitution of Lord Rooker's euphemistic 'people' with 'immigrants', and 'applying for nationality' with the similar sense of 'gaining a British passport', allows the voice of Lord Rooker to be incorporated into the sentence which purports to represent David Blunkett's

discourse. In the next sentence the direction is reversed, as the reporting verb ('claimed') purports to represent Lord Rooker, but the represented discourse incorporates David Blunkett's phrase, 'race relations', which did not appear in Lord Rooker's interview. When the voices of others are incorporated into a text, there are always choices about how to 'frame', or contextualise those voices, in terms of other parts of the text (Fairclough 2003a: 53). The effect of the incorporations here is that the voices of David Blunkett and Lord Rooker become intertwined and inseparable, despite their significant differences in their original form.

The representation of David Blunkett's statement is dialogic, as 'controversial' and 'risk of a backlash' anticipate voices raised in opposition. Such voices are represented in the second half of the article, as the Chief Executive (Habib Rahman), and then the former Director (Claude Moraes), of the *Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants*, respectively characterise the proposal to expand language testing for citizenship as 'linguistic colonialism' and 'racist rhetoric'. The response of Habib Rahman is partly conveyed in what Voloshinov (1973: 151) terms "quasi direct discourse". That is, in representing Habib Rahman's comment on 'the proposal', the omission of the reporting verb indicates the identification of the narrator (here, the voice of the newspaper) with the character (here, the voice of Habib Rahman):

> It suggested that immigrants with poor English were to blame for harming race relations.

The voice of the article is here liberal, and appears to support opposition to the government's position. In the representation of Habib Rahman's discourse, the phrase 'race relations' clashes with the same phrase in David Blunkett's (and, indeed, Ann Cryer's) discourse. In an example of "hidden polemic" (Bakhtin 1994: 107), the phrase is directed towards David Blunkett's use of the same phrase, "naming it, portraying, expressing. . .clashing with it, as it were, within the object itself". The discourse of Habib Rahman incorporates David Blunkett's phrase in order to more effectively reject it.

Metonymic representation

The article in *The Independent on Sunday* offers an apparently balanced report of the debate, representing the voices of several perspectives. However, in comparison with the articles from *The Guardian* and *The Independent* of the previous day, the question of language testing for spouses of British citizens has

been deleted. As it is principally in this regard that new legislation was being considered, this transformation of the overall debate is significant in altering the focus of the argument. David Blunkett did not refer to the issue of language testing for spouses of British citizens, so *The Independent on Sunday* did not represent this argument. This is an example of the way in which a press briefing statement can limit political damage. It is very likely that both *The Independent on Sunday* and *The Observer* would have run the story generated by Lord Rooker's interview if the Home Office had not intervened. As it transpired both Sunday newspapers instead ran the story based on David Blunkett's statement. In its recontextualisation in *The Observer* of Sunday August 19th, the debate takes another turn, as a new social actor is represented: the Prime Minister. Here the debate is represented between metonymic replacements for Tony Blair and David Blunkett, as the Prime Minister is referred to as 'Downing Street' (twice) and 'Number 10', while the Home Secretary is referred to as 'The Home Office' on several occasions. There is also reference to 'officials' (who could be officials of the Home Office or Downing Street), and a Downing Street 'spokeswoman'. Metonymic representation enables the voice of *The Observer* to "conjure away responsible, involved or affected actors (whether victims or perpetrators), or keep them in the semantic background" (Reisigl & Wodak 2001: 58). Here the effect of metonymic reference to Tony Blair and David Blunkett is to provide an institutional debate, and one which does not involve them as individuals. This is difficult ground for the politicians, and their actual voices are not heard. At this stage it is the voices of 'officials' and spokespersons which enter the debate.

Transformation by addition

The beginning of the article from *The Observer* (Appendix 5.5) transforms the discourse of David Blunkett and Lord Rooker by "addition" (Van Leeuwen & Wodak 1999: 98):

> The government's asylum policy was last night in fresh disarray as David Blunkett was forced to defend Immigration Minister Lord Rooker over controversial calls for compulsory English lessons for refugees.

In this sentence both David Blunkett's and Lord Rooker's discourses are represented. Both are associated with 'asylum policy' and 'refugees'. However, David Blunkett's statement made no reference to either asylum or refugees,[2] and Lord Rooker's only reference to these groups in his response was in his aside, 'this has

got nothing to do with asylum seekers'. *The Observer* probably introduces 'asylum policy' and 'refugees' here because in 2001, as often since, the most explicit, controversial and socially-acceptable anti-immigrant discourse in Britain focused on 'asylum-seekers', rather than on longer-established groups. Here the Government's policy on asylum is characterised as being 'in fresh disarray' as a consequence of the statement released by the Home Office, and the vocabulary of conflict ('defend', 'forced') is invoked to emphasise the point. Recontextualisation of the debate here appears to be based on commercial considerations: transforming it as a story about the Government's confused policy on asylum is likely to sell more newspapers. The article continues with a narrative of claim and counter-claim within government which appears to support the term 'disarray', and the later conclusion of 'confusion'. In the account of events provided by *The Observer*, Lord Rooker's statement prompted outrage from refugee groups (Habib Rahman's phrase 'linguistic colonialism' is quoted), and was 'swiftly disowned by Downing Street and the Home Office'. Then 'officials' described Lord Rooker's statement as 'unfortunate', before the Home Secretary proclaimed his support for Lord Rooker, and 'the Home Office' insisted that did not mean endorsing compulsory English lessons, and 'Downing Street intervened again to deny refugees would be compelled to study English'. Such is the world of press briefings from Government departments that it is not possible to know exactly how many of these statements were issued in the form in which they are represented in *The Observer*. Despite the metonymic references, it is unlikely that Prime Minister Tony Blair, or Home Secretary David Blunkett were engaged in contrary press statements relating to asylum and citizenship, or that David Blunkett was publicly arguing with his own department. However, phrases such as 'fresh disarray', 'swiftly disowned' and 'highlights tensions' contribute to the newspaper's interpretation of the story, which is of a government confused in its policy relating to asylum-seekers and refugees. In the context of the chain of discourses which we are tracing in this volume, however, there are interesting denials from a Downing Street spokeswoman in relation to compulsory English study for citizenship applicants: 'We are not talking about requiring anyone to do it, but looking at how we make it easier for people to learn English'. At this stage in the textual chain discourse is characterised by oppositional statements, as argument is contradicted by counter-argument, and the debate constantly regenerates itself.

Transformation of discourse and ideology

In this chapter we have seen the debate about language testing for citizenship for spouses of British citizens move on and become transformed in the context of statements made by senior politicians, and the representation of these statements in the liberal broadsheet press. The argument relating to extension of language testing for citizenship is here played out on a larger stage, as the Home Secretary, and even 'Downing Street' enter the discourse as social actors. It is the representation and transformation of this discourse that has been the focus of this chapter. In the dominant and authoritative discourses of senior politicians here, the argument for the extension of the Home Secretary's English language testing powers in relation to applicants for naturalisation as citizens are several. First, there should be an extension of English language testing for citizenship because people must participate in society. This argument presupposes both that participation in society is only possible in English, and that extending the testing regime will contribute to the acquisition of English (indeed the latter presupposition underpins all of the arguments made in this discourse). Second, there should be an extension to English language testing for citizenship to prevent men discriminating against women in Asian communities. This argument is based on the presupposition that all or most men in Asian communities in Britain discriminate against women – a discriminatory presupposition, based on anecdotal evidence at best. The argument is further based on the notion that where gendered discrimination does occur (as it does in many communities in Britain as elsewhere), it will be remediated by English language testing at the point of citizenship application. Third, there should be an extension to language testing for citizenship because that is the law as it stands. This argument is based on the presupposition that the existing law is right and just. Even if this were assumed to be the case, it does not necessarily support an extension of the law to spouses of British citizens applying for naturalisation. Fourth, there should be an extension to language testing for citizenship legislation for the sake of good race relations. This argument is based on the assumption that speaking languages other than English is in some way correlated with the breakdown of relationships between racial groups. This argument racialises the language debate, associating a language with a racial identity. The argument that languages are associated with racial tension entirely disregards institutionalised racism, and the agency of racist practices. These fallacious arguments are recontextualised by senior politicians, and therefore gain legitimacy. As they move up the chain of discourse they become more authoritative, and less negotiable.

In multilingual England a monolingual ideology presides. When there is any kind of social conflict associated with speakers of minority languages, their languages appear to be to blame. In the political and media discourse analysed in this chapter, senior politicians are represented as not only accepting, but reiterating, a discriminatory ideology which associates some minority languages with problems of social exclusion. In Bourdieu's terms, this authoritative discourse contributes to a process of symbolic domination, in which speakers of minority languages come to believe in the legitimacy of English at the expense of their own language or variety. These beliefs are shaped in the process of misrecognition which, as Gal and Irvine (1995) point out, often contributes to the indexical linking of linguistic varieties with character types and cultural traits, whereby linguistic behaviours of others are seen as deriving from speakers' social, political, intellectual, or moral character, rather than from historical accident. A corollary of such a linguistic ideology is that speakers of official languages or standard varieties may be regarded as having greater moral and intellectual worth than speakers of unofficial languages or non-standard varieties (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004a). Thus, according to Bourdieu (1991), we have to examine power in places where it is least visible, because symbolic power "is that invisible power which can be exercised only with the complicity of those who do not want to know that they are subject to it or even that they themselves exercise it" (p.163).

It is far from straightforward to identify the effects on available identity options of discriminatory language ideologies. On the face of it, there is little or no negotiation going on here: senior Government politicians appear to state quite clearly that the maintenance and use of minority Asian languages at the expense of proficiency in English contributes to social exclusion and its concomitant problems. However, identity options may be negotiated differently by different groups and individuals at different times and in different contexts. The framework proposed by Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004a) differentiates between three types of identities: imposed identities (which are not negotiable in a particular time and place), assumed identities (which are accepted and not negotiated), and negotiable identities (which are contested by groups and individuals). Each of the three categories acquires a particular status within unique sociohistorical circumstances. Options that are acceptable for, and therefore not negotiated by, some groups and individuals, may be contested by another group, or even the same group at a different point in time. As I suggested earlier, in order to fully understand the ways in which monolingual ideologies influence linguistic performance of identities, detailed ethnographic work is required, of the kind previously developed by (*inter alia*)

Heller (1999), Kanno (2003), Miller (2004), Mills (2004) and Rampton (1995, 1999a, b). In each of these studies, in diverse world contexts, it was clear that some identity options may be unavailable to the most marginalised and discriminated against segments of the population, which in multilingual societies often consist of linguistic minorities. How much room for resistance to particular positioning individuals and groups may have will depend on each particular situation, the social and linguistic resources available to participants, and the balance of power relations which sets out the boundaries for particular identity options. This complex and delicate balance needs further exploration in new linguistic settings. For example, in recently emerging work, Martin et al (2003) demonstrate that complementary schools for linguistic minority students in England offer sites of resistance to the hegemonic language ideology of the dominant group, and expand the identity options of multilingual students and their teachers. In this volume, however, analysis of political and media discourse makes visible some of the ways in which such hegemonic language ideologies are produced and reproduced.

Although the chain of discourse identified in this volume appears to demonstrate the discriminatory nature of Government policy development in relation to the minority Asian languages of England, this is not to say that the Home Secretary and his colleagues were setting out to intentionally reproduce a hegemonic ideology. It is also unlikely that Ann Cryer, Lord Rooker, David Blunkett and Tony Blair were intending to put in place a gate-keeping mechanism which deliberately excluded those who had either little access or motivation to learn English. Bourdieu (1998b: 97) reminds us that "most human actions have as a basis something quite different from intention" – that is, actions may be interpreted as being oriented towards one objective or another without there being evidence that the objective was a conscious design. In this theory of action, it is not the *intention* of the political actors in this drama that is most important, but the effects of their actions, which are based on durable and enduring dispositions. The discourse of senior politicians contributes to the reproduction of a hegemonic language ideology, thus (at least potentially) discriminating against speakers of minority languages, whether or not it is their intention to do so. In Chapter 6 I examine the ways in which the voices of social actors in the drama were represented in a series of official reports into the violence of Summer 2001.

5.1 Appendix

Q.: Do you agree with Ann Cryer that new citizens should learn to speak English?

Lord Rooker: I am on record in the House of Lords of supporting exactly what Ann Cryer said about this issue, based on constituency experience. There is a real problem she has identified. There are situations, this has got nothing to do with asylum seekers, where sometimes people are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English by their family. The men say 'they don't need it'. I don't accept that because it's people being denied their civil rights. The question arises do we require people to learn English as a consequence of applying for nationality, which you've got to do in English anyway. We're looking at this. We're looking at the issue of citizenship. People must maintain their culture, maintain their religion and live in peace and tranquillity but they must not be denied opportunity to participate properly particularly in the employment market.

(*ePolitix.com* 17th August 2001)

5.2 Appendix

Working knowledge of English could become compulsory for immigrants

Anne Perkins

The Guardian Saturday August 18, 2001

A working knowledge of English could be made compulsory for people applying for British citizenship, the home office minister Lord Rooker revealed last night.

In a move likely to provoke a storm of protest, Lord Rooker said: "The question arises do we require people to learn English as a consequence of applying for nationality, which you've got to do in English anyway. We're looking at this. We're looking at the issue of citizenship."

It is the first time it has emerged that a requirement to learn English forms part of the wide-ranging review of aspects of immigration policy, which the home secretary, David Blunkett, announced last week. The review includes the controversial dispersal system and the voucher scheme. Changes are expected to be announced to the Labour party conference at the end of next month.

The idea was condemned as "linguistic colonialism" by the chief execu-

tive of the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants. "The message this would send out would be terrible," said Habib Rahman. "It would be very damaging to race relations, and to diversity. Of course people should be encouraged to learn languages – but that's different from making it a requirement."

In the interview, for the ePolitix website, the minister for citizenship and immigration denied it was an attempt to stifle diversity. "People must maintain their culture, maintain their religion and live in peace and tranquillity, but they must not be denied their opportunity to participate properly, particularly in the employment market," said Lord Rooker.

The minister added his experience as a constituency MP in Birmingham convinced him that the idea – proposed by the Labour MP for Keighley, Ann Cryer, last month – could be useful.

"Sometimes people are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English by their family. The men say, 'They don't need it.' I don't accept that, it means people will be denied their civil rights."

There is already a requirement to be able to communicate at a basic level when applying for citizenship, but after a campaign by the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants it was waived for people coming to Britain to marry.

Ann Cryer's original suggestion also prompted a storm of protest. Speaking in the wake of the Bradford riots, she argued that a lack of competent English led to failure at school and a struggle to find work, and ultimately alienation.

She said: "A great deal of poverty in the Asian communities in Bradford and Keighley is down to the fact that many of our Asian communities do not speak English or very little." One member of Labour's national executive, Shahid Malik, responded by accusing her of "doing the BNP's work for them".

Last night Suzanne Rooney, the former Labour chairwoman of education in Bradford, said a lack of English among immigrants was not the real problem. "Most young men coming here speak quite good English, up to level 10 which is the equivalent of GCSE," she said.

"The issue is young children who don't speak English in the home, and who arrive in the classroom behind in their language development.

"There is also a cultural difference. They don't play family games involving reading and writing, they have a much more outdoor culture. That's where help is needed, which we are giving with the Sure Start scheme."

A spokeswoman for the Commission for Racial Equality also accused Lord Rooker of missing the main point. "Certainly we wouldn't want anyone to

be forced to learn English, but the main concern now is the need for better preparation by local authorities coping with asylum seekers."

5.3 Appendix

English lessons may become condition of UK citizenship

By Paul Waugh, Deputy Political Editor

The Independent August 18th 2001

All immigrants could be asked to learn English as a condition of taking on UK citizenship, Lord Rooker, the Home Office minister has suggested.

The Home Office was considering imposing such a rule as a means of ensuring that the wives of new citizens had proper access to mainstream society and the labour market, he said yesterday.

In an interview with political website ePolitix.com, the asylum and immigration minister also confirmed reports that Home Secretary David Blunkett was considering scrapping the controversial asylum voucher system introduced by his predecessor Jack Straw.

However, he insisted that there was no question of ending the policy of dispersal of asylum-seekers around the country in the wake of the murder of Kurd Firsat Yildiz, who was stabbed to death in Glasgow a fortnight ago.

Moves to force immigrants to learn English would be highly controversial among some refugee groups. New citizens currently have to prove they have a "grasp of English", but when their spouses join them later they often arrive with virtually no working knowledge of the language.

Making English mandatory for those seeking citizenship would be one way of ensuring that ethnic minority women were not denied their civil rights by their own menfolk, said Lord Rooker.

Lord Rooker, whose former constituency of Birmingham Perry Barr has a large Asian community, said: "People must maintain their culture, maintain their religion and live in peace and tranquility, but they must not be denied their opportunity to participate properly, particularly in the employment market.

"There are situations. . .where, sometimes, people are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English by their family. The men say they don't need it. I don't accept that, because it's people being denied their civil rights."

5.4 Appendix

Blunkett 'English for passports' plan

By Severin Carrell

Independent on Sunday Sunday August 19th 2001

David Blunkett, the Home Secretary, has confirmed he is considering a controversial change to the citizenship rules which would require immigrants to learn English as a condition of gaining a British passport.

Despite the risk of a backlash from MPs in his own party, Mr. Blunkett said he supported his immigration minister, Lord Rooker, who claimed on Friday that compulsory English lessons would help immigrants find work and improve race relations.

The Home Secretary said he wanted to provoke "a debate" about whether immigrants seeking British nationality should be forced to learn English as part of a wider discussion about citizenship and racial integration.

In a statement released yesterday, a spokesman said the Home Secretary believed that understanding English played "an important and central part. . .in developing good community and race relations, and the chances of obtaining both education and employment".

However, the proposal was condemned by Habib Rahman, chief executive of the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants, as "linguistic colonialism". It suggested that immigrants with poor English were to blame for harming race relations.

"The message this would send out would be terrible. It would be very damaging to race relations," he said.

Claude Moraes, the former director of the JCWI and now a Labour MEP, accused ministers of returning to the racist rhetoric of the 1960s. Most immigrants learnt English quickly without being forced to do so, he said.

"This is not the major obstruction to entering the labour market. Race discrimination is," he added. "It's misleading to emphasise language and it's a throwback to the Sixties and Seventies. Compulsion sends out the wrong message."

5.5 Appendix

Blunkett fuels English lessons row

Gaby Hinsliff and Martin Bright

The Observer Sunday August 19, 2001

The government's asylum policy was last night in fresh disarray as David Blunkett was forced to defend Immigration Minister Lord Rooker over controversial calls for compulsory English lessons for refugees.

Rooker's apparent endorsement of the idea in an interview on Friday prompted outrage from refugee groups, who dubbed it 'linguistic colonialism', and was swiftly disowned by Downing Street and the Home Office.

Officials described it as 'unfortunate', pointing out the requirement could contravene the Human Rights Act. But yesterday the Home Secretary issued a surprise statement proclaiming his support for Rooker 'in seeking a debate on the important and central part an understanding of English plays in developing good community and race relations and the chance of obtaining both education and employment.'

The Home Office insisted that did not mean endorsing compulsory English lessons 'at this stage', only looking at ways of encouraging language learning, such as providing more English lessons through the state.

But the confusion illustrates Labour's growing difficulties with immigration policy – and highlights tensions between an increasingly confident Blunkett – who has rarely been far from the headlines over the summer – and Number 10.

Last night, Downing Street intervened again to deny refugees would be compelled to study English in order to gain residency. 'We are not talking about requiring anyone to do it, but looking at how we make it easier for people to learn English,' said a spokeswoman.

Rooker, a veteran Minister widely regarded as a safe pair of hands, was originally asked by the e-politix website about MP Ann Cryer's earlier controversial call for compulsory English lessons. Arguing that 'there was a real problem she has identified', he confirmed the Home Office was looking at the issue.

Chapter 6

Representing the voice of the people

In previous chapters we have seen discriminatory discourse framed in public settings where relatively liberal values are the expectation and the norm. It is evident that in contexts of local news media, Parliamentary speeches, ministerial interviews, government statements and the national broadsheet press, illiberal arguments can be traced through textual chains in which they are constantly recreated and transformed in new contexts. A crucial aspect of this process of recontextualisation is that as discourse is reiterated and reworked in increasingly authoritative settings, it gains legitimacy and becomes less negotiable. In the present context, the argument that language testing for citizenship applicants should be extended to include the spouses of existing citizens moves up the chain of discourses as it is rehearsed in the more authoritative voices and contexts of statements by the Home Secretary and the office of the Prime Minister. However, the prevalent and audible voices in such textual chains rarely include those of all of the social actors concerned. In this chapter I will examine the diversity of voices represented in the several reports which appeared at the time of, and following, violence on the streets of Burnley, Oldham and Bradford in the Summer of 2001. The recontextualisation of polyphonic political discourse allows the more authoritative speaker/author to make use of other voices in a way which suits the speaker's own political direction, and "skews the likely interpretation on the part of the hearer or reader" (Chilton & Schäffner 2002: 18). At the same time some voices are deleted from recontextualised arguments, and fail to find their way into policy-making fora.

In the reports examined in this chapter the views of social actors in Bradford, Oldham and Burnley (and elsewhere) are represented in: (apparently) direct discourse, as their contributions are quoted verbatim; indirect discourse, as their voices are represented using a reporting verb; and quasi-direct discourse, as their views are indirectly represented but without a reporting verb. The reports also substantially include the voices of the authors of the reports, which at times comment on the contributions of the respondents. In addition, the reports make intertextual reference to each other, and to the voices of politicians represented elsewhere in the chain of discourses of which the reports are

a part. Just some of the voices represented in the reports include those of social actors described as:

– 'white people'
– 'white groups'
– 'some poorer white communities'
– 'the white community'
– 'white residents'
– 'young people'
– 'The British National Party'
– 'service providers'
– 'residents'
– 'white and African-Caribbean Oldhamers'
– 'parents of Pakistani and Bangladeshi ethnic origin'
– 'black and ethnic minority groups'
– 'some black and ethnic minorities'
– 'the Muslim community'
– 'the Asian community'

The identities of other contributors were often backgrounded, as agentless passive constructions reported the unattributed views of respondents, in phrases such as 'concerns were expressed', 'there was a view', and 'it was said. . .'. As the reports into inter-group segregation and violence in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham include the voices of the above-listed speakers, they can be described as 'polyphonic'. In Bakhtin's sense, a discourse is polyphonic when it includes: "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices" (1984:6). In a similar sense to that in which Bakhtin's notion of 'polyphony' allows him to trace how Dostoevsky's characters enter the novel through discourse, so we can examine how the discursive interaction of the voices of social actors in Bradford, Oldham and Burnley constitute (or are absent from) the consciousness of the Government White Paper which succeeds them. However, while the notion of polyphony is a useful one in identifying how perspectives of a range of social actors are recontextualised in Government thinking, there are important differences between this example of 'polyphony' and Bakhtin's account. In Bakhtin's analysis of Dostoevsky's novels the author does not have any automatic right to 'know' more than his characters, to evaluate them or to speak for them (but rather to speak *to* them). In the reports relating to the social and cultural contexts of the urban north, voices of characters come and go, some attributed, some not, some hostile, others emotional, but all at the behest of the reporting panel of

authors. The usefulness of Bakhtin's model is in recognising that the Government White Paper takes the discourses represented in the other reports (and in other pre-existing discourses) and transforms them in its new, more authoritative context. This transformation is often through deletion or substitution, or by the reiteration of their discourse in a context which is situated higher up the hierarchy of discourses.

Representing the voice of the people in official reports

The many voices of the people of Bradford, Burnley and Oldham, the parts of northern England where the violence of 2001 occurred, are represented in four reports published in the same year. Three of the reports are the result of reviews commissioned specifically to investigate the causes of the violence in the streets of towns and cities in northern England in 2001 (*The Oldham Independent Review*, December 2001, Chaired by David Ritchie; *Community Cohesion. A Report of the Independent Review Team* Chaired by Ted Cantle, December 2001; and the *Burnley Task Force Review*, Chaired by Lord Clarke, December 2001). The fourth report, *Community Pride, Not Prejudice. Making Diversity Work in Bradford*, Chaired by Sir Herman Ouseley, had been commissioned prior to the events of that Summer, and was published during the same week in July 2001 as the violence occurred, and just six days before Ann Cryer's speech to Parliament on July 17th. In keeping with analysis of the 'chain of discourses' of which the reports are a part, I will briefly examine them in the chronological order in which they were published, beginning with *Community Pride, Not Prejudice. Making Diversity Work in Bradford* (henceforth *The Ouseley Report)*.

The Bradford review

The Ouseley Report is the outcome of a review conducted by a team led by the former Chair of the *Commission for Racial Equality*, Sir Herman Ouseley. The review team comprised a diverse range of people who had connections with Bradford, including academics, professionals and students. The central question which guided their review was as follows: "Why is community fragmentation along social, cultural, ethnic and religious lines occurring in the Bradford district?" (page ii). Following the introductory paragraphs of the review, the next section is titled 'Bradfordian Views'. This section reports the 'common concerns' of individuals, voluntary organisations, local and regional employers, and public service authorities and agencies, as well as those 'whose

voices are rarely heard', including young people, the vulnerable and disaffected (p. 9). The section which reports these 'common concerns' is the focus of analysis here. The issues raised by respondents are set out in bullet-pointed paragraphs, and follow the disclaimer:

> People from all backgrounds raised concerns as they saw them. What follows are their views, not those of the team. (p. 9)

My focus here is mainly on those points in the report which refer to language ideological debates relating to minority Asian languages in these communities.

Genre chains

One way to approach political discourse is through analysis of 'genre chains', and the mixing of genres in a text. The notion of 'genre' has a range of interpretations and definitions. I am here using the term in Bakhtin's (1986) sense of a genre as the language typically used in a particular form of activity. One of the questions we can ask of a genre is: 'How (if at all) are social actors represented?' In the 'Bradfordian Views' section of *The Ouseley Report* the answer to this question is complex, revealing that within the genre of 'official report' there may co-exist a range of ways of reporting the discourse of social actors. This mix, or 'hybridity' of forms of representation can be identified in the linguistic means by which these 'views' are reported. One of the first bullet-pointed paragraphs is as follows:

> So-called "community leaders" are self-styled, in league with the establishment key people and maintain the status quo of control and segregation through fear, ignorance and threats. (p. 10)

It is immediately noticeable that the phrases 'So-called' and 'self-styled' are familiar from Ann Cryer's speech to Parliament, delivered six days after the publication of Lord Ouseley's report (see Chapter 4). It becomes clear that in her Westminster Hall speech, Ann Cryer reiterated these descriptions of Asian community leaders in *The Ouseley Report*. The key verb here ('maintain') has an ideological role, establishing the "existential assumption" (Fairclough 2003a: 55), or presupposition, that the status quo is controlled and segregated through fear, ignorance and threats. It appears that it is the community leaders who are responsible for maintaining social segregation. The report offers no indication of how 'common' these 'common concerns' were in their gathering of evidence,[1] and in the absence of raw data it is impossible to know whether this is a transformed or composite version of the original.

It is noticeable that there is no reporting verb in the representation of the 'voice' of the contributor(s) here. This may simply be consistent with the genre of 'official report', but it is an inconsistent feature of this section of the report. This means of representing discourse is similar to what Voloshinov (1973: 151) termed "quasi-direct discourse", in which "the omission of the reporting verb indicates the identification of the narrator with his character". However, the present tense is retained (in quasi-direct discourse the imperfect tense is used), so the effect is of the secondary discourse of the contributor(s) appearing as the primary discourse of the report. Compare the representation of another view, from the same section of the report:

> Islamophobia is regarded as prevalent in schools and the community and affects how the Asian community is regarded and treated, especially Muslims. (p. 10)

Here there is no question of this 'Bradfordian view' being mistaken for the perspective of the review team. The reporting verb ('is regarded') establishes a distance between the view reported, and the authorial voice of the report as a whole. The boundary between the authorial voice and the reported view was more permeable in reporting the 'fear, ignorance and threats' maintained by community leaders, to the extent that the voice of the report and the voice of its contributor were almost indistinguishable. Although we can not know the relationship between the report and the original in the comment on Islamophobia, it is the relationship between this reported view and the text as a whole that is illuminating (Fairclough 2003a). It is not possible to say whether this is an example of the views of an individual, represented as indirect speech, or an abstraction away from specific statements made during the review. It is clear, however, that the review team is less closely associated with this view than with the view about the community leaders. As in the previous example, this statement, attributed in general terms to one or more contributor(s) to the Ouseley review, was echoed in Ann Cryer's Westminster Hall speech six days later, when she said: 'There is little point in blaming the situation simply on racism and Islamophobia'. It was already evident (Chapter 4) that Ann Cryer's statement was hostile to, and clashing with, other discourses which may have referred to Islamophobia as a causal factor in the violence in Bradford. *The Ouseley Report* provides specific instances of those discourses.

Representation of Bradfordian voices

In neither of the above examples is responsibility for the 'voice' of the discourse made explicit. This is also the case in the following example from the 'Bradfordian Views' section of *The Ouseley Report:*

> Inter-continental marriages mean that around 50% of the marriages that take place in the Asian community result in an intake of new residents who are unable to communicate in the English language, which limits their participation in mainstream social and educational activities. (p. 11)

This is a further case of a view represented in *The Ouseley Report* which is recontextualised in Ann Cryer's speech. The simple statement of cause and effect between inter-continental marriage and limited participation in society is legitimated in 'result' and 'which limits'. As in the first example, the lack of a reporting verb allows for ambiguity. The topos of number here implies that this is an official discourse rather than a 'common concern' of the people in general. Another 'view' takes a similar theme:

> Asian women face particular obstacles to their participation in decision-making processes at all levels. (p. 11)

Here again it is not clear what are the 'particular obstacles' which stand in the way of Asian women's participation in decision-making processes. The relationship between the reported view and the original contribution to the review is unclear. The genre dictates that these are probably summarised views, rather than verbatim quotations from individuals. What is unclear is whether they are the views of 'Asian women' or 'new residents' themselves, or of others who commented on their perceived predicament.

In further examples of the non-agentive views of 'Bradfordians', more arguments which will resurface further along the chain of discourse are introduced:

> Non-English speaking homes prevent parental help being given with homework or prevent parental participation in schools. (p. 14)

> Children are taken out of formal education at critical periods for lengthy stays in Pakistan, thus damaging their academic development. (p. 14)

Each of these 'views' was picked up by Ann Cryer in Parliament six days after the publication of the report, and recontextualised, adding authority and legitimacy to opinions for which there is little supportive evidence. In the 'views' reported in this section of the report, fallacious arguments are reproduced, usually in a voice which implies that they are the direct speech of 'ordinary peo-

ple'. In fact the voice of this section of the report is complex. Here we appear to have a plurality of unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of full-valued voices (Bakhtin 1973:4). The frequent lack of a reporting verb, and lack of agency in the representation of speech, allow a dialogical interaction between voices which have equal status. However, the representation of the voice of the people is not quite as simple as this. In the production of the report, views are summarised, altered and made to fit the genre. Some views which are held by a small number of people are included alongside other views which are held by many more people. Some views are excluded entirely, while others were never received by the review team. Yet the status of the views reported by Ouseley is enhanced when they are repeated in a more authoritative context. Perhaps the most significant aspect of Ann Cryer's recontextualisation of the 'Bradfordian Views' is the *reiteration* of arguments in the more legitimate context of the House of Commons, rather than that of an anonymous contributor to the review team's evidence. Recontextualisation moves the arguments into an increasingly non-negotiable materiality (Wodak 2000), legitimating and rationalising them as they travel along the chain of discourse.

Before leaving *The Ouseley Report*, it is worth glancing at the authorial summary of the 'Bradfordian views' represented above:

> The current Bradford scenario is one in which many white people feel that their needs are neglected because they regard the minority ethnic communities as being prioritised for more favourable public assistance; some people assert that the Muslims, and, in particular, the Pakistanis, get everything at their expense. Simultaneously, the Asian communities, particularly the Muslim community, are concerned that racism and Islamophobia continue to blight their lives resulting in harassment, discrimination and exclusion. They argue that they do not receive favourable or equal treatment and that their needs are marginalised by decision-makers and public service leaders. (p. 16)

In this section of the report previously anonymous views are now accorded generalised agency, in a way which represents them as oppositional. No longer is everyone defined as 'Bradfordian'. Replacing the apparent democracy of all views standing alongside each other, some of the views now belong to 'white people', while others belong to 'Asian communities, particularly the Muslim community'. This pattern of oppositional discourse is familiar from the language ideological debate reported in the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* (Chapter 3). The two 'sides' stand squarely opposite each other, positioned there by the authoritative, authorial voice. In the recontextualised summary of Bradfor-

dian views here the voices of the people correspond with the overall findings of the review that social segregation is the main problem in Bradford.

The Oldham review

On 14th June 2001 a team was commissioned by the Home Secretary, David Blunkett, to set up an independent review of the disturbances which had recently occurred in Oldham. At the invitation of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council, Greater Manchester Police and the Greater Manchester Police Authority, David Ritchie was appointed to Chair the Independent Review. The review team set up processes through which the people of Oldham could represent their views to the team.[2] Between 1st August and 19th October 2001, 915 people were interviewed, and in addition 200 meetings took place. This section of analysis is concerned with the representation of the views of the people of Oldham.

Between reported speech and the reporting context

In the *Oldham Independent Review* a broad range of voices is represented. In many cases the speakers are backgrounded, leaving the voices to speak for themselves. Sometimes the voices are framed in particular ways in the reporting discourse, so that they are objectified, evaluated, and even marginalised. At other times they are reported side-by-side, with no reporting verb, as if they had equal authority and status. Voloshinov notes that the mechanism of representing reported speech is located "not in the individual soul, but in society." (1973: 117). That is, the representation of speech – for example in direct and indirect speech – and the evaluative reception of that speech, is contextualised and recontextualised socially and historically. This is true of both reporting speech and represented speech:

> Between the reported speech and the reporting context, dynamic relations of high complexity and tension are in force. A failure to take these into account makes it impossible to understand any form of reported speech.
>
> (Voloshinov 1973: 119)

For Voloshinov the true object of inquiry is the dynamic interrelationship between the speech being reported and the speech doing the reporting. In the representation of polyphonic voices in the official reports considered in this chapter, it is this interrelationship that enables us to investigate the legitimation and evaluation of the represented voices by the authorial voice.

The role of the English language

Most of the examples here are from the section of the report titled 'Summary of Public Views'. I have selected them for their relevance to the debate on language and application for citizenship status, with which the discourses represented in this volume are principally concerned. Examples from elsewhere in the report are included where they complement or contradict those in the 'Summary of Public Views' section.

The review team found that a language ideological debate about the role and status of various languages in Oldham was alive and well. It is worth quoting one section of the report at length:

> One of the most difficult issues we faced as a Panel was the role of the English language in Oldham and its correct relationship with the mother tongues of people of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin. This was voiced frequently as a matter of concern by white and African-Caribbean Oldhamers, either in the shop or at meetings elsewhere. Altogether 150 visitors to the shop raised issues about the place of English in Oldham's society, the great majority of them white.
>
> The main concerns of white and African-Caribbean people we spoke to were that English was the language of the town and of England as a whole, and was therefore the only language which should be used for the conduct of business in official or unofficial documents emanating from public authorities, and in public institutions such as schools. To a very considerable extent this is, of course, exactly how things are. But the translation of documents and public notices into other languages, the widespread availability of interpreters at public expense, and the teaching of English as an additional language at school, or other support to young children in their mother tongues, were resented. There was an element of fear in some white people's reactions, that their culture was in some way threatened by the widespread speaking of other languages in what had always been a monolingual town. Police and health workers also commented that a lack of fluency in English and the consequent need to use interpretation services, impeded their ability to deliver effective services. (p. 28)

Here the authorial voice frames the reported discourse of the contributors in several ways. In the first clause ('One of the most difficult issues we faced as a Panel'), the concern of the contributors is evaluated by the Panel and kept at a safe distance. This was a difficult issue for the review panel, so the audience should know that they did not uncritically accept the views of the people on this occasion. A second means by which the views of Oldhamers are framed is in the specific ('150') and non-specific ('raised frequently') reference to the

number of occasions on which the issue of language was raised by contributors. A third means by which authorial discourse frames the represented discourse is in the aside, sandwiched between the 'concerns of the white and African-Caribbean people':

> To a very considerable extent this is, of course, exactly how things are.

That is, the authorial point of view notes that some of the points made by the respondents were redundant, as they were demanding that which was already the case. A fourth means by which the views represented here are framed is in the sentence beginning 'There was an element of fear'. Here the phrase 'in some way' frames the represented discourse, evaluating it in the assumption that the way in which 'their culture was. . .threatened' is far from self-evident. Finally, the represented discourse is framed in a more positive light, finding more legitimation in the support of (presumably monolingual English-speaking) 'Police and health workers'. In the framing devices used here, the authorial voice maintains the boundary between the voice of the report and the voice of the contributors.

Language, suspicion, and fear

The 'resentment' spoken of here is also reported in the Appendix, 'Summary of Public Views':

> There is resentment that many Asians have only a poor understanding of English. This results in a lack of interaction between the white and Asian communities. This lack of interaction leads to suspicion and fear. (p. 82)

In this version of the same remarks, the agency of 'white and African-Caribbean Oldhamers' is backgrounded. This is not the only sense in which this representation of the 'resentment' is ambiguous. The construction of three sentences linked by 'This results in' and 'This. . .leads to' introduces an apparent legitimacy to the statement of cause and effect, which seems to blame 'many Asians' for the 'suspicion and fear'.

This discriminatory ideology which symbolically links limited proficiency in English with negative aspects of society is represented in several forms in this section of the *Oldham Independent Review*. However, there are also isolated examples of a view which contests the dominant ideology:

> Some residents, white and Asian, stated that the indigenous population should make more of an effort to speak Asian languages. It was suggested that these languages should be learnt at school. (p. 82)

Here the reporting verb is strongly evident, maintaining the boundary between the voice of the authors of the report and the voice of the contributors. The authors are not responsible for the (relatively liberal, and in fact unusual) view that English speakers should learn minority Asian languages. However, the same paragraph reverts to reporting a more common view:

> Others felt resentment that Asian languages were being promoted in schools and by the local authority which printed literature in various languages. The high cost of this was a cause of concern. (p. 82)

The diversity of views received by the review team is exemplified here, as the second example offers an opinion which is oppositional to the first, restating the topoi of finance and burden, which argue that Asian languages should not be taught in schools, or printed by the local authority, because of the cost of such services. These topoi are recognisable from the language ideological debate played out in the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* (see Chapter 3).

In other examples of represented contributions to the review which related to English language proficiency, the reporting verb was entirely absent:

> Poor language skills amongst the Asian community restrict their ability to gain well-paid employment. (p. 82)

> Language is a major social, economic and cultural barrier between the white and Asian communities. (p. 82)

> English should be spoken by all to unify the community. Immigrants should learn English as a condition of residency as per the American model. (p. 82)

In these examples the represented discourse is framed only by the overall heading of this section of the report – 'Summary of Public Views'. The lack of reporting verbs in these examples appears to blur the boundaries between the authorial point of view and the opinions of the contributors. In the first of the examples the topos of advantage is employed to state as a fact an argument which is pursued throughout this chain of discourses, including in the statements and speeches by Ann Cryer, Lord Rooker and David Blunkett. Here 'poor language skills' means 'poor English language skills'. Elsewhere in the report there is reference to: 'specific evidence of racial discrimination in the labour market and its demotivating effects' (p. 34). By the time this view is represented as the view of the 'public', it has been mitigated to: 'There was a feeling amongst Asians that some employers discriminated against them when they apply for a job' (p. 80). Notwithstanding this, the issue of 'Asian' people's failure to learn English is far more strongly stated in the report as a cause of unemployment than the racist and discriminatory practices of some employers.

In the second and third of these examples, the lack of a reporting verb obfuscates agency, and the identification of voice remains vague. It is not clear whether contributors to the review said that English should be spoken by all, or this was the view of the review panel. It may be that both voices are merged here, as the authors both report (one or some of) the views they received from their contributors, and at the same time make recommendations for the Government to introduce new legislation. Topoi of advantage, threat/danger and authority are invoked here to argue that everyone should speak English because it would be good for everyone, as this will bring about greater unity ('unify the community'); and all immigrants should learn English, because that is how the issue of language and citizenship is dealt with in the United States of America. It is not clear whether the recommendation is that English should be spoken all the time, or specifically in public places. There is a reiteration here of Ann Cryer's view that the alternative to all members of the Asian community having 'some grasp of English' is 'a Belfast-like situation'. There appears to be a proposal for a solution to the problem of English not being spoken, in demanding that 'Immigrants should learn English as a condition of residency'. This again echoes Ann Cryer's solution to the perceived language problem.

Representing women in the voice of the people

In the *Oldham Review* the views of a number of contributors concerning the role and status of women, and of arranged marriages, are represented. Similar arguments are represented elsewhere in the chain of discourses relating to language testing for citizenship. As before, the presence or absence of the reporting verb alters the voice of the contribution. In the following two examples from the 'Summary of Public Views' section, the reporting verb is very much in evidence:

> There is a view held in the white community that Asian men treat women, both Asian and white, as second-class citizens. (p. 82)

> Arranged marriages were highlighted as an issue of concern, in particular when they take place between women from Pakistan/Bangladesh and Oldham residents. (p. 82)

In these examples there is clear boundary maintenance between the voice of the reported discourse and the authorial voice, suggesting that the review panel does not wholeheartedly agree with such generalisations. However, elsewhere the question of 'arranged marriages' is associated with societal segregation in the authorial voice of the review panel:

> Another factor reinforcing segregation is the proportion of marriages between young Oldhamers of Pakistani and Bangladeshi heritage and husbands or wives from the sub-continent. These continue at a high level and since the new husbands or wives do not typically speak English or have much understanding of the cultural background to which they are moving, the tendency to remain in a separate community is reinforced. (p. 10)

The source of the review team's information is not clear. What is certain is that, in line with the discourses of Ann Cryer and other official discourses, intercontinental marriages are widely held to be a contributing factor in the social segregation and violence in northern towns.

Reporting verbs are absent again in two further examples from the 'Summary of Public Views' section:

> White women receive verbal abuse from Asian men in the street. (p. 82)

> Many Asian women are isolated from society, unable to speak English and confined to the home. This has a detrimental effect on their children whom by the time they go to school have only a limited grasp of the English language. (p. 82)

There appears to be no question here about the truth of the assertion that 'white women' are abused by 'Asian men' in public places. The source of the statement is not clear, and nor does it appear in the substantive part of the report. Similarly, the 'voice' of the second example is difficult to trace, despite the definite tone of the statement. This is probably not the represented view of 'Many Asian women', who may have a range of different views on the question of social isolation, and the 'detrimental effect on their children'.

Representing extreme views

The many voices represented in the *Oldham Independent Review* include that of the Right-wing British National Party:

> The British National Party met us and argued that multiculturalism has never worked and that voluntary repatriation for Pakistanis and Bangladeshis should be introduced. Quite apart from the question what would happen if no-one took up the offer, this policy constitutes a fundamental breach of the human rights of British citizens, designed in our view to intimidate, and it is as unworkable as it is disreputable. The reality is that these communities are as much British as any others. (p. 6)

The views of the BNP are dismissed by the authors of the report in the evaluative statement beginning 'Quite apart from'. The negative framing of this view creates a clear boundary between the voice of the report and the voice of the BNP.

The Burnley review

At the end of July 2001 Lord Clarke was invited to act as independent Chair to a Task Force set up to examine the violence which occurred in Burnley on the 23rd to 25th June. The aim of the Task Force was to listen to the voices of as many people and organisations as possible in Burnley. These voices were heard at public meetings, through phone calls and letters to the Chair, through meetings with voluntary and community groups, and through responses to a questionnaire sent to every household in the Borough.[3] The voices represented in the Burnley Report are claimed as the voices of 'the people':

> The people of Burnley have spoken loudly and clearly of their fears, their concerns, their hopes for the future and above all, their determination to lift their town following the events of June 23rd to 25th. (p. 38)

In the report these voices are often quoted in direct discourse, often without a clear reporting context or evaluative commentary.

Representing racist discourse

In the Burnley Report racist discourse is most strikingly represented in direct quotation of responses to the review team's request for views and opinions. These discourses are realised in the kind of figurative language, and argumentation strategies, which are familiar in public discourses on immigration. However, the format of the report is such that these examples are decontextualised, as they appear only as epigraphs to each new section. Thus, while the voices of a range of social actors are made evident in the report, when opinions are most directly quoted their speaker is backgrounded to the extent that their origin can only be guessed at. In the first of these examples, the following quotation, located immediately following the title of the 'Community Relations' section, is not ascribed to any individual or group, but stands alone, with no reporting verb to connect it to the main text:

> We feel that our whole life and culture is under threat and that we are suffering a silent invasion. (p. 47)

Here the argument is realised in the invasion metaphor, described by Reisigl and Wodak (2001:59) as one of the most frequent and stereotypical metaphors used in discriminatory discourse about migration. Although this fragment of discourse is decontextualised in its location in the report, the representation of immigrants as an 'invasion' is sufficiently familiar to link this quotation cohesively to other discourses.

Immediately following this quotation is another, without a reporting verb or syntactic cohesion:

> Disproportionate amounts of money (be it Council, Government or European money), spent in the Daneshouse area of town – mainly Asian occupied. (p. 47)

This example is represented in quotation marks, but is not ascribed to a particular speaker. A familiar argumentation strategy recurs here, to implicitly argue that public money should no longer be spent in the mainly Asian Daneshouse area of Burnley. This argument, that 'disproportionate' amounts of Council money had been spent in the 'Asian' areas of Burnley, was reiterated on several occasions in the immediate aftermath of the disturbances of June 2001, despite the fact that there was no evidence to support its veracity.

In a third example of direct discourse in the Burnley Report, the following quotation was located immediately following the heading 'The White Community':

> Many of the Asian population are either unwilling or too lazy to learn our language, thereby making themselves unemployable and unable to integrate in the life of the host country. (p. 50)

Reisigl and Wodak (2001:55) point out that in discriminatory discourse, the characteristic of laziness is among the most frequent negative traits predicated to immigrant or 'foreigner' groups. In this discourse, the high rate of unemployment in the 'Asian community' in Burnley is their own fault. This argument, which 'blames the victim', is a familiar one in anti-immigrant discourse.

The role of racist political discourse

The Burnley Report points out that the British National Party had a role to play in creating the conditions for violent disorder in summer 2001:

> Throughout our study it has become clear that some of Burnley's white population has been influenced by the British National Party (BNP). Recent Local Authority by-elections demonstrated a vote of 21% for this

> party. This confirms the electoral support given to the BNP in Burnley at the last General Election, which was the second highest in the country. Consultation with young people also found that racism was significant amongst this group. Disturbingly, in some parts of Burnley it was found that some young people hold openly hostile views to the Asian population of the town.

Here the views of 'some young people' are represented hesitatingly, framed and mitigated in the evaluative terms 'Disturbingly' and 'sadly'. Again agency is backgrounded here, and discourse is abstracted away from its origin. In the Burnley and Oldham reports, unlike in the voices of politicians heard so far in the chain of discourses, the role of the BNP is recognised in creating the conditions for social unrest.

The Cantle report

The Government's response to the disturbances in towns and cities in northern England in 2001 was to establish a Review Team, led by Ted Cantle, "to seek the views of local residents and community leaders in the affected towns and in other parts of England on the issues which need to be addressed to bring about social cohesion" (*The Cantle Report* 2001:i).[4] The Report, *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team Chaired by Ted Cantle* (henceforth *The Cantle Report*) was completed in December 2001. *The Cantle Report* distinguishes itself from the Burnley, Bradford and Oldham reports by saying that its remit was to 'focus on the lessons for national policy' (p. 5). This report, commissioned and published by the Home Office, is of higher status and authority than the reports considered earlier in this chapter. As such, it moves the arguments higher up the chain of discourses.

Language and law

The Cantle Report moves its focus away from the represented discourse of the people consulted, in favour of authorial discourse which relies on generalised statements. All discourse is dialogic, however, and if the footprints that Cantle's proposals leave in the sand do not lead directly to the social actors interviewed by the review team, they do lead back (and forward) to other discourses. These include texts which play authoritative roles in the chain of discourses, including the speeches and statements of Ann Cryer, Lord Rooker, and David Blunkett. In *The Cantle Report* there is a call from the report's authors for a national debate,

led by Government, to develop 'a new compact, or understanding, between all sections of the community'. The authorial voice continues:

> We believe that such a debate should seek to determine both the rights and responsibilities of each community. Whilst respect for different cultures is vital, it will also be essential to agree some common elements of 'nationhood'. This might revolve around key issues such as language and law. (p. 19)

The reference to 'language and law' seems to be a reintroduction of the argument raised by Ann Cryer in her speech to Parliament, that there should be new legislation relating to English language proficiency. However, such are the mitigations and ambiguities here that it is difficult to unpick exactly what is being proposed by the authors of the *Cantle Report*. Exemplification is immediately provided in the next sentence though:

> For example, a more visible support for anti-discrimination measures, support for women's rights, a universal acceptance of the English language (seen as particularly important in some areas) and respect for both religious difference and secular views. (p. 19)

Here several points are introduced to exemplify the topics to be engaged with in the 'national debate' ahead. When several points are listed together, they are "placed in connection, but without any indication of the precise nature of the connection" (Fairclough 1989: 188). In this example several unimpeachable and certainly liberal proposals are made: that there should be more support for anti-discrimination measures, that women's rights should be supported, and that there should be respect for religious difference and secular views. These proposals are unarguably laudable and acceptable to most. Any other proposal linked with them is likely to be viewed as equally egalitarian. Thus, in this context 'a universal acceptance of the English language' has all the appearance of a liberal proposal. The topos of justice and equality appears to argue here that if there is a universal acceptance of the English language, greater equality will ensue. Only in this specific point is the (abstracted and parenthetical) voice of the people represented: '(seen as particularly important in some areas)'. Perhaps less sure of itself on this point than others, the authorial voice looks to the voice of (some of) the people for support. What is most noticeable in these examples of issues for debate is that the general 'anti-discrimination measures', along with 'support for women's rights', 'respect for religious difference' and '(respect for) secular views' all refer to examples of discriminatory practices which should be put right. The odd case is that of the English language, which is very far from being discriminated against. In fact if the list were to be consistent,

the third example should read: 'a universal acceptance of languages other than English'. Instead, the question of the English language proficiency of linguistic minority people in Britain is stealthily and euphemistically introduced in a context which implies that this is a straightforward question of social justice. A further point here is that the clause 'support for women's rights' is placed in connection with 'a universal acceptance of the English language'. In the chain of discourses emerging in the debate represented here, this may be a recontextualisation of Ann Cryer's and Lord Rooker's argument that Asian men deny Asian women their 'rights' by denying them the opportunity to learn English. Simply by being placed in connection with each other, the points about women's rights and the English language become closely linked.

The promotion of new values

The *Cantle Report* calls for 'the promotion of new values', and goes on as follows:

> we would expect these new values to contain statements about the expectation that the use of the English language, which is already a pre-condition of citizenship (or a commitment to become fluent within a period of time) will become more rigorously pursued, with appropriate support. (p. 19)

Here the issue of 'acceptance of the English language' has moved up the ladder of priorities for bringing about greater social cohesion in Britain. In a topos of law, the law as it stands is invoked to support the notion that language testing is crucial for a cohesive society. In fact the report is erroneous here: there was no current requirement for citizenship applicants to demonstrate that they 'use' English, merely that they meet the rather vague criterion of having 'sufficient knowledge' of English, Welsh or Scottish Gaelic. The phrase 'more rigorously pursued' implies that either new legislation should be forthcoming to ensure that English is universally used, or that the existing law be invoked more strongly. It is almost impossible to imagine that a government could effectively legislate to ensure that linguistic minority groups 'use' the dominant language in all domains of society. While the term 'use' is probably an error here, and should read 'proficiency', it stands as a particularly illiberal proposal in a Government-commissioned report. At the same time, the error may reveal more about official thinking on this issue than some of the more ambiguous statements made elsewhere.

This paragraph of the report continues by invoking the topos of burden, which argues that the use of English is a burden on society, and has the potential to be a burden in the future:

> This will ensure that subsequent generations do not bear the burden of remedial programmes and, more importantly, that the full participation of all individuals in society can be achieved much more easily. (p. 19)

The topos of humanitarianism is invoked in stating that once the universal use of English is achieved, this will bring about 'the full participation of all individuals in society'. It is not clear what is meant here by 'full participation'. The implication is that either the use of languages other than English, or low proficiency in English, are major factors in preventing 'participation'. Of course there are many monolingual English speakers in Britain (including large numbers in Burnley, Oldham and Bradford) who may be characterised as socially excluded. Here, however, the assumption is that 'participation' is achieved through use of the English language.

In the *Cantle Report* recontextualisation of discourse is in the direction of the texts generated by politicians rather than the responses of 'the people' of Burnley, Oldham and Bradford. Arguments proposed in the speech of Ann Cryer (Chapter 4), the interview of Lord Rooker and the statement of David Blunkett (Chapter 5), are resurfaced and reiterated. At the same time, the myriad voices of 'the people' who responded to the inquiries conducted in the north of England and other areas are largely backgrounded, as the proposals of the report fall into line with those of the Government.

The discourse of official reports as language ideological debate

In Chapter 2 I suggested that language ideological debates often become symbolic battlegrounds on which broader debates over race, state and nation are played out. I also proposed that language ideologies are often the location of images of 'self/other' or 'us/them'. In the four reports reviewed in this chapter language ideologies are not only reflected in the many voices of the people of the northern towns and cities where violence occurred in 2001, but are also reproduced as links in chains of discourse which enter into a new and authoritative materiality. Some of the means by which the official reports become part of a chain of authoritative discourse are clearly exemplified in the way Ann Cryer picks up and recontextualises features of *The Ouseley Report*. Ann Cryer's speech immediately endows the report's findings with greater author-

ity and a wider audience. At the same time the M.P. shapes the discourse of the report through additions, omissions, deletions and substitutions. As we have seen, Ann Cryer's speech was in turn frequently reiterated, reported and reworked, so that the arguments initially represented by Lord Ouseley and his team gained authority as they travelled up the political line.

I have previously argued (Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004a) that language ideologies can be used as gate-keeping practices to create, maintain and reinforce boundaries between groups of people. This is most likely to be the case in contexts of asymmetrical power relations, where speakers of minority languages are subject to the gate-keeping practices put in place by the powerful (dominant-language-speaking) group. Of course the reproduction of language ideologies as gate-keeping practices is not the sole preserve of the elite group. Language ideologies are reproduced in the attitudes, practices and beliefs of groups who themselves may be relatively powerless. As Bourdieu (1998b) points out, this may include those who are subject to the symbolic violence of the dominant group. That is, language ideologies are reproduced in constant misrecognitions of one language as intrinsically of greater worth than others. These misrecognitions cut across social groups, and include speakers of minority languages. Minority language speakers therefore may themselves believe that their languages are inferior to the dominant language or languages. Bourdieu views such acts of submission and obedience as acts which involve "cognitive structures, forms and categories of perception, principles of vision and division" (1998b: 53). A key point here is that this is a *historical* process, which over time becomes a shared principle of vision and division. This process constructs what Bourdieu calls a "common historical transcendental" (p. 54), through a continuous set of shared evidences constitutive of national commonsense. In the many voices represented in the four reports of reviews into the contexts and events of violence in northern England in 2001, a "commonsense world" (Bourdieu 1998b: 53) is articulated in which it appears to be self-evident that minority Asian languages have negative associations, and indeed pose a significant threat to social cohesion. This powerful, common-sense ideology is constituted in a number of different argumentation strategies (topoi) in the many voices represented in the reports. The most commonly heard topoi are the topos of culture, the topos of threat, the topos of responsibility and the topos of abuse. There are also examples of responses to the review panels which suggest that minority Asian languages should have less funding and support because that would benefit the linguistic minority communities themselves.

The threat of minority Asian languages

Several respondents to the Burnley and Oldham review panels indicated that the minority languages spoken by Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups were a threat. In summarising some of the views received, the Oldham review team found that:

> There was an element of fear in some white people's reactions, that their culture was in some way threatened by the widespread speaking of other languages in what had always been a monolingual town.

As we have seen, a number of responses to the review panels made this argument. The voices heard and represented by the review panels were effectively calling for the homogenisation of language and culture, demanding that only English be used in public encounters, as the visibility of minority languages other than English was perceived as a threat to local and national culture. In a frequently heard discourse, it was said that English should be the only language of business, government, and education. Minority languages were at times associated with invasion, and were also represented as a barrier between white and Asian communities. In these repetitions of familiar discriminatory arguments language ideologies are reproduced, and move unproblematically from local to elite discourses. The reproduction of such ideologies is not unidirectional, however. Once the elite group has established, through a process of historical and ongoing misrecognition, that one language has greater moral worth than other languages, other groups reiterate the same discourse, contributing to the ongoing reinforcement of the borders between dominant and dominated groups. Bourdieu points out that too little is still known about the countless acts of recognition and misrecognition that produce and reproduce the "magical frontier between the dominant and the dominated" (Bourdieu 2000: 169), and which give to an illusory representation all the appearances of being grounded in reality. In the discourse of some of the respondents to the review panels, there was a clearly stated misrecognition of minority Asian languages constituting a threat to the 'life and culture' of the monolingual, 'White' group.

Language, culture and representing the 'Other'

Schieffelin and Doucet (1998) note that language ideologies are often the location of images of 'self/other' or 'us/them'. In the discourse of the voices in the four official reports, minority languages are frequently associated with cul-

tural practices which are represented negatively. Invoking the topos of culture, the argument proposed in the reports is that as certain cultural practices of the Asian minority are different from those of the majority, they create social segregation and the potential for conflict. In *The Ouseley Report* in particular, the cultural practice of inter-continental marriages is represented in negative terms, as it is said to 'result in intake of new residents who are unable to communicate in the English language'. A second cultural practice which is negatively represented in *The Ouseley Report* is that of family visits to Pakistan and Bangladesh, which are said to harm children's education because they lose proficiency in English. These points are reiterated in the *Oldham Review*, which summarises some of the views of the public, adding that 'Many Asian women are isolated from society, unable to speak English and confined to the home'. In this discourse language becomes one of a number of cultural features which represent the 'Otherness' of the minority group(s). Here common-sense public discourse identifies cultural practices which are different from those of the dominant group.

I previously introduced the notion of 'new racisms' (May 2001; Schmidt 2002), which often describe groups in cultural terms without specifically mentioning 'race'. As overtly racist discourse has become unacceptable in public settings, a new racism has developed in which specific cultural forms have come to signify racialised identities. Racialisation represents others as engaging in certain cultural practices so alien and foreign that it is impossible to imagine them having equal status with those doing the racialising. One of these cultural practices is the use of languages other than English in public and private settings. This process of racialisation is deeply embedded in cultural assumptions, produced and reproduced in the constant misrecognitions which constitute common-sense consensus. Bourdieu speaks of the dominant language and culture asserting its legitimacy by rejecting other possible cultures and languages:

> By rising to universality, a particular culture or language causes all others to fall into particularity. What is more, given that the universalization of requirements thus officially instituted does not come with a universalization of access to the means needed to fulfil them, this fosters both the monopolization of the universal by the few and the dispossession of all others, who are, in a way, thereby mutilated in their humanity. (Bourdieu 1998b: 47)

According to common-sense knowledge, it is obvious that England is an English-speaking country, so those who propose discriminatory policy in relation to languages other than English can claim to be egalitarian while acting

to exclude linguistic minorities from equal membership in the national community (Schmidt 2002). In much of the discourse of the four official reports, the use of languages other than English becomes an emblem of 'othernesss' and difference which signifies a racialised identity.

Language and responsibility

In the discourse of the four official reports there is a strongly articulated view that responsibility for the apparent social segregation in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham lies with the Asian communities. Not the least of the causes of this segregation is said to be the use of minority Asian languages, and lack of proficiency in English. Asian people are said to be 'too lazy to learn the language' (*Burnley Review*), while 'English should be spoken by all to unify the community' (*Oldham Review*). Here the topos of responsibility argues that those who do not speak English are (at least partly) to blame for the segregation and lack of social cohesion in the three areas where violence occurred in 2001. In this discourse there are only negative associations with minority Asian languages. Negative language ideologies are reproduced, and the possibilities for minority language speakers to activate their linguistic capital in the social world of the majority group are diminished. In the 'field' (Bourdieu 1990) constructed in this discourse, not only are minority Asian languages negatively represented, but also the speakers of those languages bear responsibility for the social ills associated with the languages. In such a social arena it may be difficult for speakers of minority Asian languages to activate their social and linguistic capital, to get "ahead of the game" (Bourdieu 1998b: 81). The rules of the game may be embodied in the 'native English speaker' (or at least in the 'native English speaker' whose habitus conforms to other rules of the game – including those relating to socio-economic status, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and able-bodiedness), but they are unlikely to exist in the incorporated state of the minority language speaker. That is to say, negative ideologies about minority Asian languages are unlikely to construct a world in which speakers of those languages are able to easily access resources and materials in the majority-language arena. For those whose habitus conforms to the field, "everything seems obvious and goes without saying" (Bourdieu 1998b: 81). As such, language ideologies may act here as gate-keeping practices, ensuring (of course not necessarily *intentionally*) that while some have a feel for the game, others do not:

> Having the feel for the game is having the game under the skin; it is to master in a practical way the future of the game; it is to have a sense of the history of the game. (Bourdieu 1998b: 80)

For those who do not have the game under their skin, access to resources may be fraught with problems. Studying language ideological debates in political and other public discourse can identify the ways and means of the construction of the field. However, without a focus on interactional processes in which minority language speakers negotiate access to (symbolic or material) resources, the extent to which such ideologies act as gate-keeping mechanisms is at least partly conjectural. It is clear that in multilingual Britain today some linguistic minority groups are more economically successful than others. It is certainly not the case that the fact of speaking a minority Asian language in itself causes educational or economic failure (although this is the very ideology represented in Ann Cryer's Westminster Hall speech and the debate which followed). However, when the elite group in society puts in place a series of gate-keeping mechanisms which prevent some linguistic minority groups from activating their cultural and linguistic capital in certain social arenas, it is less likely that these groups will gain access to symbolic or material resources. This process of symbolic domination acts hand-in-hand with factors such as poverty, racism and Islamophobia to ensure that certain groups continue to maintain their position as the lowest-earning and least economically mobile in multicultural Britain. In order to understand the considerable diversity of experiences of linguistic minority groups in Britain we need to go beyond the structural, to engage with interactional processes at the local level (Blackledge & Creese 2005). To this end there is a need for extension of existing links between the traditions of critical discourse analysis and linguistic ethnography, to demonstrate not only the role of the discursive construction of social arenas in asymmetrical access to resources for linguistic minority speakers, but also the processes through which this occurs in interaction (cf. the recent and ongoing work of the UK Linguistic Ethnography Forum, 2004).

Abuse and resentment

A frequently heard argument in the voices represented in the four official reports is that the Asian minority group (in this case especially the Pakistani-heritage group) received a disproportionate amount of money from local government, and that having received so much they should not demand more. A familiar argument from the local newspaper articles reviewed in Chapter 3,

this is recontextualised in the reports. These arguments (topoi of finance and abuse) recur with regularity in anti-immigrant discourse. In the *Oldham Review* there is said to be resentment of the 'high cost' of printing literature in Asian languages, while in the *Burnley Review* 'disproportionate amounts of money' were said to be spent in the mainly-Pakistani Daneshouse area of the town. *The Ouseley Report* finds that 'some people assert that the Muslims, and, in particular, the Pakistanis, get everything at their expense'. This resentment of local government money spent on minority Asian communities further contributed to a climate of opposition and tension in Burnley, Bradford and Oldham. Although there is very little evidence to support these claims, their repetition in several semiotic contexts constructs a social world in which there is potential for tension between 'Asian' and 'White' groups. A further effect of such discourse is likely to be the reproduction of a 'field' in which minority Asian language speakers are less willing or able to access resources. A discourse which asserts that *they* are taking *our* money makes the claim that resources are not available to the minority group without the permission of the majority. In such an environment of symbolic violence it is probable that some of the minority group are unable or unwilling to activate their social capital, and therefore unable to access symbolic or material goods.

Language and the nation

In the discourse of the official reports voices are represented which make explicit links between the English language and a sense of nationhood. For example, as we have seen, in the *Oldham Review* there was a view represented that 'English was the language of the town and of England as a whole, and was therefore the only language which should be used'. *The Cantle Report* picks up this point, recommending that in the new legislation it will be essential to agree some common elements of 'nationhood' which revolve around language and the law. In this discourse there appears to be an essentialist association between the concept of the English (or British) nation and the English language. In the construction of the national identity, language ideologies are often used as gate-keeping practices to create, maintain and reinforce boundaries between people in a broad range of contexts. In the discourse of the official reports a language ideology prevails in which those who are able or willing to speak English rather than their minority languages are more acceptable as members of the nation than those who mainly or exclusively speak minority Asian languages. Language ideological debates such as this one almost always occur in the context of relations of power between groups, and are invariably about more than

language alone. Here an argument which maintains that only English should be used in public domains because it is the language of England reproduces and reinforces an ideology of homogeneity in a heterogeneous society. There appears to be no discussion in the reports of the possibility of imagining the nation as one which is explicitly multilingual. When society is socially stratified, and when some of the least powerful groups are those who speak minority languages other than English, debates which exclude those minorities contribute to the reproduction of inequality. In Chapter 7 we will see that such arguments become more authoritative as they move closer to the legislative centre of Government.

Chapter 7

The legitimation of discriminatory discourse

In this chapter the polyphonic discourse of the previous chapters is recontextualised and transformed in the law-making processes of the State. Discourses which previously were, to some extent at least, negotiable, contested and multiple, emerge in authoritative, legitimised and non-negotiable forms in the official text of the Government White Paper, *Secure Borders, Safe Haven. Integration with Diversity in Modern Britain* (February 2002), and in legislation enshrined in the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Bill,* which was granted Royal Assent in November 2002. A further, related text will also be considered here: an article written for the *Foreign Policy Centre* by Home Secretary David Blunkett, and published in October 2002.

The symbolic power of language

So far in this volume we have seen discriminatory discourse iterated and reiterated in contexts which include local media discourse, local political discourse, national media discourse, national political discourse, and the discourse of official reports. Although they may at times contest and dispute the ideological battleground, these voices can be described as links in a chain of discourse, which become increasingly authoritative, and less negotiable, as they move up the chain towards the policy-making and legislative centre. However, not all of the voices in the chain are recontextualised in the more legitimate discourse of the State. Bourdieu (2000) suggests that political (and therefore discursive) struggle is a struggle to impose the legitimate vision of the social world. While powerful institutions such as the media and education are major players in the construction of the legitimate world, it is in the institution of the State, and its law-making authority, that the unofficial becomes official, and the illegitimate becomes legitimate. Of course, in an increasingly globalised environment, the State is not necessarily involved in the legitimation of consensus at all levels. However, the State makes a decisive contribution towards the production and reproduction of the instruments of construction of social reality. Discourse is

endowed with symbolic power, and is the more effective when supported in law, which is the objectification of the dominant, legitimate vision of the world, guaranteed by the State (Bourdieu 2000: 186). Bourdieu provides helpful examples of the legal authority of the State: the verdict of a judge, the birth certificate, the award of an identity card. Each of these is an example of the symbolic power of the State, which is legitimate only because the people (mis)recognise it as legitimate. The particular example at the heart of the chain of discourse analysed here is the award of citizenship status to applicants for naturalisation as British citizens. It is clear that although the criteria for the award of citizenship status are instituted in law, they are at the same time discursively constructed and subject to change.

What I want to suggest here is that the legitimation through inscription in law of apparently common-sense consensus is far from straightforward. Legislative discourse sharply senses other discourses which have preceded it on the same subject, and deals with them by transforming them in a process of recontextualisation. This transformation may occur through omission of particular arguments from the eventual legislation, or through the simple repetition of particular arguments. Elsewhere, however, the more or less discrete, polyphonic discourses which emerged and were heard or unheard in contexts where boundaries between them were maintained, are now incorporated, disseminated and merged with the voice of the legitimate authority. In double-voiced discourse the more legitimate voice of the State is able to deal with and dismiss voices which previously contested the ideological battleground. In Bakhtin's (1973) terms, the plurality of unmerged consciousnesses which contributed to political debate become a unity of merged consciousnesses in the authoritative voice of the legislative machine. It is this process of transformation by recontextualisation that frames the analysis of legislative discourse in this chapter.

Secure Borders, Safe Haven

The Government White Paper, *Secure Borders, Safe Haven: Integration with Diversity in Modern Britain* was presented to Parliament by Home Secretary David Blunkett in February 2002. In the Executive Summary of the White Paper a rationale for legislative change is set out:

> In an increasingly diverse world, it is vital that we strengthen both our sense of community belonging and the civic and political dimensions of British citizenship. In particular, we intend to offer language teaching and light touch

> education for citizenship for those making a home in the UK – with a view to a simple examination for citizenship applicants similar to that which exists in many other countries. (p. 11)

Here the diversity of the 'world' carries two senses: first, that of the diverse world beyond British shores, which would attempt to bring its diversity into Britain; and second, the sense of Britain itself becoming increasingly diverse (presumably ethnically/culturally diverse). The intensifying adverb, 'increasingly' adds the topos of number to this latter sense, implying that this increasing diversity requires some action (the most straightforward and literal sense of the clause is hardly correct: the world itself cannot be said to be 'increasingly diverse'). Here 'it is vital' works with 'we strengthen' to create a sense of urgency and necessity for action. Consensus is built as the irresistible argument gains force. Why is it necessary that *we* strengthen our sense of community and citizenship? Because it is threatened by increasing diversity.

In the first sentence the deictic 'we' carries the inclusive sense of 'we the British people' (although at the same time it can be read as exclusive, as it does not appear to include those who are bringing about increasing diversity). In the second sentence, 'we intend' is less inclusive, indicating the plans of the Government. Here the White Paper recontextualises the discourse of Ann Cryer ('requirement for them to take a full-time English course to reach a reasonable level') and Lord Rooker ('do we require people to learn English'). The views and proposals of Cryer and Rooker gain authority, becoming legitimate as they move up the chain of discourses. At the same time, however, the authorial voice is less certain of itself, introducing mitigation strategies which are aware of critical voices which regard the stated intention as illiberal and discriminatory. Thus the imposition of extended language testing for citizenship is characterised as an 'offer', the education associated with the examination is 'light touch', it is aimed at 'those making a home in the UK' (not 'immigrants'), and the examination will be 'simple'. In these mitigation strategies the voice of the White Paper anticipates its critics, and is acutely aware of their objections. In Bakhtin's terms, the voice of the White Paper is to a large degree determined by its "characteristic awareness of the other person's word" (1973: 163). Discourse here is 'double voiced', authoritative and legitimate, but also aware of its opponents. In the final clause of this section of the White Paper, justification of the proposed language testing policy is ensured through the topos of authority, making reference to similar policies which exist in 'many other countries'. In Annex A of the White Paper, seven countries are listed (Australia,

Austria, Canada, France, Germany, Netherlands, USA), which have some form of language testing for citizenship.

In the second half of the same paragraph, liberal and illiberal voices co-exist within the single consciousness of the author:

> This will strengthen the ability of new citizens to participate in society and to engage actively in our democracy. This will help people understand both their rights and obligations as citizens of the UK, and strengthen the bonds of mutual understanding between people of diverse cultural backgrounds. It will also help to promote individuals' economic and social integration. (p. 11)

The pronoun ('This') at the beginning of the first sentence here, repeated at the beginning of the second, and substituted ('It') at the beginning of the third, refers to the simple language examination for citizenship applicants. The repeated pronoun implies a logical cohesion to the text, as does the repetition of 'strengthen', which appears three times in this short paragraph. This over-lexicalisation insists that community belonging, democracy and 'mutual understanding' will all be strengthened by education in, and examination of, the English language. Implicitly, then, a failure or refusal to become proficient in English threatens these liberal and laudable features of society. In the first sentence here, language testing is said to strengthen the 'ability of new citizens to participate in society'. This resonates with Lord Rooker's point that 'people. . .must not be denied their opportunity to participate properly', and with the Cantle Report's statement that 'the full participation of all individuals in society can be achieved much more easily'. As it is repeated in increasingly authoritative and legitimate contexts, the term 'participation' accrues senses as it travels, becoming associated with a liberal voice which is stating an illiberal argument.

In the next sentence the benign, liberal authorial voice offers to 'help people understand both their rights and obligations as citizens of the UK'. In a recontextualisation of *The Cantle Report*, which called for debate about nationhood to revolve around language and law, and to determine the rights and responsibilities of each community, 'responsibilities' is now substituted with the intensified 'obligations'. The same argument is here not only repeated in a more legitimate and authoritative context, but is put in a way that demands more of 'people'. In the final sentence here the topos of advantage is invoked to argue that language tests are a good thing, because if 'people' take them, they will achieve greater economic and social integration. There is no mention here of the myriad voices of the people of Oldham, Burnley and Bradford who spoke of racism as a key factor in unemployment patterns. Instead, the Govern-

ment's argument is that testing the English language proficiency of citizenship applicants is the key to greater equality.

Language and cultural practices

The White Paper argues that there are certain 'cultural practices' that conflict with the Government's vision of citizenship and democracy:

> The Human Rights Act 1998 can be viewed as a key source of values that British citizens should share. The laws, rules and practices which govern our democracy uphold our commitment to the equal worth and dignity of all our citizens. It will sometimes be necessary to confront some cultural practices which conflict with these basic values – such as those which deny women the right to participate as equal citizens. (p. 30)

In Britain during the last ten years or so, the focus of racist discourse has at least partly shifted from people of Black Caribbean heritage to Muslim peoples whose heritage is in Pakistan and Bangladesh. In this climate, as we saw in Chapter 2, a number of visible cultural practices have come to represent the difference of Muslim Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups from the majority, including, *inter alia*, wearing ethnic dress, especially the *hijab*, participating in arranged marriages, building and attending mosques, fasting during religious periods, eating Halal meat, engaging in regular prayer, especially on Fridays, and setting up and attending Islamic schools (Parekh 2000; The Runnymede Trust 1997). From time to time there have also been sensationalised news stories of female genital mutilation and 'honour killings', both associated with Muslim communities. All of these practices have been reported in the British media in ways which emphasise the difference between Muslims and the majority British group. At the same time, such reporting has often characterised 'Muslims' as a homogeneous group, although there is in fact great diversity among British Muslims. These practices, as reported in political and media discourse, become symbols of difference between the 'White' majority and British Muslim groups (see Blackledge 2001, 2003 for examples of media and political discourse which locate some of these practices as markers of difference). As such, they are racialised cultural practices, which become metaphors for 'racial' differences which cannot now be spoken. Although the cultural practices referred to in the White Paper are not specified, ambiguity here allows speculation that they include all of the above. In fact, even in the exemplification provided here there is vagueness and ambiguity. It is not clear which

cultural practices deny women the right to participate as citizens, or who is responsible for them. However, the recontextualisation of the word 'participate' here connects this argument to those in the *Cantle Report* and in Lord Rooker's interview, and in the Executive Summary of the White Paper itself, all of which stated either implicitly or explicitly that use of, or proficiency in, the English language, was the key to participation for women. The repetition of Cantle's 'values' also links the arguments in the two documents. This recontextualisation through repetition connects the argument about discriminatory cultural practices (of, implicitly, Asian men) to the subsequent argument about language and citizenship.

This cohesive link is all the more forceful in the powerful conjunction which connects the second half of this paragraph to the first:

> Similarly, it means ensuring that every individual has the wherewithal, such as the ability to speak our common language, to enable them to engage as active citizens in economic, social and political life. And it means tackling racism, discrimination and prejudice wherever we find it. (p. 30)

The pronoun phrase ('it means') maintains the ambiguity of this paragraph. It is not clear what 'it' refers to here – possibly the Human Rights Act, or perhaps the necessity of confronting the cultural practices. Here 'ensuring' is also ambiguous, as it has the senses both of opportunity and of coercion. The phrase 'every individual' recontextualises Cantle's 'the full participation of all individuals', making a cohesive link between the texts. This link is reinforced in 'our common language', a recontextualisation of Cantle's 'common elements of nationhood'. The topos here becomes familiar, as the liberal argument that the ability to speak English enables individuals to engage in 'economic, social and political life' reworks the statement from David Blunkett's office (August 18th 2001) that understanding English was central to 'the chances of obtaining both education and employment'. The cohesive tie between this argument and the previous sentence ('basic values – such as those which deny women the right to participate as equal citizens') are emphasised in the repetition of the phrase 'such as', and the word 'citizens'. Recontextualisation by repetition here implies a link between the argument that women should not be denied 'the right to participate as citizens' and the argument that the ability to speak English enables individuals 'to engage as active citizens'. Recontextualisation by substitution (of 'participate' with 'engage' and 'active') emphasises the connection. That is, these two sentences are connected in ways which allow them to be interpreted as the *same* argument: that women are denied the right to participate in society if they do not speak English. The repetition of 'citizens'

here builds the case for 'the ability to speak English' to be linked to application for citizenship. The liberal credentials of such an argument are clinched with the *topos of equality* in the final sentence of this paragraph, as the conjunction, and repetition of the ambiguous 'it means', links the proposed requirement to speak English with the unimpeachable and unarguable determination to tackle 'racism, discrimination and prejudice'. Just as *The Cantle Report* listed acceptance of English alongside support for anti-discrimination measures, so the White Paper introduces its illiberal policy statement in a neo-liberal frame.

The question of English language testing for citizenship is picked up in the White Paper four paragraphs later:

> The Government believes we should do much more to prepare people for British citizenship, to enhance its significance and to celebrate its acquisition. Prior to the conferring of citizenship through naturalisation, we believe it is necessary for all those who are seeking long term resident status to be provided with the opportunity (where they do not already have the facility) to receive language training and to receive an easy to understand and practical guide in the form of both print and video, about Britain and its institutions relevant to an understanding of the society they are entering. For those moving towards naturalisation, the facility would need to be more structured as indicated below. For those simply living in our country, it is important that in the early stages after taking up residence, such support is readily available, including the immediate period after the granting of refugee status. (p. 31)

In this section the coexistent voices of liberalism and illiberalism are again evident in a single discourse. The liberal voice is characterised by a stated belief in celebration of citizenship and the provision of opportunity and support for naturalisation applicants. At the same time, the modality of the illiberal voice is assertive and certain: 'it is necessary', 'it is important'. Language implicitly becomes a set of necessary skills here, in which 'people' can be trained with an easy to understand and practical guide. Language is a commodity, a 'facility', which can be received, and implicitly can be sent and delivered. The position of the learner is here a passive one – language will be delivered by the government to the people, and the people will receive it. No agency is accorded to the immigrant or refugee group. They are a problem to be dealt with in a practical way.

Practical knowledge about British life or language

The section of the White Paper *Preparing people for citizenship* begins as follows:

> Becoming British through registration is – or should be – a significant life event. It can be seen as an act of commitment to Britain and an important step in the process of achieving integration into our society. Yet, in spite of this, some applicants for naturalisation do not have much practical knowledge about British life or language, possibly leaving them vulnerable and ill-equipped to take an active role in society. This can lead to social exclusion and may contribute to problems of polarisation between communities. We need to develop a sense of civic identity and shared values, and knowledge of the English language (or Welsh language or Scottish Gaelic, which are provided for in the British Nationality Act 1981), can undoubtedly support this objective. (p. 32)

There is an assumption in this discourse that the term 'Britain' carries shared, consensual meanings, and that the phrase 'our society' is equally agreed upon. As the two groups referred to in this paragraph are those who are British citizens and those who are not, the implication is clearly that society belongs to those with citizenship status. The powerful conjunction ('Yet') introduces an oppositional argument. In spite of the fact that taking British citizenship is an act of commitment to Britain and a step towards achieving integration, 'some applicants' do not have much practical knowledge about British life or language. Again, there is a presupposition of consensus about what constitutes 'British life'. In the context of the White Paper 'British language', a misnomer, may be taken to mean English, and, exceptionally, Welsh or Scottish Gaelic. Language is again reconceptualised here. Whereas previously it was a set of skills in which someone could be trained, or a commodity which someone could receive, now it is a body of knowledge which an individual can know 'about'. The Government's confused thinking about language and citizenship is evident in these reconceptualisations.

The consequences of having little knowledge about British life or language are made quite explicit. It can lead to 'social exclusion', and 'may contribute to problems of polarisation between communities'. Here the term 'polarisation' is a substitution for 'segregation', which is cited in the *Ouseley*, *Oldham* and *Burnley* reports as a major factor in the development of violence in the summer of 2001. This recontextualisation does not simply repeat the argument made in those reports: now lack of 'practical knowledge' about 'British language' is said to potentially contribute to one of the (ostensible) causes of the violence.

That is, the *topos of threat* here argues strongly that if citizenship applicants do not acquire English (or another British language) there is a threat of social disorder. This is a recontextualisation of Ann Cryer's argument in her speech to Parliament, in which she said that all members of the Asian community must gain 'some grasp of English', as 'the alternative is a Belfast-like situation'. While the language of the White Paper is less colourful, the argument is the same: either all Asian people must learn English, or there is a threat of violence in the streets. The White Paper here proposes a means of avoiding such disorder: 'We need to develop a sense of civic identity and shared values'. As elsewhere in the White Paper, the apparently inclusive 'we' is in fact exclusive here. It must be assumed that the Government believes itself to *have* a sense of civic identity. Therefore 'we' here implies 'they', as it is the people who do not have much practical knowledge of British life or language who are the other social actors here. Indeed, it is clear that as knowledge of the English language can support the sense of civic identity, it is the people who are not proficient in English who need to develop this (the strong modality of 'undoubtedly' is notable here). That is, the responsibility for preventing the polarisation of communities and possible recurrence of violence on the streets lies with those who have been in the country for the shortest period of time.

Language and democracy

The next paragraph of the White Paper adopts a still more authoritative tone:

> It is a fundamental objective of the Government that those living permanently in the UK should be able, through adequate command of the language and an appreciation of our democratic processes, to take their place fully in society. Evidence suggests that migrants who are fluent in English are, on average, 20 per cent more likely to be employed than those lacking fluency. (p. 32)

The Government states its case with authority here, as 'should be able' implies both 'must' and 'should have the opportunity'. Once again the liberal coexists with the illiberal in a single phrase. In one sense there is reference to the *requirement* that those living permanently in the UK *should* learn English; in another sense this is reference to the provision of opportunity for immigrant groups to learn English. Here 'adequate command of the language' assumes agreement that 'the language' is understood to be English (or Welsh or Scottish Gaelic). The phrase 'adequate command' is a recontextualisation of similarly vague attempts, made elsewhere in the chain of discourses, to say what 'level'

of English 'should' be acquired (in Ann Cryer's speech, 'a good level of English', 'a reasonable level' and 'some grasp'; in *Cantle* 'the use of the English language' and 'universal acceptance'; in *The Guardian*'s report of David Blunkett's actual statement, 'a working knowledge'; in the Home Secretary's actual statement, 'understanding English', and in the existing legislation, 'sufficient knowledge'). The differences between these various definitions of required or desired proficiency in English imply some confusion on the part of those who would propose a language requirement for citizenship applicants. The conjunction linking 'adequate command of English' with 'an appreciation of our democratic processes' identifies an ideological position: speaking English is associated with an appreciation of 'our' (British?) democratic processes. By implication, then, failure to acquire English is associated with undemocratic process. That is, proficiency in Asian languages rather than English can be said to be undemocratic. The final clause in this sentence is replete with presupposition ('to take their place fully in society'). Through learning English adequately, and appreciating our democracy, immigrants will be able to take their place in society. It is not clear what 'their' place is. Certainly there are many British citizens who have gained a more than adequate (by any definition) command of English, and who have a profound appreciation of democratic process, who find that their place in society is largely determined by discriminatory practices in employment, housing, education and other social institutions.

In the next section of this paragraph the topos of authority legitimates arguments in favour of language testing for citizenship in two ways: through reference to existing legislation in Britain, and with reference to current requirements in other countries:

> There is already a requirement in the British Nationality Act 1981 that applicants for naturalisation should have a sufficient command of a recognised British language, but this is not really enforced in practice. It is simply assumed, unless there is evidence to the contrary. The administration of language tests as part of the naturalisation process exists in a number of countries including France, Germany, Australia and Canada. (p. 32–33)

Here the voice of the White Paper adopts the argument previously rehearsed by Ann Cryer, although the list of countries here is slightly different (Ann Cryer referred to 'the United States of America, Canada and the Netherlands'). The argumentation strategy in the first two sentences of this section make the case that 'because this is already the law, it should be implemented'. The apparently common-sense logic of this paragraph is authoritatively reinforced with reference to legal process. The argument here resides in what Bourdieu (2000: 94)

calls "genesis amnesia", or "law is law, and nothing more". That is, in order to win the argument it is sufficient to quote the law. It is not necessary to say why the law came into being. Nor is it necessary for anyone to remember *why* it came into being. To say that it *is* the law is sufficient.

The certification of language

In the next paragraph of the White Paper the Government sets out how it proposes to distinguish those who have reached an acceptable standard of English to become British citizens from those who have not:

> In order to promote both the importance of an adequate command of English (or one of the recognised languages) and an understanding of British society, the Government intends to require applicants to demonstrate that they have achieved a certain standard. We envisage that, subject to certain limited exceptions, applicants would need to produce certificates showing that they had passed a test, if necessary after taking part in a suitable course. (p. 33)

Here the Government indicates its intentions, recontextualising the verb used by Lord Rooker ('do we require people to learn English') and Ann Cryer ('requirement for them to take a full-time English course'), legitimating their argument in a more authoritative and official context. As before, the level of English proficiency required of citizenship applicants by the Government is vague. The phrase 'a certain standard' is uncertain and non-specific. Perhaps because it is aware of its own ambiguity, or because it senses its critics, the authorial voice now becomes less assertive. The Government's intention is mitigated to 'We envisage', and the subjunctive mood replaces the assertive modality of the previous sentence. Here the Government's voice appears to be aware of the presence of the opposition voice, and so becomes more tentative than before.[1] That is, the White Paper is here double-voiced, as it both states the intention of the Government and senses the voice of its critics. Bakhtin (1973: 163) described this as internal polemic, in which: "The word is intensely aware of the presence alongside it of another person's word speaking about the same object, and that awareness determines its structure". Here the oppositional voice is barely present. Yet in the context of the chain of discourses in this debate, the shift of modality in the authorial voice indicates an uncertainty born of critical engagement.

What is the Government tentative about here? The only new proposal is for applicants to be required to 'produce certificates'. The 1981 British Nation-

ality Act already required citizenship applicants to demonstrate that they had 'sufficient knowledge' of English. The introduction of a requirement for certificates is new, and is therefore proposed with less certainty. The *certificate* has a symbolic role in the manifestation of the State's power to ratify or invalidate the apparently arbitrary and vaguely determined 'command of English'. Just as the birth certificate indicates an identity, or the passport determines a nationality, the proposed English language proficiency certificate appears to be the symbolic demonstration of the State's legitimation of certain skills. In Britain the current debate about the introduction of identity cards is based around the Government's power to impose legitimacy. Bourdieu points out that through such symbolic means the Government has the power to put an end to argument about who is 'legitimate' and who is not. It is worth quoting Bourdieu's point at length:

> While the State reserves for its directly mandated agents this power of legitimate distribution and redistribution of identities through the consecration of persons or things (with deeds of ownership, for example), it may delegate derived forms of it, such as the *certificate*, academic or medical, of aptitude, incapacity, invalidity, etc., a recognised social power giving legitimate access, entitlement, to advantages or privileges, or the *diagnosis*, a clinical act of scientific identification which may be endowed with legal efficacy through the prescription and play a part in the social distribution of privileges, by establishing a social frontier, the one which distinguishes a category of beneficiaries. (Bourdieu 2000: 187)

Symbolic indications of identities and positions in society are only legitimate because they are misrecognised as such. That is, they have no intrinsic value or status unless there is consensus that they do. Yet the process of symbolic violence constructs a world which is divided along social frontiers: some are legitimate, others are not; some are citizens, others are not. In most cases the award of a certificate is reward for effort or achievement. In the discourse of the White Paper the Government implies that it will award certificates to those who 'have achieved a certain standard'. However, the certificate here is not simply reward. To be able to produce the certificate brings further rewards, but to fail to do so risks social exclusion. That is, the very word 'certificate' is here double-voiced, and ambiguous. As reward for endeavour it is a liberal notion. As punishment for failing or refusing to learn English to a certain standard, it is deeply illiberal. The certificate is the means by which the State imposes a "magical frontier" (Bourdieu 2000: 169) between those chosen to be citizens and those who are refused.

The legal authority of discriminatory argument

In the next section of the White Paper, the specific proposal for legislative change in relation to language and citizenship is articulated:

> We envisage these requirements extending to the spouses of applicants who are married to British citizens and British Dependent or Overseas Territories citizens who are not at present subject to the language requirement. The Government is concerned that everyone should be able to take a full and active part in British society. We do not think it is sufficient simply to rely on a spouse's knowledge of the language. (p. 34)

In fact this is the key change to existing legislation in relation to language and citizenship proposed in the White Paper. While the previous paragraph stated that 'the Government intends to require applicants to demonstrate that they have achieved a certain standard', this requirement was already enshrined in the *British Nationality Act* (1981). In the proposal here, this requirement, previously waived for spouses of applicants who are married to British citizens, will be extended to include them. This constitutes a direct and apparently logical recontextualisation of Ann Cryer's argument in her speech to the House of Commons on 17th July 2001. This argument explicitly linked the violence in the streets of northern England to the tradition of 'bringing wives and husbands from the sub-continent who have often had no education and have no English'. This argument was recontextualised and reiterated as it moved along the chain of discourses in the period between Ann Cryer's speech in the summer of 2001 and the publication of the White Paper in February 2002. In Chapter 8 I will discuss in more detail the question of whether 'spouses' in this discourse refers to women rather than both women and men.

Integration with diversity

In October 2002 the Home Secretary, David Blunkett, wrote an article which was published on the Foreign Policy Centre[2] website. It set out his vision of democracy, citizenship and civil society (*Foreign Policy Centre* 2002). The article was published during the month preceding the award of Royal Assent to the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* 2002. That is, the chain of discourses with which this volume has been concerned had reached the point at which the arguments were no longer negotiable. If the debate still continued, there was less need than ever for the Secretary of State to listen to dissenting

voices. Papers were being prepared, and the Bill was about to pass into law. In this context, it was possible for the Home Secretary to write from a less constrained perspective than otherwise he might. In the article he set out his views on citizenship:

> An active concept of citizenship can articulate shared ground between diverse communities. It offers a shared identity based on membership of a political community, rather than forced assimilation into a monoculture, or an unbridled multiculturalism which privileges difference over community cohesion. It is what the White Paper *Secure Borders, Safe Haven* called "integration with diversity." (p. 6)

The repetition of 'shared' in the first two sentences of this section of the article frames the discourse in a liberal context. 'Shared ground' and 'shared identity' promise a solution to the apparent problems of diverse communities. David Blunkett claims that 'an active concept of citizenship' provides a desirable alternative to the equally negative options of 'forced assimilation' and 'unbridled multiculturalism'. In the phrase 'forced assimilation' David Blunkett's discourse senses its opponents, and attempts to deal with them by distancing itself from any accusation that his proposals force minority groups to leave behind their own culture as they are required to assimilate to the host society. The discourse here implies that of course, the Home Secretary would never *force* anyone to assimilate to British society.

While 'assimilation' is here held to belong to illiberalism, 'integration' is characterised as desirable and legitimate. The legitimacy of 'integration' is re-established here with reference to the White Paper – effectively, David Blunkett is claiming authority for his view because he has said it before in a different, and more officially recognised, context. In this paragraph the phrase 'unbridled multiculturalism' carries with it a world of history. Although the sense of 'multiculturalism' is usually positive, denoting an affirmative orientation to diversity in societies, here the pejorative adjective insists that 'multiculturalism' is negative. Now 'multiculturalism', associated with liberal education in Britain in the 1970s and 1980s, either threatens to go, or has gone, too far. That is, the topos of abuse dictates that multiculturalism should be stopped. The adjective 'unbridled' implies that if it is allowed to do so, multiculturalism will create a turbulent, uncontrolled world.[3] In this oppositional discourse, the positive interpretation of diversity is held to privilege difference over community cohesion, as if this were a simple, mutually exclusive dichotomy. It is interesting to note that the other pejorative usage of the term 'multiculturalism' in this chain of discourse was in the representations of the ultra-Right British National

Party to the Oldham Review: 'The British National Party met us and argued that multiculturalism has never worked'. There is little daylight here between David Blunkett's view of multiculturalism and that of the explicitly racist political party. In the Home Secretary's view, you can't have *both* an acceptance and understanding of people from different cultural groups, *and* community cohesion. In the chain of discourses examined here, 'community cohesion' means an end to violence on the streets. That is, in a topos of threat, 'unbridled multiculturalism' should be stopped because it will lead inevitably to social disorder. Here again is an example of 'double-voiced discourse': supporters of 'multiculturalism' are dismissed with a pejorative adjective which brooks no argument, and insists that it has all gone too far.

'People must be free'

The Home Secretary continues his discourse on the rights and duties of citizenship:

> The starting point for an active concept of citizenship must be a set of basic rights and duties. Respect for cultural difference has limits, marked out by fundamental human rights and duties. Some of these boundaries are very clear, such as in the examples of forced marriage or female circumcision (more accurately described as female genital mutilation, for that is what it is). These practices are clearly incompatible with our basic values – an observation which went unremarked in the first edition of my book, but one for which I was later vilified! However, other issues are less clear, and it is for democratic politics to resolve disagreement and find solutions. (p. 6)

Much of this paragraph rehearses the discourses previously introduced in similar forms earlier in the textual chain. An 'active concept of citizenship' has been introduced in the White Paper ('active citizens'), while assumed 'values' are recontextualised from both *Cantle* ('these new values') and the White Paper ('values that British citizens should share'). The 'rights and responsibilities' suggested in *Cantle* here become 'rights and duties'. That is, David Blunkett travels the well-trodden road of quasi-liberalism, invoking a presupposed consensus about what is assumed by rights, duties and citizenship. The clause 'Respect for cultural difference has limits' appears to reiterate the argument of the previous paragraph, now supported with reference to the authoritative 'fundamental human rights and duties'. The phrase 'human rights and duties' is ambiguous, as it implies *both* the unarguable value of 'human rights' *and* an assumed consensus about which 'rights and duties' are essential for British

citizenship. Here 'cultural differences' and 'These practices' cohesively link to the 'cultural practices' of the White Paper. The cultural practices referred to by the Home Secretary include frequently recurring symbols of Islamophobic discourse, 'forced marriage' and 'female circumcision'. In none of the reports into community cohesion analysed in previous chapters did these issues appear to be of concern to the residents of Burnley, Oldham or Bradford. However, they appear in the Home Secretary's discourse as an addition to the debate. Just as the White Paper linked such cultural practices to 'the ability to speak our common language', so David Blunkett goes on to discuss the ability or inability of new migrants to speak English, introduced here in the vague and ambiguous 'other issues'. Before discussing the importance of the English language in becoming a citizen, he takes an exclamatory sideswipe at those who have previously vilified him, and may vilify him again. The exclamation mark here does ideological work, mocking David Blunkett's critics for missing out on the first opportunity to criticise him, and dismissing critics of his unimpeachable views. The exclamation mark is sure of itself, confident that the reader/audience will share in its point of view. Finally in this paragraph, the text links to what is to come, introducing issues which are 'less clear', and which may be resolved by 'democratic politics'. Once again the voice of the text invokes the liberal principles which frame so much of this chain of discourses about immigration and citizenship:

> Citizenship should be about shared participation, from the neighbourhood to national elections. That is why we must strive to connect people from different backgrounds, tackle segregation, and overcome mutual hostility and ignorance. Of course, one factor in this is the ability of new migrants to speak English – otherwise they cannot get good jobs, or share in wider social debate.

The familiar terms of the debate recur here: 'active', 'citizenship', 'participation'. The imperative to 'tackle segregation', and 'overcome mutual hostility and ignorance' is again liberal in its orientation. These are some of the aspects of the social conditions in Burnley, Bradford and Oldham which contributed to the context in which violence became possible in 2001. However, the following sentence, beginning with a marker of presupposition ('Of course') which creates and assumes consensus, links segregation, hostility and ignorance with 'the ability of new migrants to learn English'. Although the second half of the sentence mitigates the assertion with the topos of advantage, which suggests that new migrants ought to learn to speak English for their own good, the connection to hostility and ignorance is clearly made.

'It helps overcome the schizophrenia'

The next section of David Blunkett's article is intensely dialogic, engaging with an opposition which is implicitly present:

> I have never said, or implied, that lack of fluency in English was in any way directly responsible for the disturbances in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham in the summer of 2001. However, speaking English enables parents to converse with their children in English, as well as their historic mother tongue at home and to participate in wider modern culture. It helps overcome the schizophrenia which bedevils generational relationships. In as many as 30% of Asian British households, according to the recent citizenship survey, English is not spoken at home. But let us be clear that the lack of English fluency did not cause the riots.

The first sentence of this paragraph either responds to, or anticipates, its opposition. This is what Bakhtin (1973: 163) termed "hidden dialogicality", a single utterance which has the character of the dialogue of two people in which the speeches of the second are omitted:

> The second interlocutor is invisibly present, his words are absent, but the profound traces of those words determine all of the first interlocutor's words. Although only one person is speaking, we feel that this is a conversation, and a most intense one at that, since every word that is present answers and reacts with its every fibre to the invisible interlocutor, it points outside itself, beyond its own borders to the other person's unspoken word.

David Blunkett is arguing robustly against an invisible opposition. As we have seen, in the chain of discourse leading to the drafting of the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act*, lack of fluency in English *is* discursively linked to the violence. Of significance here is the word 'directly'. If lack of fluency in English was not *directly* responsible for the rioting, the possibility, and even the implication, remains that it was therefore *indirectly* responsible. The connective 'However' at the beginning of the next sentence does ideological work: far from rejecting the suggestion that lack of fluency in English caused the street violence, a cohesive connection is established between that idea and what is to come. In fact this sentence raises the question of which languages are, or should be, spoken at home by Asian parents. Here 'speaking English' seems to mean the ability to speak English as well as actual use of English. In this sentence 'historic' is oppositional to 'modern', creating a tension between

Asian languages and 'wider modern culture', which is presumably British. That is, Asian languages are linked to that which is narrow, and perhaps narrow-minded, archaic and out of date. The pronoun introducing the next sentence refers to 'speaking English', again with the sense of both proficiency and use. Speaking English at home, and the *ability* to speak English, can prevent 'the schizophrenia which bedevils generational relationships'. The definite article lends authority here: there is a presupposition that 'schizophrenia' is a recognised and agreed phenomenon for people who speak minority languages at home. The verb 'bedevils' adds a sinister note, implying evil. The implication is clear: a failure to speak English, and to learn English, is linked to mental health problems and family disharmony. This sentence is cohesively linked to the previous two, and is still governed by the connective 'However'. As such, not only is a failure to speak English the cause of mental and domestic disorder; it is also a factor in the outbreak of social disorder. This paragraph is semantically linked to the previous one: the ability, or inability, of new migrants to speak English is associated with segregation, ignorance and hostility.

'Political correctness' and the politics of despair

In the next section of his article, David Blunkett introduces a notion which appeared on several occasions in the chain of discourses which led to the legislative change relating to language testing for citizenship applicants – that of 'political correctness'. Although the article does not use this term, it is implicit in the Home Secretary's statement:

> It is vital that the Left doesn't inhibit debate on these issues. Where people feel silenced, they turn to the politics of despair. We should embrace debate on citizenship, and make change happen in our communities, rather than just the statute book. If the Left fails to offer real solutions to these issues, the Right will step into the gap.

Here David Blunkett argues that 'the Left' inhibits debate. He does not say how this process occurs, but it is a recognisable argument, which refers to more explicit versions of the same in other contexts. That is, David Blunkett recontextualises the argument that 'the Left' prevents people from speaking honestly and openly about problems in society, preferring such debate to be coded in 'politically correct', inoffensive language. David Blunkett's argument here rests on a presupposed understanding that it is a concern with 'political correctness' that prevents open discussion of solutions to problems in communities. Although he would once certainly have been included in this category,

David Blunkett refers to 'the Left' as if they are the cause of increasing support for extreme Right-wing parties in Britain. It is not clear who he means by 'the Left', but ambiguity allows the category to be broadly interpreted. Fairclough (2003d) makes the point that critics of political correctness often refer to diverse groups of people as if they constituted a homogeneous movement. Moreover, the category is used pejoratively to position particular speakers and discourses as extreme, and worthless. Nor is it a category chosen by those so identified:

> 'Political correctness', and being 'politically correct' are, in the main, identifications imposed upon people by their political opponents.
>
> (Fairclough 2003d: 21)

Fairclough argues convincingly that the critique of political correctness has been successful because the politically correct movement has left itself open to accusations of arrogance, self-righteousness and Puritanism, and has caused widespread resentment. Fairclough further suggests that, like most successful ideologies, such critiques contain some truth. Indeed, I would go further, to argue that a common response to 'politically correct' language is one of mockery, and a consensual nod and a wink. What I want to suggest with reference to the chain of discourses relating to language testing and citizenship, however, is that the critique of 'political correctness' has been appropriated and transformed across a broad spectrum of opinion as a catch-all category which is used to marginalise liberal argument, to apportion blame where it is not due, to misdirect discussion, and to isolate discourse from its cultural context.

The marginalisation of liberal argument is exemplified in the *Lancashire Evening Telegraph* article of 7th September 2000, which reported the immoderate views of Councillor Harry Brooks as he called for an end to funding of translation services in Burnley (see Chapter 3):

> He expected the knee-jerk, politically-correct, party hack accusations of racism which a motion like his would provoke.

Here not only Councillor Brooks, but also the local newspaper, appropriates and recontextualises the term 'politically-correct' to head off its opposition. The Councillor's argument rests on a presupposed understanding that anything 'politically-correct' is necessarily based on pedantic, woolly neoliberalism, and can be ignored or derided. The same phrase is used to similar purpose in Ann Cryer's speech to the House of Commons in July 2001 (see Chapter 4), as she speaks of her:

> fear of verbal abuse from the so-called leaders among the Asian community and the politically correct whites. Following my experiences in the past few days, I can say that the thought police are alive and well in Bradford.
>
> (Hansard 2001)

Here Ann Cryer's discourse senses its opposition, and condemns it to the margins in the sweeping phrases 'so-called leaders' and 'politically correct whites'. If leaders are only 'so-called', they need not be taken seriously; if 'whites' are 'politically correct', they can safely be ignored and set to one side. In an intertextual allusion ('thought police') to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, George Orwell's fictional vision of a futuristic world dominated by the State as 'Big Brother', Ann Cryer here links political correctness to something more sinister than neoliberalism. There is a clear sense that the 'politically correct' lobby sets out to control discourse and debate.

Recontextualisation of the critique of 'political correctness' does not necessarily always use this specific term. The official reports into the background to the disturbances in the streets of Burnley, Bradford and Oldham speak of 'fear of challenging wrong-doing because of being labelled "racist"' (*Ouseley Report* 2001: 1), and 'Some white people have complained that they are unable to complain or raise issues without being branded racist' (*Burnley Task Force* 2001: 51). These representations of the voices of respondents indicate a broad consensus that political correctness is influential in the cultural politics of communities. The more official and authoritative authorial discourse of *The Cantle Report*, however, recontextualises these voices in an apparently liberal frame:

> In our anxiety to eliminate the forms of insulting behaviour and language, we have created a situation in which most people are now unwilling to open any subject which might possibly lead to uncomfortable differences of opinion. In this lies a big danger. If neighbours are unable to discuss differences, they have no hope of understanding them. Those who wish to cause trouble then have a fruitful field in which to operate. (*The Cantle Report* 2001: 20)

The argument here is similar to that in David Blunkett's article for the *Foreign Policy Centre*: that (at least part of) the blame for the segregation of communities and lack of social cohesion lies with the politically correct lobby who prevent communication between 'neighbours'. There is no doubt some truth in this, as a common concern is lack of communication between groups. However, this discourse is disconnected from its cultural context, in which there are many factors at work in creating the conditions for segregation and violence, including the activity of ultra-Right political groups. Just as in David Blunkett's article, *The Cantle Report* proposes that people's fear of being politically

incorrect creates a space into which the ultra-Right can move. This argument, like the one which states that immigration should be stopped because it causes racial tension, is based on a fallacious conclusion, or *'argumentum at consequentiam'* (Wodak 2001:74). No evidence is offered in either case to support the apparently logical conclusion that the anxiety of the liberal Left about terminology will inevitably lead to the growth of the ultra-Right. However, in both instances the case is confidently asserted.

Lord Rooker, speaking in the House of Lords shortly after the events of Summer 2001, was equally confident in his critique of political correctness as he pointed out that 'Asians are not a homogeneous group':

> Their religions come from an absolutely different standpoint. Lumping people together is a big mistake, particularly when we white leaders do it because we think it is politically correct. Going along with political correctness is part of the cause of the problem. (Hansard 19th July 2001)

It is a little difficult to unpick the ambiguity of Lord Rooker's speech, as it is not clear how 'lumping people together' could really be described as 'politically correct'. However, in another *argumentum at consequentiam*, political correctness is again cited as 'part of the cause of the problem', where the 'problem' is the segregation of societies, lack of social cohesion and violence in the streets. Again, 'political correctness' appears to be a convenient and uncontroversial scapegoat. The critique of political correctness extends beyond the discourse of the Labour government, however. In the following instance it is appropriated by Nick Griffin, the leader of the racist, ultra-Right British National Party, to support his justification of racial inequality:

> Mankind is divided into races, and those races, while sharing many common features of humanity, are innately different in many ways beyond mere colour. Despite the propaganda of neo-Marxist academic and media prostitutes, and the cowardice of conservatives who dare not stand up to the totalitarian bullying of Political Correctness, this is a fact.
>
> (http://www.bnp.org.uk/articles/race_reality.htm. 21st November 2003)

The British National Party includes frequent (57 on their website as of 21st November 2003) references to 'political correctness' as the cause of the problems inherent in the 'multicultural experiment' of Britain. The fallacious use of the term is not altogether different from the use of the same term by David Blunkett, Lord Rooker and *The Cantle Report*. In each of these links in the chain of discourse, 'political correctness' is said to be to blame for allowing the development of a society which is either too segregated (Blunkett/Rooker/Cantle) or too multicultural (Blunkett/Griffin). In the discourse surrounding social

cohesion and segregation in Britain, both liberal and extremist voices appropriate and recontextualise the critique of political correctness for their purposes. Since such a critique is a central plank of BNP argument and ideology, the British Government should perhaps consider whether it is desirable to lie with such strange bedfellows. The critique of political correctness is too neat and tidy a conclusion to complex questions about language and citizenship. The citizenship issue should be debated within its cultural, historical and political context, and the role of discourse in structuring the debate should be fully recognised and discussed. Only then can the critique of 'politically correct' language be addressed. As it is, there is disturbing synchronicity in the simplistic appropriation of this discourse by Government and ultra-Right alike.

The *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act*

On 7th November 2002 the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* received Royal Assent, and passed into law. The Act extends the requirement to demonstrate sufficient knowledge of English (or Welsh or Scottish Gaelic) to those applying for naturalisation on the basis of marriage. That is, following the passing into law of the Act language testing requirements extend to the spouses of applicants who are married to British citizens. For all applicants, including spouses of British citizens, the Act adds a requirement that applicants should demonstrate "sufficient knowledge about life in the United Kingdom" (1, 1, (ca)). The Act further legislates to extend the powers of the Secretary of State to test applicants' knowledge of English (or Welsh or Scottish Gaelic), and their knowledge of life in the United Kingdom. These are set out in terms of new regulations which refer to:

- possession of a specified qualification
- possession of a qualification of a specified kind
- attendance on a specified course
- attendance on a course of a specified kind
- a specified level of achievement
- a person designated by the Secretary of State to determine sufficiency of knowledge in specified circumstances
- enable the Secretary of State to accept a qualification of a specified kind as evidence of sufficient knowledge of a language

The Home Office *Summary of Contents of the Act* explains that it:

– Places more emphasis on applicants having a knowledge of the language (English, Welsh or Scottish Gaelic)

The *Explanatory Notes* to the Act offer the following gloss:

> The provisions require those who apply for naturalisation as a British citizen to have sufficient knowledge about life in the United Kingdom; allow for regulations to be made which would specify how this requirement – and the existing requirement in relation to knowledge of English, Welsh or Scottish Gaelic – is to be met; extend the language requirement to those applying for naturalisation as the spouse of a British citizen or a British overseas territories citizen

It is in the extension of the language requirement to the spouses of existing British citizens that the law changed in relation to language testing for citizenship applicants.

The consecration of language

Bourdieu (1977) proposes that the law symbolically consecrates structures of power relations between groups. In the present example, the law is extended to institute differential relations of power between citizenship applicants who are able to fulfil certain language requirements, and those who are either unable or unwilling to do so. However, Bourdieu goes further than this in his analysis, arguing that while the law adds its specific symbolic force to the ongoing mechanisms and misrecognitions which render it unnecessary to constantly legitimate social distinctions through force, it is not in the law itself that such legitimation principally occurs. Rather, the law records existing structures of power in a form that makes them eternal and universal, rendering more visible the structuring structures which for the most part remain hidden. In the present case, it is not only the introduction of the legislation itself that contributes to the reproduction of iniquitous structures of power, but the discourse generated by the debate leading to the legislation, which produces and reproduces a commonsense world in which speakers of minority Asian languages in Britain appear to be responsible for social segregation.

Having said this, it is clear that the introduction of new legislation belongs to the category of 'official acts of discourse' which are symbolically effective only because they are accomplished in a situation of authority by 'officials' who act with the authority of the state:

> The sentence of the judge or the grade of the professor, the procedures of official registration, certified reports or minutes, all the acts meant to carry legal effect, such as certificates of birth, marriage or death etc., all manners of public summons as performed with the required formalities by the appropriate agents (judges, notaries, bailiffs, officers of *etat civil*) and duly registered in the appropriate office, all these facts invoke the logic of official nomination to institute socially guaranteed identities (as citizen, legal resident, voter, taxpayer, parent, property owner) as well as legitimate unions and groupings (families, associations, trade unions, parties etc.). By stating with authority what a being (thing or person) is in truth (verdict) according to its socially legitimate definition, that is, what she or he is authorised to be, what they have a right (and duty) to be, the social being that they may claim, the state wields a genuinely *creative*, quasi-divine power. (Bourdieu 1998b: 52)

In such official acts of discourse the state accords legitimate definition to existing structures and practices. The extension of the Home Secretary's powers to test the English language proficiency of applicants for citizenship enables him (or his representative in the form of a notary or teacher) to state with authority that the applicant is or is not socially legitimate, and is (or is not) accorded a socially guaranteed identity as a citizen.

The law is only one feature of the powerful public discourse which constitutes the production of the social arena, but its distinctiveness is to be found in its non-negotiable materiality. The judgement of law is the least negotiable judgement, guaranteed as it is by the power of the state. Bourdieu suggests that the state institutes a kind of "national common sense" (1998b: 54) which inculcates common forms of perception, understanding and memory. In this way the structures of the state reproduce a common, shared belief that things are as they are because that is as they should be. The universal point of view ("doxa" – Bourdieu 1998b: 57) holds sway precisely because it is the universal point of view. However, as I have already suggested, it is not only in the mechanism of the state that language ideologies are constituted. Nor are other public (e.g. political and media) discourses the only sites of the production of language ideologies. Rather, language ideologies are frequently reproduced in private and semi-private interactions which position speakers of minority Asian languages as inferior or deficient. Linguistic minority speakers are frequently able (or forced) to negotiate identity positions precisely at the interface between the public/ideological and the private/interactional dimensions. When identity positions are contested there may or may not be room for negotiation. It is clear that when an applicant for naturalisation is turned down on the basis that their English is not sufficient to become a citizen, there is no

room for negotiation in the short term, as a non-negotiable identity is imposed by the state. However, in order to understand the ways in which linguistic minority speakers respond to the dominant ideology constituted in the chain of discourse surrounding the extension of citizenship language testing, it is necessary to adopt a methodology which goes beyond analysis of public discourse. Identity positions may be contested when certain identity options are imposed or devalued, and others are unavailable or misunderstood. Negotiation is a logical outcome of unequal identity options. However, it cannot be assumed that all linguistic minority speakers will negotiate identities in similar ways. Analysis of the negotiation of identities in a multilingual society which values one language at the expense of others requires a methodology which elicits detailed and sustained empirical work on non-textual processes and relationships, and acknowledges the interpretations of linguistic minority speakers themselves. This can be achieved through a combination of ethnography with linguistics and linguistically sensitive discourse analysis, which focuses on the intersection of communicative practice with social and cultural process (UK Linguistic Ethnography Forum 2004). Excellent examples of minority language speakers negotiating (or attempting to negotiate) identity positions in multilingual societies across the world have recently demonstrated the value of the 'negotiation of identities' framework (see the several studies collected in Pavlenko & Blackledge 2004b). In each of these studies the authors share an understanding that while agency and choice are crucial features of identity positioning, identities are often contested, and many individuals find themselves in tension between their chosen identities and others' attempts to position them differently. Heller (2005) makes the point that multilingual practices only make sense when connected to processes of structuration across time and space. In the present volume my aim is to identify the ways in which discriminatory language ideologies come into being, and in doing so potentially diminish identity options for linguistic minority speakers. In the analysis presented here a language ideological debate which began in the apparently absurd notion that social disorder and civil unrest are linked to, if not caused by, some groups' use and knowledge of Asian languages rather than English, has been transformed into new legislation which requires all applicants for British citizenship to prove that they have sufficient knowledge of the language of the dominant host group.

Chapter 8

Discourse, power and the multilingual world

In the course of this volume I have suggested that a language ideological debate in the British political arena underwent transformations as it moved along a chain of discourse. In this process some elements of the debate were substituted and rearranged, while others were deleted altogether, and yet others added at a late stage. Further, the salient arguments in the debate gained legitimacy as they were reiterated in increasingly authoritative contexts, for example in Parliament, and in increasingly authoritative voices, for example that of the Home Secretary. These arguments were usually presented as liberal discourses which promoted equality and social justice. However, in a detailed analysis of the discourse strategies and linguistic means and realisations at work in these arguments we find illiberalism masquerading as liberalism. Discriminatory argument is often disguised as egalitarian argument, allowing politicians to articulate both discriminatory and emancipatory discourses even in the same utterance, thus appealing to liberal and illiberal sides of the debate. The analysis set out in Chapters 3 to 7 identifies in some detail the discourse strategies and linguistic means by which political text is able to speak with two voices in the same utterance, and by which argument is transformed as it travels along discursive chains. However, this is not all that needs to be said. While finally it is not possible to know the effect of politicians' utterances on the social world at large, let alone on individuals in particular, we need to do more than map the extent of discriminatory discourse. Rather, such an analysis may be illuminated by locating it in the context of a theoretical framework in which relations of power in society are viewed in terms of the response of the individual. It is for this reason that I return to the notion of symbolic violence, established in the theoretical framework of Bourdieu (1990).

Multilingualism and symbolic domination

In the linguistic market-place power relations exist which mean that all speakers do not start out equal. Rather, in multilingual societies some speakers are

able to activate linguistic capital which enables them to gain access to powerful social domains, while others activate linguistic capital which enables them to gain access to domains which offer less tangible rewards in terms of economic and social mobility. This is not, as is sometimes suggested, a question of 'more' or 'less' linguistic capital, but of different linguistic capital having different power in different domains. For example, if a Sylheti-speaking woman in Britain needs to speak to her child's English-speaking teacher about the child's progress at school, she is unlikely to do so successfully as long as the school remains an English-only institution. The linguistic minority speaker, who may also be multilingual, may be unable to activate her symbolic capital because the language of the school is not her language (see Blackledge 2000 for extended analysis of such an example). What I want to suggest here is that the dominance of English in such an interaction (which in fact may not even be an interaction if the Sylheti-speaker decides not to approach the English-only school) is not inevitable. Instead, it is a dominance constructed out of what Bourdieu (2000: 172) terms the "structuring structures", the acts of dominance and submission which create a social and linguistic environment in which some languages, and the speakers of those languages, are superior to other languages and the speakers of those languages. In Bourdieu's model this symbolic domination is set up not only through the coercion exercised by the dominator, but also through the consent given by the dominated. The consent to domination by the dominated is significant because it is in this process that domination comes to appear natural. When structuring structures are uncontested, their rightness and validity appear to go without question. However, Bourdieu makes the point that this consensus is not a voluntary servitude, or a conscious, deliberate act. Rather, it is a response to the constant and repetitive instances of discursive acts which reproduce the social order and give "an illusory representation with all the appearances of being grounded in reality" (2000: 181).

In the face of such constant acts of recognition and misrecognition, linguistic minority speakers and majority language speakers alike come to understand that the majority language is superior, and that it is only natural that those who do not speak English find it difficult to gain access to certain markets, including the educational system, the judicial system, and welfare rights institutions. The Sylheti-speaking woman who wants to discuss her child's progress with the teacher may be unable to do so because she believes that her English is insufficient for the purpose. She may find the prospect embarrassing or even shameful if she has to struggle to find the appropriate words, and the collective misrecognition of English as the most (or perhaps the only) important language means

that she is unable to demand an appropriate interpreter. Of course, in Britain as elsewhere, many schools do provide access to interpreters with appropriate linguistic resources – but the situation I describe here is far from uncommon (see Blackledge 2000). Analysis of such an interaction must include questions about how it is that in a relatively liberal, multilingual democracy, those who do not share the linguistic resources of the majority come to be subject to socially acceptable discrimination.

Many of the collective acts of recognition and misrecognition which structure the social order occur in day-to-day interactions at the local level. At the same time, consensus is produced and reproduced in public discourse. In the chain of discourses analysed in the preceding chapters of this volume, political discourse is able to contribute to consensual reality at least partly because discriminatory argument is framed in liberal contexts. When explicit discrimination is no longer acceptable, it masquerades as liberalism and appears instead in an implicit form. It is for this reason that when Ann Cryer proposes English language tests as an entry clearance requirement for 'husbands and wives who seek permanent settlement', she does so in the context of suggesting that such a policy would bring about greater equality in society. It is also for this reason that the Home Secretary frames his illiberal proposals for an extension to language testing legislation in the context of an argument for greater participation of minority groups in society. As we have seen in the course of this volume, the chain of discourses in this debate is extensive. Illiberal discourses which are framed in liberal argument are particularly powerful practices in the political struggle to impose the legitimate version of the social world. They are powerful because they are difficult to contest. Any argument which contradicts them also potentially contradicts their liberal elements. Thus they accumulate in what Bourdieu calls "the form of a symbolic capital of notoriety and respectability, which gives the authority to impose the legitimate knowledge of the *sense* of the social world" (2000: 185). Illiberal discourses which masquerade as liberal discourses contribute to the production and reproduction of consensus which appears to be 'common-sense', while in fact including discriminatory practices.

Practical knowledge and linguistic resources

For Bourdieu, "practical knowledge" is the knowledge inscribed in the bodies of social agents by past experiences. This knowledge is located in systems of schemes and perception, appreciation and action:

> These systems of schemes and perception, appreciation and action enable them to perform acts of practical knowledge, based on the identification and recognition of conditional, conventional stimuli to which they are predisposed to react; and, without any explicit definition of ends or rational calculation of means, to generate appropriate and endlessly renewed strategies, but within the limits of the structural constraints of which they are the product and which define them. (Bourdieu 2000: 138)

That is to say, practical knowledge is the bodily means by which habitus is performed in the social world. In this sense it is the manifestation of the interaction between habitus and that social world:

> And when habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a 'fish in water': it does not feel the weight of the water, and it takes the world about itself for granted. (Bourdieu & Wacqant 1992: 127)

Practical knowledge may be described as having a 'feel for the game' without really knowing how or why one has a feel for the game. The rules of the game were learned as part of the dispositions of the habitus. All is well in the "almost miraculous encounter between the habitus and a field" (Bourdieu 1990: 66), in the relation between habitus and social world, as long as social actors have a 'feel for the game', or are as 'fish in water'. If social worlds are constituted by the more powerful groups ('white', male, middle-class, English-dominant, heterosexual, able-bodied), the social agents who will feel most at home in those worlds are likely to be those who share these characteristics. In the case of the discussion central to this volume, however, citizenship applicants are on the whole unlikely to share these attributes. Rather, almost by definition, the habitus of an applicant for citizenship is likely to have been inscribed through the dispositions of a culture (or 'life') other than 'British', and in a language other than English (or other British languages). The question then raised is: Does the Government's legislative change in the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* create the conditions in which it is more or less likely that the 'practical knowledge' of citizenship applicants will benefit those applicants? The common-sense answer runs as follows: Yes, the immigrant groups will learn English, because the consequences of not doing so will mean that they will not be able to acquire British citizenship. Learning English will be good for them, as they will be able to find work and economic stability, and it will be good for society as a whole, as greater integration and equality will be achieved. In the process of becoming more integrated their habitus will change, and they will 'become British' in their practical knowledge as well as in their citizenship status. This is the view supported by the Government. However, an alterna-

tive interpretation might be the following: Citizenship applicants will not be able to activate their pre-existing practical knowledge, because there will be no place for it in a social world which requires them to demonstrate knowledge of 'British life and language'. Unable to activate their social capital in an alien world, they may feel like 'a fish *out of* water', and be either unable or unwilling to achieve the required learning. The test of British life and language becomes a gate-keeping device, which may prevent them from ever becoming British citizens. If they either refuse or fail to acquire proficiency in English they will be the subject of powerful discourses which blame them for violence in which they played no part. This discourse may become a further site of alienation, leading them to feel less 'British' than ever, despite their initial willingness.

Multilingualism and the State

The process of symbolic domination is by no means the sole responsibility of the State. As we have seen, the social world is produced and reproduced in multiple and diverse discourses which lie outside of the State apparatus. In particular, media and educational discourses are powerful in the production of symbolic domination. However, the State plays an important role in granting legitimacy and authority to discriminatory discourses, not least because it has the power to inscribe them in law:

> Through the structuring it imposes on practices, the State institutes and inculcates common symbolic forms of thought, social frames of perception, understanding or memory, State forms of classification or, more precisely, practical schemes of perception, appreciation and action.
>
> (Bourdieu 2000: 175)

In structuring structures through the process of law-making, the State creates the conditions for the production of a common-sense world in which discriminatory practices are not only permissible but acceptable. For Bourdieu, this process is more than a conscious, calculated consensus. Rather, the State is able to gain the consent of the people because it has historically imposed the cognitive structures through which it is perceived. For this reason no legislative act of the State can be fully understood without reference to its historical context. Diachronic analysis attempts to integrate available knowledge about the historical sources of the social and political fields in which discursive events are embedded. At the same time, it situates the ways in which particular genres are subject to historical change (Wodak 2000). Analysis of the historical

links between discourses does not necessarily allow us to discover the origin, or source, of discriminatory discourse which finds its ultimate authority in the legislative machine, as such textual chains may have no identifiable beginning or end. However, it does provide a means of making visible the production and reproduction of such discourses. Bourdieu points out that the State "creates the conditions for an immediate orchestration of habitus" (2000: 175) which is the foundation of consensus, based on shared self-evidences, and constitutes 'common sense'. In the context of the debate analysed in this volume, discriminatory discourse is presented as common sense by representatives of the State, in interviews, speeches, and official documents. The division of people into English speakers and non-English speakers is embedded in a simple, common-sense dichotomy. The division of the populace into 'citizens' and 'non-citizens' is accepted as common sense. And the division of non-citizens into those who speak English, and therefore deserve to join the community of citizens, and those who do not speak English, and are therefore denied the opportunity to join the community of citizens, gains consensus.

In his analysis of Pascal, Bourdieu argues that recognition and acceptance of the authority of the law is based on misrecognition of the arbitrariness that underlies it (2000). The obedience that the State obtains results mainly from the docile dispositions that it inculcates by the order it establishes through, for example, schooling. That is, consensus is gained not by propaganda, or even by a deliberate deception of the masses by the State. Rather, it is gained through constant acts of recognition and misrecognition which "impose a recognition of the law based on misrecognition of the arbitrariness which underlies it" (168). In the example presented in this volume, consent to a law which potentially denies citizenship status to spouses of British citizens is presented as common sense in two ways. First, it achieves consensus because acceptance of the authority of the law has been gained through habituation to custom and law that has been gained by its very existence and persistence (that is, we accept the efficacy of the law because it is the law). Second, it gains consensus through frequent and repeated discursive acts which misrecognise English as a language which is superior to the other languages of England (that is, we accept the efficacy of the law because it reflects a current and largely uncontested ideology). The arbitrariness of the law is not difficult to see, but it is not often seen because habituation to custom and law prevents us from seeing.

Multilingualism and citizenship

The notion of citizenship is constructed in practices, including discourse practices. Administrative and legal discourses, as well as popular culture, provide a range of ways of thinking and talking about oneself as a citizen. Pervasive but almost unremarked discourses and practices serve as signifiers of citizenship. These include voting and referenda, letters to newspapers or M.P.s, jury duty, public inquiries and other participatory events, marches and demonstrations and so on. Individual citizens generate their performance of citizenship in relation to these rather than simply acting out pre-ordained scripts. These are the product of a tension and negotiation between the power of the pre-constructed, and the power of the situated agency. In this section I will address this notion of the negotiation of citizenship in multilingual contexts.

In Chapter 2, following Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004a), I differentiated between imposed identities (which are for one reason or another not negotiable), assumed identities (which are accepted and not negotiated), and negotiable identities (which are contested by groups and individuals). In the political and media discourse discussed in this volume we have seen that citizenship identities are for some people imposed, while for others they are assumed or negotiated. Taking the notion of citizenship in its legal sense, most residents of Britain assume citizenship identities which provide statutory rights. For others, lack of access to English classes, either through a process of symbolic violence, or through a practical lack of resources, means that they may be unable to meet the legal requirement to demonstrate proficiency in English, and are therefore unable to negotiate their citizenship identity. They are positioned by the legislative system as deficient in language and therefore deficient in the required capital to become good citizens. An identity as a deficient non-citizen is imposed, and is non-negotiable.

The discourse leading to legislative change in the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* repeatedly associates 'citizenship' with the notion of 'participation', and with 'rights' and 'duties'. In repeated examples, official political discourse calls for an 'active' conception of citizenship which is 'a real expression of the life of the community' (*Secure Borders, Safe Haven*). Research on citizenship should involve recognition of the dialectic between pre-construction of citizenship and the performance of citizenship within everyday practice, and address the tension between these preconceptions and what is achieved in communication. In the present study I make no attempt to investigate what is achieved in communicative interactions. However, it is possible to identify in the official political discourses analysed here tensions between coercive and

collaborative conceptions of what citizenship should be. In the discourse of the White Paper, and of the texts which feed into and from it, democratic, liberal principles explicitly underpin a call for greater participation in the life of community and neighbourhood, and in national elections. In this liberal argument, people should 'take their place in society', sharing a common identity and common values. However, as we have seen, this apparently liberal, collaborative notion of citizenship is apparently unable to accommodate the presence in society of minority Asian languages. There is a constant tension between Government discourse which speaks of social inclusion, while at the same time frowning on households where 'English is not spoken at home'. In this discourse speaking languages other than English is the very opposite of active citizenship. There is even an implication that if the Home Secretary were able to legislate to prevent people using their own languages in their own homes, he would do so. It is clear that in England at the beginning of the twenty-first century a good citizen is one who speaks English. Multilingualism, and speaking languages other than English, is a threat to society.

The authority of law is supported by symbolic forms of power which represent that authority. In the case of the current debate, citizenship will only be conferred on production of a certificate which guarantees that the applicant has 'sufficient knowledge' of English. The certificate, awarded by representatives of the State, according to vaguely defined criteria, must be produced *to* the State as a symbol of the applicant's suitability to be awarded citizenship. In addition to the language requirement, the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* also requires that those who apply for naturalisation as a British citizen have sufficient knowledge about life in the United Kingdom. No specific criteria are stated in the legislation, but certification of 'sufficient knowledge about life in the United Kingdom' remains a symbolic form of power which acts on behalf of the State. In the case of the discourse discussed in this volume, the consecration of 'sufficient knowledge of English', and 'sufficient knowledge of life in the United Kingdom', becomes a recognised social power, giving access to the privileges and advantages of citizenship. By the same token, failure or refusal to acquire the requisite symbolic capital in a form that can easily be tested may lead to the denial of such privileges. The struggle to negotiate identity as a British citizen is dependent on the accumulation and activation of a specific form of symbolic capital. As such, those who test whether this form of symbolic capital has been accumulated become the State's gatekeepers. Those who wish to become members of the community of British citizens must first negotiate their way past such gatekeepers.

The *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* now requires there to be a citizenship ceremony for those granted citizenship, at which the long-standing Oath of Allegiance to the Crown is either sworn or affirmed:

> I, [name], swear by Almighty God / do solemnly and sincerely affirm that, on becoming a British citizen, I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second, her heirs and successors according to law.

While the Oath itself has not changed in the recent legislation, the new requirement is for it to be stated aloud in a public place. At a time of diminishing enthusiasm for the monarchy in Britain, many existing British citizens may not be prepared to promise to bear true allegiance to the Queen. Here the State is, in Bourdieu's terms, the "site par excellence of the official and effective principle of the construction of the world" (2000: 186), raising the status of the award of citizenship so that it is more visible. The ceremony acts in a similar way to the certificate, as a symbolic form of the power of the State, a performative utterance that states what is, and what is not, in a recognisable form. In addition to swearing or affirming the Oath, those granted citizenship are now required to make a pledge at the ceremony:

> I will give my loyalty to the United Kingdom and respect its rights and freedoms.
> I will uphold its democratic values. I will observe its laws faithfully and fulfil my duties and obligations as a British citizen.

Here the discourse of the *Cantle Report*, and the White Paper, and of David Blunkett's *Foreign Policy Centre* article, is further legitimated and authorised. The conception of citizenship as 'rights', 'duties' and 'obligations', constantly reiterated in the chain of discourse leading to the new legislation, is now formally enshrined in a pledge which is a key element of the new citizenship ceremony. The pledge, like the Oath, acts as a symbol of obedience to the State. The legitimation in this non-negotiable form of a version of citizenship which presupposes consensus allows no room for manoeuvre on the part of the new citizen. The message is clear: either make the pledge in its current form, or do not become a citizen. Thus yet another gate-keeping device is awarded ultimate authority and legitimacy, establishing what Bourdieu (1998b: 54) terms the "definite differences between those who submitted to the rite and those who did not".

Multilingualism and symbolic racism

In Chapter 2 I introduced the notion of 'new racisms' (May 2001; Schmidt 2002), which often describe groups in cultural terms without specifically mentioning 'race' or overtly racial criteria. As explicitly racist discourse has come to be unacceptable in public settings in most modern societies, a *new racism* has developed in which specific cultural forms have come to signify racialised identities. As a process, racialisation renders others as having certain characteristics so alien and foreign that it is impossible to imagine them having equal status with those doing the racialising. One of these cultural characteristics is the use of languages other than English in public and private settings. This process of racialisation is deeply embedded in cultural assumptions, produced and reproduced in what Bourdieu terms the constant 'misrecognitions' which constitute common-sense consensus. According to this consensus, it is obvious that England is an English-speaking country, so those who propose discriminatory policy in relation to languages other than English can claim to be egalitarian while acting to exclude linguistic minorities from equal membership in the national community (Schmidt 2002). In the discourse of the political debate analysed here, the use of languages other than English becomes an emblem of 'otherness' and difference which signifies a racialised identity. The debate becomes racialised because in England at this point in history, immigration patterns have created a multilingual society in which most speakers of languages other than English are also members of racialised minority groups, whose languages are stigmatised as markers of those racialised identities.

The dominant discourse in this political debate about language is one which is assimilationist in relation to the linguistic context of England. That is, the discourse reflects a dominant ideology in which Asian languages should either be used only in private, or should not be used at all. At times this discourse is explicitly discriminatory. Frequently, however, it is framed in liberal terms, and masquerades as argument which is egalitarian and emancipatory. Furthermore, explicitly discriminatory argument is often not separate from ostensibly liberal argument, but sits alongside, co-existing within a single utterance. In the chain of discourses surrounding the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act*, illiberal features of argument are consistently framed in liberal terms. Discourse is double voiced, as argument which racialises speakers of languages other than English co-exists with argument which proposes a more equal society for those same racialised minorities. However, as Schmidt (2002:158) proposes, the very purpose of the social process of racialisation is inequality, and is therefore at odds with egalitarian argument. Liberal argument is used

to frame discriminatory policy proposals because racist discourse is "the last thing to be said" (Bourdieu 1991:153), that is, it is that which should not be publicly uttered. Racism is no longer acceptable, so linguistic discrimination takes its place, in a process of symbolic racism.

Racist discourse and polyphonic voice

As we have seen in the examples in Chapters 3 to 7, argument for linguistic discrimination is consistently made throughout the chain of discourses linking the civil disorder in Bradford, Burnley and Oldham with the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum* Act. By the time the chain of discourses reaches the White Paper, the simple oppositional discourse which characterises society as divided between 'Whites' and 'Asians' is no longer as explicit as before. However, linguistic differences are no less racialised in this more official discourse than in those which precede it. In the discourse of the White Paper language policy ('ensuring that every individual has the wherewithal, such as the ability to speak our common language') is linked to cultural practices which conflict with basic democratic values. As the previous texts in this chain of discourses have spoken of the opposition of 'Whites' and 'Asians', this does not need to be explicitly stated in the White Paper. It is clear that cultural practices which conflict with democratic values are associated with speaking languages other than English, and with Muslim Asian groups. As before, this racialising discourse is framed in a liberal context, as a proposal for extension of language testing legislation is associated with 'tackling racism, discrimination and prejudice'. The 'cultural practices' argument is articulated in more explicit terms by David Blunkett in his *Foreign Policy Centre* article. In this less official context, David Blunkett allows himself to characterise those who do not speak English as 'British Asian'. In this discourse use of languages other than English, even in the privacy of the home, is associated variously with hostility, ignorance, and even schizophrenia. In the same article as certain 'cultural practices' are criticised, the language argument is once again racialised in the discourse of the Home Secretary. In the debate about the extension of language testing for citizenship legislation, the racialisation of language puts at the heart of the issue the question of what it means to be British (or, perhaps, English). At the same time as calling for policy which tackles racism and discrimination wherever they are to be found, official Government discourse positions speakers of languages other than English as 'other', outside of the mainstream, and outside of the values and practices which contribute to democracy and social cohe-

sion. This is a debate about the politics of identity. In the end it is a question of whether it is possible to be British while continuing to speak the language of one's heritage. The dominant discourse in this debate is clearly monolingual in its ideological orientation. As English language dominance is conflated with a racialised 'White' dominance, the extension of an existing gate-keeping device to prevent the participation in society of some linguistic minorities can be nothing other than discriminatory.

Multilingualism and gender

With reference to the Roman Catholic Church in France, Bourdieu (1998b) argues that religious institutions work both practically and symbolically to euphemise social relations, including relations of exploitation. Bourdieu's analysis reveals a "structural duplicity, which leads to double-edged strategies. . .and a double language" (1998b: 118) in discourse which functions as an instrument of euphemisation. Bourdieu proposes that euphemistic discourse is less duplicity and hypocrisy than denial, a discourse which is able to assure the coexistence of opposites. When domination and discrimination can not be exercised directly (as they can not in political discourse in Britain), they "must be disguised under the veil of enchanted relationships" (Bourdieu 1977: 191). That is, the exercise of symbolic domination must be hidden from view lest it reveals its true nature. Euphemism underpins the discourse of British politics just as it structures the "double meanings" (Bourdieu 1998b: 118) of the Catholic Church in France. In the discourse surrounding a language ideological debate which argued that minority Asian languages are associated with violence and segregation, language is often ambiguous, two-sided, and even contradictory. The process of euphemism is only effective if there are shared understandings of euphemistic terms: in the discourse analysed here 'people' are understood to be women, 'spouses' are (almost always) wives, 'participation' refers to integration, mainly of immigrant women, while 'a full and active part in British society' often refers to the need for women to learn English.

In the political and media discourse presented in this volume there are several references to language proficiency and use in relation to 'husbands and wives', 'wives and husbands', and 'spouses'. Rarely is there specific reference to 'men' or 'women'. However, these non-specific nominations are frequently euphemisms which carry implicit meanings understood as more specific references to language ideologies in relation to linguistic minority women. In her speech to Parliament, Ann Cryer spoke of 'the established tradition of bringing

wives and husbands from the sub-continent who have often had no education and have no English' as one of the main causes of school under-achievement in the 'Asian community', and consequently as a cause of the civil disorder in northern England. Elsewhere in her speech Ann Cryer referred in similar terms to 'husbands and wives', and to 'spouses'. In each case this group is represented as an actual or potential problem for social cohesion. Although Ann Cryer does not explicitly refer to women here, later in her speech she offers an example of what she calls a 'silver lining' in the race relations debate, when she speaks of 'young, capable Asian women who were completing their A-level courses'. That is, in the logic of the argument presented in her speech, although some spouses are unable to participate in society because they do not speak English, there is a contrary example in which Asian women are participating successfully. The emphasis on women in offering a 'silver lining' for Ann Cryer strongly suggests that (in her references to husbands, wives and spouses) it is women who suffer social exclusion through their lack of English.

At other points in the same chain of discourses there are more specific references to 'Asian' women as the victims of social exclusion through lack of English use and proficiency. As we have seen, in his interview with *ePolitix.com,* Lord Rooker three times referred to 'people', saying that 'People are not encouraged or persuaded to learn English'. In perhaps the most explicit reference to women as the victims of social exclusion, Lord Rooker added: 'The men say "they don't need it"'. Lord Rooker's invocation of civil rights ('it's people being denied their civil rights') locates this statement in a textual chain which included his speech to the House of Lord's, where he had argued that Asian women and girls are subject to civil rights abuses by Asian men. Although in his interview with *ePolitix.com* there is no specific reference to 'Asians', it seems clear that when he refers to 'people' he is referring to 'Asian' women. This conclusion is also reached by *The Independent* newspaper on 18th August 2001, in which Lord Rooker's 'people' is recontextualised as 'wives' and 'women'.

There are further references to Asian women in particular in the official reports into the social conditions underlying the civil disorder in 2001. In the *Ouseley Report* it is reported that 'Asian women face particular obstacles to their participation in decision-making processes at all levels'. This point is made in the same paragraph as the suggestion that arranged marriages mean regular intakes of 'new residents who are unable to communicate in the English language'. That is, Asian women are said to face obstacles to participation because they are subject to arranged marriages and imported from the sub-continent with little or no English proficiency. In the represented discourse of respondents to the *Oldham Review*, there are several examples of discourse

which problematises Asian women. In this discourse arranged marriages and social isolation are among the generalisations associated with Asian women in Britain.

Home Office statistics relating to the admission of spouses to Britain from the Indian sub-continent show that in 2001 a large majority of spouses admitted were wives (7790) rather than husbands (4580) (Dudley, Turner, & Woollacott 2003). We have seen that one of the cohesive links in the chain of discourses relating to citizenship and social exclusion is the word 'participate', which is particularly invoked with reference to the social exclusion of Asian women. In the *Cantle Report* 'the full participation of all individuals' is called for, following advocacy of 'support for women's rights'. Here the emphasis is on the perceived need for Asian *women* to learn English. In the White Paper the Government sets out its proposals to deal with cultural practices which may conflict with democratic values, 'such as those which deny women the right to participate as equal citizens'. While there is no specific reference to explain what kind of cultural practices deny women the right to participate as equal citizens, there is a strong implication that this is a recontextualisation of Lord Rooker's argument that in Asian communities 'the men' prevent women from learning English. The Government's suggestion that cultural practices embedded within Asian communities are the main reason that British Asian women may not 'participate as equal citizens' seems to entirely delete from the discourse any reference to inequalities based on racism, economic discrimination and broader gender relations in society.

The New and the Old

In 2003 *The New and the Old*, the report of the 'Life in the United Kingdom' Advisory Group was published. This group was appointed by the Government to advise the Home Secretary on the method, conduct and implementation of a 'Life in the United Kingdom naturalisation test', which determined what should be meant by the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* in requiring of citizenship applicants 'sufficient' ability in language and knowledge of society and civic institutions. The group was Chaired by Sir Bernard Crick, and included thirteen other experienced members from academic, educational and local government backgrounds. Despite the remit to recommend what is meant by 'sufficient ability in language', none of the members of the group were linguists or professional language testers. The group's recommendations were

concerned with three main effects of the 2002 legislation relating to applicants for naturalisation as British citizens:

– Applicants will have to supply certification, from approved professional sources, of proficiency in language and also in understanding of society and civic institutions in the United Kingdom
– This requirement will also apply to spouses of British citizens
– The process will culminate in a civic ceremony

In their introductory remarks the authors of the report note that the language requirement has been part of nationality law for many years, but the requirement was undefined and 'in application varied, often perfunctory and sometimes uselessly minimal'. The group was given the remit of producing proposals for the methods of assessment to be used in the teaching and assessment of English language and knowledge of life in the United Kingdom. In Section 2.2 of the report, the authors set out the rationale for their recommendations, albeit in general terms:

> The more we all know about each other, both new and settled inhabitants taking pride in our country, the less likely are serious problems to arise and the more we can help each other. The new requirements are to be seen not as a new hurdle but as a much needed entitlement. (p. 8)

The topos of advantage is convincing in its tone, suggesting that the new, more rigorous test of English language proficiency is for the good of those taking the test. However, plausibility is strained, and in an example of Bakhtinian hidden dialogicality, the report senses its opposition, and argues against it. The voice of the opposition is stated in order to be rejected ('to be seen not as a hurdle'), and an official recommendation is put forward in its place. It is notable that the tests 'are to be seen' as entitlement rather than hurdle. Of course the entitlement to citizenship status could be offered without a language test – and therefore the test *is* a hurdle. It is not clear what the authors of the report have in mind in implying that 'serious problems' are likely if we fail to know about each other, but in the context of the chain of discourses presented in this volume it seems to refer to a repetition of the civil disorder in Burnley, Bradford and Oldham in 2001. The assertion that 'The more we all know about each other. . .the more we can help each other' suggests a mutuality in dealing with race-related tensions. However, the 'new requirements' are far from mutual. They do not require the majority indigenous group to learn about the languages and cultures of newly arrived or recently settled groups. Rather, only the reverse is true. A façade of liberalism and mutuality here disguises support for a coercive policy.

At the same time as recommending implementation of the legislation in the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act*, Sir Bernard Crick's report provides a rare example in this complex chain of discourses of acceptance that bilingualism is not necessarily a negative phenomenon:

> Use of the English language itself is possibly the most important means of diverse communities participating in a common culture with key values in common. There is also the fact that people need some level of English for the crucial matter of basic employment as well as everyday life. Immigrants may choose to work other than in an English-speaking situation, but they should not feel trapped in it by reason of not having English. But even so, large areas of Wales and some parts of Scotland furnish clear examples that bilingual cultures are not inherent threats to the unity of the state and to the integration of diverse communities, old and new. Speaking mainly one language in the home and mainly another at work has not threatened the integration of either state or society. But if some in the home cannot speak any English, that is plainly to their great disadvantage, unless very old or infirm and being cared for. (p. 11–12)

The first half of this section of the report reiterates the dominant ideology in this chain of discourse, recycling the terminology ('common culture', 'key values in common') of the White Paper, the *Cantle Report* and David Blunkett's *Foreign Policy Centre* article. However, the ideological orientation of this section of the text turns on the word 'But'. Having represented the dominant view, the discourse of the authorial voice now clashes with that view, arguing that 'bilingual cultures are not inherent threats to the unity of the state', and bilingual practices have 'not threatened the integration of either state or society' (although it is not clear why the examples cited are from Wales and Scotland, after many years of migration to Britain from many regions of the world). Here the discourse of the report collides with the dominant ideology of the chain of discourses linking the civil disorder in 2001 to the extension by Government of language testing for citizenship. The 'topos of threat' so commonly repeated throughout the chain of discourses is engaged with directly here, arguing that bilingualism is *not* a threat to society. Although there is nothing here about the societal, familial, or individual benefits of bilingualism, this is the most positive official reference to languages other than English in the political and media texts encountered in this chain of discourse.

The *Crick Report* goes on to propose a Programme of Studies for a unified 'language-with-civic-content' programme of teaching and learning. The report's recommendations include:

– that funding should be made available for suitable organisations to produce resource books and teaching and learning materials for ESOL teachers.
– that a 'Living in the United Kingdom' handbook, both in English and bilingual versions, should be given free to all United Kingdom residents applying for naturalisation
– that there should be assessment of applicants' *progress* in developing language skills, rather than requiring a common language standard for all applicants; no single standard or single route to final assessment of English language skills will suit all individual cases
– that all those who have an avenue to indefinite leave to remain are able to access an English language screening/assessment at the earliest possible opportunity. The assessment should be referenced to the National Standards for adult literacy and the Adult ESOL Core Curriculum; this should be conducted by an appropriately qualified person.
– that the current requirement for new arrivals to have three years residence before qualifying for free ESOL classes be abolished.

The orientation of the Crick Report is towards making English language testing for citizenship part of an integrated programme, in which there are several routes to successful fulfilment of the assessment criteria. The report makes recommendations which are sufficiently flexible to allow achievement of citizenship criteria which are tailored to the individual learner.

The debate moves on

The beginning and the end of a chain of political discourse is difficult to ascertain, even if we accept that it has a beginning and an end. It is more likely that debates about language, immigration and diversity have continued in one form or another for hundreds of years, and that they will continue to run for many years in the future. However, in the context of the language ideological debate presented in this volume, the chain of discourse became more authoritative as it moved towards the centre of Government, and found its ultimate legitimacy when incorporated in new legislation.

On 28 July 2004 the Government implemented the new legislation in the *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act* 2002, and changed the language requirements for those seeking naturalisation as British citizens:

> The standard of language ability expected of those who want naturalisation has now been set at ESOL Entry 3. The Home Office requires confirmation of ability at this level or above from those applying for British citizenship.
>
> (Home Office 2004)

The Guidance summarises the required standard as follows: 'A person at ESOL Entry 3 is able to follow straightforward spoken explanations and instructions and hold a conversation on a familiar topic'.[1] The Guidance suggests several different ways in which applicants can satisfy the language requirements:

- Applicants who have an ESOL Entry 3 certificate, an equivalent language certificate, or can demonstrate that they have previously obtained an educational qualification (e.g. GCSE, A Level, Degree) assessed in English, can use this to apply directly to the National Directorate in Liverpool.
- Those who have the fluency of a native speaker but none of the certificates or qualifications mentioned above, can ask a notary to verify their fluency.
- Those applicants working towards a full ESOL Entry 3 certificate, who have met the criteria at Entry 3 for the speaking and listening mode, can ask a teacher qualified, or working towards qualification, to verify this.
- Those who ***do not have fluency in English***, or any of the certificates or qualifications mentioned above, will need to take a Skills for Life ESOL Initial Assessment in Speaking and Listening in order to demonstrate ability at Entry 3 or above (emphasis in original).

(Home Office 2004)

In the guidance for implementation of the legislation the contested terms 'fluency' and 'native speaker' appear to be used unproblematically. The Home Office Guidance offers the following advice to notaries (who are very unlikely to have any skills or training in language testing or assessment):

> If you believe an applicant for naturalisation who appears before you is a native speaker of English then you should complete a certificate on their behalf. If you believe that such a person is not a native speaker but has 'a knowledge of English to the level reasonably expected of a person of full age and capacity whose native language is English', then you should complete the certificate. The standard to bear in mind is not that of the 'average' native English speaker, but rather the minimum knowledge of the language which could be expected from an adult native English speaker who does not suffer from a learning disability.

Confusingly, the paragraph in the Guidance which follows this seems to contradict the advice that the standard should *not* be that of the 'average native English speaker':

> Your assessment can only be done on a face to face basis. It is an assessment of fluency in speaking and understanding English, not of literacy. A brief conversation should be enough to enable you to decide whether in your opinion the person before you is a native English speaker, or alternatively has a command of English as good as the average native speaker.

In the same Guidance the standard to be assessed by notaries untrained in language testing and assessment is 'not that of the average native English speaker' and 'as good as the average native speaker'. In Chapter 2 I summarised recent linguistic research (Leung et al. 1997; Rampton 1995) which has convincingly challenged the notion of 'native-speaker proficiency'. It is also notable that whereas elsewhere in the Guidance it is stated that candidates may ask notaries to verify their 'fluency', in the specific information for notaries there is also reference to 'knowledge' and 'command' of English. Such contradictions seem to suggest continuing confusion in the Government's attempts to insist on a common standard of English proficiency as a criterion for the award of citizenship.

Monolingual ideology in a multilingual state

In the chain of political discourse linking the civil disorder in northern England in 2001 with legislative change in 2002, an ideology becomes visible which clearly privileges the English language above the other languages of England. This ideology is most strongly evident as argument moves closer to the centre of Government. The official discourse of a Parliamentary speech, an interview with a Home Office minister, a Home Office statement, a Government-commissioned report, a Government White Paper, an article by the Secretary of State, and a new Act of Parliament, all contribute to an ideology which places English above the other languages spoken and written in multilingual England. Not only is English consistently positioned as the language of communication and democracy, but also languages other than English are consistently linked with a range of negative features. Languages of Pakistan, Bangladesh and India in particular are accorded negative associations which can only be described as discriminatory, and as examples of symbolic racism. These negative associations have been made visible in the detailed analysis of political discourse over

the last several chapters. To summarise, negative features associated with Asian languages in this political and media discourse include the following:

- languages other than English are associated with civil disorder, as they bring about segregated societies and create the conditions for racial violence
- languages other than English are associated with school underachievement of linguistic minority children, as children who speak these languages at home are educationally disadvantaged
- languages other than English are associated with social segregation, as monolingual English speakers are unable to communicate with people who speak these languages
- languages other than English are a burden on society, as remedial programmes and translation services carry a cost to public funds
- languages other than English are a threat to democracy, as people who speak these languages are unlikely to understand political issues
- languages other than English are a threat to citizenship and nationhood, as speakers of these languages are unlikely to be able to participate in civic and community institutions
- languages other than English are a threat to the communities in which they are spoken, as they bring about isolation, unhappy marriages, poor employment prospects, and lack of social mobility.

In some examples from the chain of political discourse, the use of Asian languages is tolerated, as long as this is in private domains. There is no support in any of these texts for policy which encourages the use of languages other than English in public settings. Instead, the drive behind the political texts is one which associates a range of problems with the use of Asian languages, and sets out to devise policy and legislation to insist that all residents of England speak English. The means towards this end is the extension of the requirements for applicants for naturalisation as British citizens to demonstrate that they have sufficient English proficiency to undertake their duties and obligations as citizens. However, this policy is flawed on a number of counts. The associations between languages other than English and civil disorder, school underachievement, social segregation, societal burden, and threats to democracy, nationhood, citizenship and community are fallacious arguments. First, the civil disorder in the north of England was at least partly fomented by the presence in the area of the racist British National Party, which recognised and capitalised on the conditions for tension created by oppositional discourse in the local media. Second, school underachievement of linguistic minority children is not *caused* by children coming to school able to speak a language

other than English. Rather, in a multilingual classroom environment, minority languages can potentially become a resource for learning. There are many British schools in which children successfully learn through their home language alongside English in the early days of their school career. In fact recent statistics confirm that the two groups achieving the best grades in public examinations in secondary schools are currently the 'Chinese' and 'Indian' groups – both of which generalised categories comprise of linguistic minority groups.[2] These findings add to the already robust research which indicates that speaking languages other than English is by no means necessarily a barrier to high educational attainment in British schools. Third, social segregation is undoubtedly a characteristic of many British cities. However, it is not necessarily a result of people speaking languages other than English. Factors such as discriminatory housing policy, racist employment practices, and the economic status of linguistic minority people, play a major role in the demographic distribution of linguistic groups. Fourth, minority Asian languages are not inevitably a burden on society, but have the potential to be a considerable resource (languages such as French, German and Japanese are viewed in this way). Fifth, speakers of languages other than English can only be said to be a threat to participation in the democratic process when all political discourse, election campaigns and institutional texts are presented solely in English. Where this is the case, some people who mainly use Asian languages may be disenfranchised. However, the responsibility to present political argument in accessible forms lies with political institutions, not with the individual. Sixth, participation as a citizen is not essentially determined by proficiency in English, providing that opportunities for participation are available in languages other than English. In fact many monolingual English citizens do not 'participate' in the political process, suggesting that language may not be the most important factor in determining the extent of participation. Seventh, languages other than English are not a threat to the communities in which they are spoken unless the dominant institutions in society determine that this should be so. Where English is the sole language of powerful institutions such as schools and colleges, the legal system, and the welfare system, some speakers of languages other than English may not be able to activate their cultural and linguistic capital within these institutions. Where these institutions present themselves as multilingual environments, however, it is more likely that linguistic minority speakers will be able to gain access to them, and to activate their symbolic resources in these settings.

There is a difference between coercing someone to learn a language and giving them access to an environment where learning can take place. There are questions of how speakers of languages other than English activate their social

and linguistic capital to gain entry to a place of learning which may be perceived as 'white', middle-class and academic. Learning English will not remove other barriers to participation for linguistic minority groups whose language is racialised in the ideological debate. If linguistic discrimination is a form of symbolic racism, other symbolic features will replace it, even where discrimination based on accent and non-native-like usage is not activated. Finally, the coercive nature of a policy which requires applicants to learn 'sufficient' English or be refused access to the community of citizens, strengthens the existing gate-keeping mechanism so that it is more socially exclusive than before. In almost all of the discourse surrounding this policy development there is a tension between political argument that the policy and legislation is liberal and egalitarian, and the practice, which is illiberal and discriminatory.

Multilingual Britain: Some ways forward

The political discourse encountered in charting the story of legislative change relating to English language testing for citizenship is less than encouraging. However, the monolingual ideology constructed in official discourse is at odds with the linguistic practices which characterise British society, which are diverse, changing, and complex. Political discourse is out of touch with the way people use their languages, think about their languages, and with the values and beliefs they attach to their languages. Bilingual and multilingual people in Britain, and monolingual minority-language speakers, whether they are British citizens or not, engage in a broad range of multilingual linguistic practices in their homes, in their schools, in their communities, in their places of worship, in the course of their business, in social settings, and in their leisure activities. Well over three hundred languages are spoken in London alone. These languages are used for pragmatic purposes, for symbolic purposes, and for religious purposes. They are used in the negotiation of identities, and in claiming national, regional and religious belonging. They are used in mixed forms, hybrid forms, and in entirely separate forms. These bilingual and multilingual practices do not cause problems or difficulties to the speakers of these languages. On the contrary, they are for many people a crucial part of their sense of themselves. The dominant monolingual ideology produced and reproduced in official and political discourse, as well as in local discourses at the micro level, constructs a society in which the many languages of England largely remain within particular groups, as a process of symbolic domination persuades multilingual speakers that their languages are not welcome in the wider pub-

lic domain. The effect of this is that in a multilingual society a monolingual arena is constructed and constantly reinforced, and the use of languages other than English remains hidden. The insistence that languages other than English have negative associations clearly reinforces the dominant ideology of monolingualism, which continues to be at odds with actual linguistic practices in society, and reproduces social stratification and inequality. However, this process is not inevitable. Whilst those who engage in multilingual practices may not have the power to change the social arena, senior political actors do have this power. The legislative machine has the authority and legitimacy to make changes which can break the cycle of reproduction of discriminatory language ideology, and better reflect the multilingualism of the people of Britain. Whilst The Parekh Report (which addresses the future of multi-ethnic society with barely a nod in the direction of the languages of Britain) recommends that the Government formally declare the United Kingdom a multicultural society (Parekh 2000), I would recommend that the Government declare the United Kingdom a multilingual society. In so doing, the legislative agenda could begin to redress the dominant monolingual ideology in the direction of the reality of multilingual Britain.

Some of the contexts in which Government can effect change include educational, community, institutional, and media settings. Legislation providing for the authentic and appropriate use of home languages wherever possible in primary and secondary education would raise the profile of multilingualism in society, and offer enhanced learning opportunities for all pupils. There is currently some good practice in this area, but it tends to be developed on an ad hoc basis, often by individual schools or services. The current educational climate in schools in England is such that without an explicit legislative steer from Government, it is unlikely that there will be development of the use of minority languages in the curriculum. Education in schools offers the most fertile opportunity for the reorientation of language ideologies, as minority languages can find both authentic and appropriate opportunities for learning. Despite the weight of research evidence which demonstrates the positive effects for all pupils of a multilingual ethos in classrooms (see Cummins 2000, 2003 for a summary), most schools continue to reflect (and therefore reproduce) the monolingual ideology at large beyond the school gates. The recent emphasis on language learning in the development of the Government's 'National Language Strategy' (DfES 2002) is to be welcomed, but initial reports suggest that minority Asian languages continue to be marginalised in its implementation, thus reproducing existing ideologies.

National and local government policy providing for enhanced links between mainstream schools and complementary schools where community languages are taught and maintained would have the potential to raise the status of minority languages other than English, and recognise the cognitive value of learning more than one language. Recent research (Martin et. al. 2003) has convincingly demonstrated that children and young people who attend complementary (often called 'supplementary') community schools outside of regular school hours view them as 'safe spaces' in which to perform the full range of their multilingual repertoires. Here pupils may be able to negotiate identity options which are unavailable in the mainstream school setting. Teachers in complementary and mainstream schools who engage with the same children and young people can learn from each other, to the considerable benefit of their pupils.

An increased Government commitment of resources to the training of interpreters to reflect the changing linguistic make-up of Britain, and a commitment to ensure that trained interpreters are available in institutional settings to enable people with limited English proficiency to gain access to their rights, would be a further step forward. Although resources are limited, and trained interpreters are expensive, the availability of a skilled interpreter who can speak the appropriate language can be a crucial factor in a family gaining access to health services, welfare rights, and information about their child's education, to mention only some of the institutional settings where minority language speakers may be unable to activate their linguistic and cultural capital. This is more than a question of language alone. Even where minority language speakers are able to speak and understand English sufficiently to engage with a doctor, teacher, solicitor, or other professional, the institutional context itself may be viewed as one where the symbolic capital of the 'White', educated, middle-class group is required. For those who do not believe that they have the legitimacy to speak in such an environment, it can be difficult to access symbolic or material resources. The British Government has made a commitment to provide resources for ESOL classes, to enable linguistic minority immigrants to learn English to the standard now required for application for citizenship status. As for the other institutional contexts above, it will be crucial that these classes take account of cultural, gendered, and linguistic sensitivity of particular minority groups. For example, the provision of women-only classes where appropriate may be the factor which determines whether or not some learners access these classes.

Finally, the abolition of the requirement for an applicant for naturalisation as a British citizen to demonstrate 'sufficient' knowledge of English would send

a message to linguistic minority residents that British people can be multilingual in languages other than English, and that to be British it is not necessary to privilege English above other languages.

The main purpose of this book has not been to simply discuss a legislative change which now requires that spouses of British citizenship applicants are subject to the same language requirement as their partners. This is important, but it only directly affects a small minority of people. The main purpose has rather been to identify in the discourse surrounding this piece of legislation the reproduction of the dominant ideology underlying much official and political thinking in relation to minority Asian languages in multilingual Britain. This is an ideology which is at odds with the linguistic practices in which people engage on a daily basis. It is an ideology which is monolingual, discriminatory, and illiberal. At the same time it is one which dresses in the clothes of liberalism, and which argues that its discriminatory policies are egalitarian and emancipatory. Through detailed analysis of texts, using critical discourse analysis, it has become clear that official discourses transform as they are recontextualised, deleting unwanted elements, adding others, and rearranging or substituting others. This chain of discourses is one of many arenas in which symbolic violence is wielded by the powerful elite in a stratified society. In the end we can not know where hegemonic ideologies have their origin, or all the contexts in which they are reproduced. We need further studies which investigate the production and reproduction of such ideologies in interactional as well as political and media discourses.

Notes

Chapter 1

1. Chilton's (2004) cogent analysis notes that the contextual source for the key phrase in Powell's speech was the Roman poet Virgil's *Aeneid*. Powell referred intertextually to the classical text to add authority to his discriminatory argument. In fact, although this infamous speech is widely referred to as the 'rivers of blood' speech, this phrase was not included in the speech itself. Rather, Enoch Powell drew on his classical education to imply that the effect of mass immigration to Britain would be violence in the streets:

> As I look ahead, I am filled with foreboding; like the Roman, I see the River Tiber foaming with much blood.

In the speech Powell warned that soon "the black man will have the whip hand over the white man", and called for wholesale repatriation of immigrants. Powell was subsequently dismissed from the shadow cabinet. While Powell's argument was even in 1968 regarded as extremist, many of his argumentation strategies are repeated in the chain of mainstream discourse analysed in this volume.

2. Some scholars have suggested that the works of Voloshinov were in fact written by Bakhtin. Others disagree. In the absence of irrefutable evidence either way, I am adopting the usual convention of citing Voloshinov's works separately.

Chapter 4

1. I am assuming here that Ann Cryer's reference to 'a Belfast-like situation' does not connote a friendly, warm city of great historical significance and architectural beauty, which lies in the heart of some of Europe's most pleasant countryside.

Chapter 5

1. Here I am concerned primarily with the homogenisation of 'Asian men', more than with the question of whether *some* 'Asian' men are oppressive in their relations with their wives and other female family members. If there is a commonly-held view that all or most 'Asian men' keep their wives and daughters under lock and key in oppressive conditions, this is by definition a discriminatory discourse, as it fails to differentiate between the social practices

of individuals and even of groups of individuals. This is not to diminish for a moment the suffering that accrues from the oppressive practices of some men in relation to some women in any ethnic, cultural or racial group.

2. 'Asylum-seekers' and 'refugees' are often conflated in British (and other) political discourse, as they are here. They are not, of course, synonymous terms.

Chapter 6

1. The review includes the following statement about its methodology: 'The approach taken by the review team was to take soundings from people across the District, with priority given to those voices which are rarely heard – for example young people, the vulnerable and the disaffected. The review also met with women's and religious groups, and heard from leaders, organisations and institutions. In addition to this the review also commissioned research to provide other independent baseline information. The review informed people across the District about its work, invited comments, produced leaflets, stimulated press reports, set up a website and e-mail address, issued returnable postcards and ran a telephone hot-line. People's views were expressed to the team through all these different ways. The review held two large assembly meetings, one in Bradford and one in Keighley, to which representatives of organisations were invited. At these meetings soundings were taken as to the key issues and people were encouraged to discuss these further. In this way it was intended that the process of discussion and comment would cascade between the organisation's representatives to people in the District. Many individuals and organisations also sent reports and other written submissions, some of which were specifically written for the review. More than 10,000 people visited the website over the course of the review and it continues to generate interest through the message board. Views expressed were wide-ranging and covered aspects of life affecting people of different backgrounds, status, circumstances and appearance. The review, however, has had to focus on the terms of reference set by its initiators, (p. 6–7).

2. The review includes the following statement from the Chair about its methodology: 'This report represents our conclusions after four months or so of work, during which I am confident that the panel have grappled effectively with the issues confronting Oldham, and have reached a good understanding of how the town works. Our first decision was to open a drop-in center in the Spindles Shopping Centre, right in the heart of Oldham, to enable members of the public to give us their views. We had a team of interviewers available during shop opening hours to take notes of people's views, and between first opening the shop at the beginning of August and closing, as demand dropped off, on 19th October, we interviewed a total of 915 people. Where necessary, we had an interpretation service available. In addition, panel members clocked up around 200 meetings with individuals or organisations in the town and many other informal discussions. We made a small number of visits outside Oldham to see how certain issues were handled elsewhere.'

3. The review includes the following statement about its methodology: 'The consultation process adopted by the Task Force was designed to reach out to as many people and organisations as possible within Burnley. Each meeting of the Task Force was preceded by a public participation session. These public meetings, attended by the full Task Force, were held at

Burnley Town Hall, South West Burnley Enterprise Centre, Stoneyholme and Daneshouse Community Centre, St. John's Roman Catholic Church Hall in Duke Bar and Burnley Wood One Stop Shop. In all a total of approximately 240 members of the public attended. The sessions were lively and covered a wide range of issues. Additionally, the Chair attended public parish meetings in Worsthorne & Hurstwood, Cliviger, Briercliffe, Padiham and met with residents of Brunshaw.

The Chair also met with Church leaders, statutory sector representatives, educationalists, community & voluntary groups, and Asian women's groups. He also had one to one meetings with 26 elected councillors. He spoke to many people during visits to different parts of the Borough. He also met individually or contacted by phone more than 100 residents as well as visiting the areas affected by the disturbances. A number of submissions were received from a wide variety of organisations within the Borough.

Residents of the Borough were invited to submit their views on the causes of the disturbances to the Task Force. Over two hundred and forty letters and e-mails were received and analysed. The vast majority appeared to be from white residents and, although a proportion of the writers identified themselves as being in their late twenties and thirties, most seemed to be from older men and women.

We believe that this Task Force has been unique in proactively seeking to provide the opportunity for every single person who lives in Burnley to be able to express their view on the issues affecting the town and the ways of tackling them. It is a credit to the process that people responded in significant numbers. In the case of the questionnaire sent to homes in the borough the response rate was far higher than the average for such exercises. In truth, many of the responses received from the public expressed views that did not make easy reading. But the views clearly showed the Task Force that there are many deep-rooted problems in Burnley that, in some instances, have found their expression in prejudice, alienation and frustration.

The majority of the responses were concerned with the large numbers of Asians/immigrants in the town and have the perception that Asians/immigrants received preferential treatment over whites from the Council and the Police. A lot of concern is also expressed on the amount of funding "Asian areas"/Daneshouse receive compared to other areas of Burnley.

There were 16 responses that are deemed outright racist. One respondent was responsible for seven of them.'(p. 32)

4. *The Cantle Report* sets out its methodology as follows: 'The Community Cohesion Review Team (CCRT) was set up to identify good practice, key policy issues and new and innovative thinking in the field of community cohesion. The terms of reference were specifically:

> *To obtain the views of local communities, including young people, local authorities, voluntary and faith organisations, in a number of representative and multi-ethnic communities, on the issues that need to be addressed in developing confident, active communities and social cohesion.*
>
> *To identify good practice and to report this to the Ministerial Group, and also to identify weaknesses in the handling of these issues at local level.*

We were aware that some towns and cities had already set up their own enquiries following disturbances during the summer and had already been the subject of Ministerial and other

visits. However, it was not our intention to cover the same ground – we were less concerned with the particular circumstances of each area and wanted to try to focus on the lessons for national policy and practice. The CCRT visited Oldham, Burnley and Bradford and, recognising that there may be both similarities and differences between communities that did not experience the same disturbances, the team also visited Southall, Birmingham and Leicester. A visit to The Black Community Forum in Sheffield was also arranged.

At each of these visits the team met local community leaders, voluntary and faith organisations, the CRE and BME organisations, Government Offices including officials tasked with delivering regeneration programmes, and youth and community workers. The team were also particularly anxious to hear the views of young people, and visited schools and community projects involving young people. As part of the information gathering stage the team also tried to identify what went wrong in the areas which experienced disturbances and what went right in others.

Apart from hearing about what had happened in the past, the team wanted to hear the views of the local residents about what changes they would like to see at a national level, bearing in mind their local experience. Therefore these visits represented not just an information gathering exercise but a real opportunity for local people to have an input into Government thinking and future strategy.'

Chapter 7

1. The clause 'subject to certain limited exceptions' is not really a mitigation, as it refers to exceptions to the law based on age or physical or mental condition.

2. The Foreign Policy Centre describes itself as 'an independent think-tank committed to developing innovative thinking and effective solutions for our increasingly interdependent world'. It was launched in 1998 by the Prime Minister, the Rt Hon Tony Blair M.P. and the then Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, the Rt Hon Robin Cook M.P.

3. *Roget's Interactive Thesaurus, First Edition (v 1.0.0)* lists 'turbulent' and 'uncontrolled' as the most common associations with 'unbridled' in the eight entries listed.

Chapter 8

1. Annex A to the Guidance explains the requirements of ESOL Entry 3 in more detail as follows:

> **ESOL ENTRY 3: WHAT IT MEANS**
>
> As was mentioned at the beginning of this note, a person at ESOL Entry 3 is able to follow straightforward spoken explanations and instructions and hold a conversation on a familiar topic. Below is a more detailed list of the speaking and listening skills which are associated with ESOL Entry 3:

> Listen and respond to spoken language, including straightforward information and narratives, and follow straightforward explanations and instructions, both face-to-face and on the telephone.
>
> Communicate orally information, feelings and opinions on familiar topics, using appropriate formality, both face-to-face and on the telephone.
>
> Engage in discussion with one or more people in a familiar situation, making relevant points and responding to what others say to reach a shared understanding about familiar topics.

2. The Department for Education and Science (2004) reported on the percentage of A to C grades achieved by different ethnic groups in public 'GCSE' examinations, held at age sixteen in all secondary schools. The 'Chinese' group achieved 74.8% A-C grades, the 'Indian' group 65.2%, 'White' 51.3%, 'Bangladeshi' 45.5%, 'Pakistani' 41.5%, 'Black Other' 40.7% and 'Black Caribbean' 32.9%.

References

Anderson, Benedict (1983). *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.

Antaki, Charles & Wetherell, Margaret (1999) "Show concessions". *Discourse Studies, 1*(1), 7–27.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo (2003). "Who is afraid of bilingualism?". In J.-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, & Li Wei (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principles* (pp. 10–27). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, M. (1973). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (translated by R. W. Rotsel). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Ardis.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (edited and translated by C. Emerson). Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (edited by C. Emerson, and M. Holquist). Austin, TX: University of Austin Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail, M. (1994). "Problems of Dostoevsky's poetics". In P. Morris (Ed.), *The Bakhtin Reader. Selected Writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov* (pp. 103–113). London: Arnold.

Barbour, Stephen (2000). "Nationalism, Language, Europe". In S. Barbour & C. Carmichael (Eds.), *Language and Nationalism in Europe* (pp. 1–17). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bayley, Paul (2004). "Introduction. The whys and wherefores of analysing parliamentary discourse". In P. Bayley (Ed.), *Cross-cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse* (pp. 1–44). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Bigler, Ellen (1996). "Telling stories: On ethnicity, exclusion, and education in upstate New York". *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 27* (2), 186–203.

Billig, Michael (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. Sage: London.

Blackledge, Adrian (1998). *A Study of School-focused Home Literacy Practices in Bangladeshi Families in Birmingham*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Birmingham.

Blackledge, Adrian (2000). *Literacy, Power and Social Justice*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Blackledge, Adrian (2001). "The wrong sort of capital? Bangladeshi women and their children's schooling in Birmingham, U.K." *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5* (3), 345–369.

Blackledge, Adrian (2002a). "'What sort of people can look at a chicken and think Dofednod?' Language, ideology and nationalism in public discourse." *Multilingua, 20* (3), 197–226.

Blackledge, Adrian (2002b). "The discursive construction of national identity in multilingual Britain". *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 1* (1), 67–87.

Blackledge, Adrian (2003). "Imagining a monocultural community: The racialisation of cultural practice in educational discourse". *Journal of Language, Identity and Education, 2* (4), 331–348.

Blackledge, Adrian (2004). "Constructions of identity in political discourse in multilingual Britain." In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 68–92). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Blackledge, Adrian & Creese, Angela (2005). "Integrating the structural and agentic in researching multilingualism". Paper presented at the *International Symposium on Bilingualism*, Barcelona, March 2005.

Blackledge, Adrian & Pavlenko, Aneta (2001). "Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts". *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5* (3), 243–259.

Blackledge, Adrian & Pavlenko, Aneta (2002). "Ideologies of language in multilingual contexts." *Multilingua, 21* (2/3), 121–140.

Blommaert, Jan (1999). "The debate is open." In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 1–38). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Blommaert, Jan & Verschueren, Jef (1998a). "The role of language in European nationalist ideologies". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 189–210). New York: Oxford University Press.

Blommaert, Jan & Verschueren, Jef (1998b). *Debating diversity. Analysing the discourse of tolerance*. London/New York: Routledge.

Blunkett, David (2002). *Integration with Diversity: Globalisation and the Renewal of Democracy and Civil Society*. London: Foreign Policy Centre.

Bokhorst-Heng, Wendy (1999). "Singapore's *Speak Mandarin Campaign*: Language ideological debates in the imagining of the nation". In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 235–266). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1990). *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1993). *Sociology in Question*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1997). *Der Tote packt den Lebenden. Schriften zu Politik und Kultur 2.* Hamburg: VSA.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1998a). *On Television and Journalism*. London, Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1998b). *Practical Reason*. London: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (2000). *Pascalian Meditations.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre & Wacquant, Loic (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Caldas-Coulthard, Carmen R. (2003). "Cross-cultural representation of 'Otherness' in media discourse". In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 272–296). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cantle, Ted (2002). *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team.* London: The Stationery Office.

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

Chilton, Paul & Schäffner, Christina (2002). "Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse". In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 1–41). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Chouliaraki, Lili & Fairclough, Norman (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Clarke, Matthew G. (Lord). (2001). *Burnley Task Force Review*. Burnley: Burnley Town Council.

Collins, James (1999). "The Ebonics controversy in context: Literacies, subjectivities, and language ideologies in the United States. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 201–234). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Creese, Angela & Martin, Peter (Eds.). (2003). *Multilingual Classroom Ecologies*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Crick, Bernard (2003). *The New and the Old. The Report of the Life in the United Kingdom Advisory Group.* London: HMSO.

Cummins, Jim (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy. Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, Jim (2003). "Bilingual education: Basic principles". In J.-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, & Li Wei (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principles* (pp. 43–55). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Davies, Bronwyn & Harre, Rom (1990). "Positioning: The discursive production of selves". *Journal for the Theory of Social behaviour, 20* (1), 43–63.

De Cillia, Rudolf, Reisigl, Martin, & Wodak, Ruth (1999). "The discursive construction of national identities". *Discourse and Society, 10* (2), 149–173.

Department for Education and Skills (2002). *Languages for All: Languages for Life*. London: DfES.

Department for Education and Skills (2004). "All ethnic groups improve at GCSE/GNVQ". Press release. London: DfES.

Dewaele, Jean-Marc, Housen, Alex, & Li, Wei (2003). "Introduction and overview". In J.-M. Dewaele, A. Housen, & Li Wei (Eds.), *Bilingualism: Beyond Basic Principles* (pp. 1–9). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dicker, Susan (1996). *Languages in America: A Pluralist View*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dudley, Jill, Turner, Gill, & Woollacott, Simon (2003). *Control of Immigration: Statistics United Kingdom 2002.* London: HMSO.

Elspass, Stephen (2002). "Phraseological units in parliamentary discourse". In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 81–110). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Essed, Paul (2000). "Beyond antiracism: Diversity, multi-identifications and sketchy images of new societies". In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The Semiotics of Racism* (pp. 41–62). Vienna: Passagen Verlag.

Fairclough, Norman (1989). *Language and Power.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman (1995a). *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language*. London/New York: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman (1995b). *Media Discourse*. London: Arnold.

Fairclough, Norman (2000). "Discourse, social theory, and social research: The discourse of welfare reform". *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 4* (2), 163–195.
Fairclough, Norman (2003a). *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research.* London: Routledge.
Fairclough, Norman (2003b). "The dialectics of discourse". *Textus, XIV* (2), 231–242.
Fairclough, Norman (2003c). "Semiotic aspects of social transformation and learning". In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (pp. 225–236). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Fairclough, Norman (2003d). "'Political correctness': The politics of culture and language". *Discourse and Society, 14* (1), 17–28.
Fairclough, Norman & Wodak, Ruth (1997). "Critical discourse analysis". In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 258–284). London: Sage.
Fetzer, Anita (2002). "'Put bluntly, you have something of a credibility problem'. Sincerity and credibility in political interviews". In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 173–201). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Fowler, Roger (1991). *Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
Gal, Susan (1998). "Multiplicity and contention among language ideologies: A Commentary". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 3–47). New York: Oxford University Press.
Gal, Susan & Irvine, Judith (1995). "The boundaries of language and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference". *Social Research, 62* (4), 967–1001.
Gal, Susan & Woolard, Kathryn (1995). "Constructing languages and publics: Authority and representation". *Pragmatics, 5* (2), 129–138.
Gardner-Chloros, Penelope (1997). "Vernacular literacy in new vernacular settings in Europe". In A. Tabouret-Keller, R. Le Page, P. Gardner-Chloros, & G. Varro (Eds.), *Vernacular Literacy. A Re-evaluation* (pp. 189–221). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Gouveia, Carlos A. M. (2003). "Critical Discourse Analysis and the development of the new science". In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 147–62). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Graham, Phil (2003). Critical Discourse Analysis and Evaluative Meaning: Interdisciplinarity as a critical turn. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis. Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (pp. 110–129). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Gramsci, Antonio (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* New York: International.
Grice, H. Paul (1975). "Logic and conversation". In P. Cole & J. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: 3: Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.
Griffin, Nick (2003). "The BNP: Anti-asylum protest, racist sect or power-winning Movement". http://www.bnp.org.uk/articles/race_reality.htm. 21st November 2003.
Grillo, Ralph (1998). *Pluralism and the Politics of Difference*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Hansard (2001). Commons Hansard Debates text for 17 July 2001, Vol. 372. http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/cm010717/hallindx/10717-x.htm
Hansard (2001). Commons Lord Debates text for 19 July 2001, Vol. 626. http:// www.publications.parliament/uk/pa/ld200102/ldhansrd/vo010719/text/1 0719-18.htm#10719-18_spmin0

Hansen, Randall (2000). *Citizenship and Immigration in Post-war Britain.* Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Hansen, Randall (2003). "Citizenship and integration in Europe". In C. Joppke & E. Morawska (Eds.), *Towards Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States* (pp. 87–109). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Heller, Monica (1992). "The politics of codeswitching and language choice". *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 13* (1/2), 123–142.

Heller, Monica (1995). "Language choice, social institutions and symbolic domination". *Language in Society, 24*, 373–405.

Heller, Monica (1999). *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity. A Sociolinguistic Ethnography.* London/New York: Longman.

Heller, Monica (2005). "Multilingualism and structuration". Paper presented at the *International Symposium on Bilingualism*, Barcelona, March 2005.

Home Office, The (1981). *British Nationality Act*. London, HMSO.

Home Office, The (2001). Press statement, 18th August 2001.

Home Office, The (2002a). *Secure Borders, Safe Haven. Integration with Diversity in Modern Britain.* London: HMSO.

Home Office, The (2002b). *Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act.* London: HMSO.

Home Office, The (no date). *Information about naturalisation as a British citizen*. London: HMSO.

Home Office, The (no date). *Naturalisation as a British citizen: A guide for applicants.* http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/default.asp?PageId=119

Home Office, The (2002a). *Summary and contents of the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act.* London: HMSO.

Home Office, The (2002b). *Explanatory notes to the Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act.* London, HMSO.

Home Office, The (2004). *Language requirement, further information – The need to prove sufficient knowledge of the English language*. London: HMSO.

Honeyford, Ray (1988). *Integration or Disintegration? Towards a Non-racist Society*. London: Claridge.

Hymes, Dell (1996). *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice*. London: Taylor and Francis.

Irvine, Judith & Gal, Susan (2000). "Language ideology and linguistic differentiation". In P. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Polities and Identities* (pp. 35–84). Santa Fe/Oxford: School of American Research Press.

Jaffe, Alexandra (1999). "Locating power: Corsican translators and their critics". In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 39–66). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jessop, Bob & Sum, Ngai-Ling (2001). 'Pre-disciplinary and post-disciplinary perspectives'. *New Politicial Economy, 6* (1), 89–101.

Joppke, Christian & Morawska, Ewa (2003). "Integrating immigrants in liberal nation-states: Policies and practices". In C. Joppke & E. Morawska (Eds.), *Towards Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States* (pp. 1–36). Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kanno, Yasuko (2003). *Negotiating Bilingual and Bicultural Identities. Japanese Returnees Betwixt Two Worlds.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Koopmans, Ruud & Statham, Paul (2003). "How national citizenship shapes transnationalism: Migrant and minority claims-making in Germany, Britain and the Netherlands". In C. Joppke & E. Morawska (Eds.), *Towards Assimilation and Citizenship: Immigrants in Liberal Nation-States* (pp. 195–238). Basingstoke/New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kristeva, Julia (1986). *The Kristeva Reader* (edited by Toril Moi). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Kroskrity, Paul (1998). "Arizona Tewa Kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 103–122). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kroskrity, Paul (2000). "Regimenting languages: Language ideological perspectives". In P. Kroskrity (Ed.) *Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Polities and Identities* (pp. 1–34). Santa Fe/Oxford: School of American Research Press.

Lancashire Evening Telegraph, 25th July 1997. Language row caused by insensitivity.

Lancashire Evening Telegraph, 27th July 1998. £44,000 translates as 'good value for money'.

Lancashire Evening Telegraph, 5th March 1999. Town hall uproar over 'racist' slur.

Lancashire Evening Telegraph, 7th September 2000. 'Racism' slur on councillor.

Lancashire Evening Telegraph, 13th September 2000. Plain-speaking Harry makes a lot of sense.

Leung, Constant, Harris, Roxy, & Rampton, Ben (1997). "The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities". *TESOL Quarterly, 31*, 544–560.

Martin, Peter, Bhatt, Arvind, Bhojani, Nirmala, & Creese, Angela (2003). *Complementary Schools and their Communities in Leicester*. University of Leicester/University of Birmingham (ESRC R000223949).

Linguistic Minorities Project (1985). *The Other Languages of England* (edited by Michael Stubbs). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Martin, Jim & Wodak, Ruth (2003). "Introduction". In J. Martin & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Re/reading the past. Critical and Functional Perspectives on Time and Value* (pp. 1–18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

May, Stephen (2001). *Language and Minority Rights: Ethnicity, Nationalism, and the Politics of Language*. London: Longman.

Mertz, Elizabeth (1998). "Linguistic ideology and praxis in U.S. law school classrooms". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 149–162). New York: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, Michael (2001). "Between theory, method, and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA". In R. Wodak & M. Meyer, (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 14–31). London: Sage.

Miller, Jenny (2004). "Identity and language use: The politics of speaking ESL in schools". In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 290–315). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Mills, Jean (2004). "Mothers and mother tongue: Perspectives on self-construction by mothers of Pakistani heritage". In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 161–191). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Muntigl, Peter (2002). "Politicization and depoliticization. Employment policy if the European Union". In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 45–79). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Office for National Statistics (2004). *Focus on People and Migration*. London: The Stationery Office.

Office for Standards in Education (1999). *Raising the Attainment of Ethnic Minority Pupils.* London: The Stationery Office.

Ouseley, Herman (2001). *Community Pride, not Prejudice. Making Diversity Work in Bradford.* Bradford: Bradford Vision.

Parekh, Bikhu (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism. Cultural Diversity and Political Theory.* London: Macmillan.

Pavlenko, Aneta (2001a). "Language learning memoirs as a gendered genre". *Applied Linguistics, 22*, 213–240.

Pavlenko, Aneta (2001b). "'How do I become a woman in an American vein?': Transformations of gender performance in second language learning". In A. Pavlenko, A. Blackledge, I. Piller, & M. Teutsch-Dwyer (Eds.), *Multilingualism, Second Language Learning, and Gender* (pp. 133–174). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pavlenko, Aneta (2001c). "'In the world of the tradition, I was unimagined': Negotiation of identities in cross-cultural autobiographies". *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5* (3), 317–344.

Pavlenko, Aneta (2002). "'We have room for but one language here': Language and national identity in the US at the turn of the 20th century". *Multilingua, 21* (2/3), 163–198.

Pavlenko, Aneta & Blackledge, Adrian (2004a). "New theoretical approaches to the study of negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts". In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 1–33). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Pavlenko, Aneta & Blackledge, Adrian (Eds.). (2004b). *Negotiation of Identities in Multilingual Contexts*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Philips, Susan (1998). "Language ideologies in institutions of power: A commentary". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 211–222). New York: Oxford University Press.

Pietikäinen, Sari (2003). "Indigenous identity in print: Representations of the Sami in news discourse". *Discourse and Society, 14* (5), 581–609.

Piller, Ingrid (2001a). "Naturalisation language testing and its basis in ideologies of national identity and citizenship". *International Journal of Bilingualism, 5* (3), 259–278.

Piller, Ingrid (2001b). "Who, if anyone, is a native speaker?" *Anglistik: Mitteilungen des Verbandes Deutscher Anglisten, 12* (2), 109–121.

Rampton, Ben (1995). *Crossing: Language and ethnicity among adolescents*. London: Longman.

Rampton, Ben (Ed.). (1999a). Styling the Other: Thematic issue. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3* (4).

Rampton, Ben (1999b). "Styling the Other: Introduction". *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3* (4), 421–427.

Reisigl, Martin & Wodak, Ruth (2000). "'Austria first': A discourse-historical analysis of the Austrian 'Anti-Foreigner Petition' in 1993". In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The Semiotics of Racism* (pp. 269–304). Vienna: Passagenverlag.

Reisigl, Martin & Wodak, Ruth (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of Racism and Antisemitism.* London: Routledge.

Richardson, John (2004). *(Mis)Representing Islam. The Racism and Rhetoric of British Broadsheet Newspapers.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ritchie, David (2001). *Oldham Independent Review: One Oldham, One Future.* Oldham: Oldham Town Council.

Rogers, Rebecca (2003a). "An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education". In Rogers, R. (Ed.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (pp. 1–18). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rogers, Rebecca (2003b). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family Literacy Practices. Power In and Out of Print.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rooker, Lord (2001). Interview with Rt. Hon. Lord Rooker, 17th August 2001. *ePolitix.com.* http://www.epolitix.com/EN/Interviews/200108/D0B92A35-415A-48AD-8CD6-24AD418993E3.htm

Runnymede Trust, The (1997). *Islamophobia – A Challenge For Us All.* London: The Runnymede Trust.

Sauer, Christoph (2002). "Ceremonial text and talk. A functional-pragmatic approach". In P. Chilton & C. Schäffner (Eds.), *Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 111–142). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schegloff, Emanuel (1997). "Whose text? Whose context?" *Discourse and Society, 8* (2), 165–187.

Schieffelin, Bambi & Doucet, Rachelle C. (1998). "The 'real' Haitian Creole: Ideology, metalinguistics and orthographic choice". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 285–316). New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, Ronald (2000). *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Schmidt, Ronald (2001). "Racialisation and culture in language policy conflict – a perspective from the U.S.A." Paper presented at the Third International Symposium on Bilingualism, Bristol, UK, 18–20 April 2001.

Schmidt, Ronald (2002). "Racialisation and language policy: The case of the U.S.A." *Multilingua, 21* (2/3), 141–162.

Silverstein, Michael (2000). "Whorfianism and the linguistic imagination of nationality. In P. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of Language. Ideologies, Polities and Identities* (pp. 84–138). Santa Fe/Oxford: School of American Research Press.

Spitulnik, Deborah (1998). "Mediating unity and diversity: The production of language ideologies in Zambian broadcasting". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and Theory* (pp. 163–188). New York: Oxford University Press.

ter Wal, Jessika (2002). "Conclusions". In J. ter Wal (Ed.), *Racism and Cultural Diversity in the Mass Media* (pp. 1–72). Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.

The Guardian, July 13th, 2001. 'Bradford's painful future,' p. 17.

The Guardian, July 27th, 2001. 'Old hatred, new style,' p. 17.

The Guardian, August 18th, 2001. Working knowledge of English could become compulsory for immigrants.

The Independent, July 13th, 2001. 'David Aaronovitch: Forget political correctness racism causes racial tensions,' p. 12.

The Independent, July 13th, 2001. 'Ouseley claims Bradford is city gripped by fear and prejudice,' p. 3.

The Independent August 18th, 2001. English lessons may become condition of UK citizenship.

The Independent on Sunday, December 9th, 2001. 'If we want social cohesion we need a sense of identity,' p. 20.

The Independent on Sunday August 19th, 2001. Blunkett 'English for passports' plan.

The Observer, August 19th, 2001. Blunkett fuels English lessons row.

The Sun, July 4th, 2003. Swan Bake. Asylum seekers steal the Queen's birds for barbecues.

Titscher, Stephen, Meyer, Michael, Wodak, Ruth, & Vetter, Elizabeth (2000). *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

UK Linguistic Ethnography Forum (2004). *UK Linguistic Ethnography: A Discussion Paper*. London: UK LEF.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London/New York: Routledge.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. London: Sage.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1997). "Political discourse and racism. Describing Others in Western Parliaments". In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), *The Language and Politics of Exclusion. Others in Discourse* (pp. 31–64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2000a). "On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration". In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The Semiotics of Racism. Approaches in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 65–84). Vienna: Passagen Verlag.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2000b). "New(s) racism: A discourse analytical approach". In S. Cottle (Ed.), *Ethnic Minorities and the Media* (pp. 33–49). Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2001). "Multidisciplinarity CDA: A plea for diversity". In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 95–120). London: Sage.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2002). "Political discourse and political cognition". In P. Chilton & C. Schaffner (Eds.), P*olitics as Text and Talk. Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* (pp. 203–238). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2003a). "The discourse-knowledge interface". In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 85–109). London: Palgrave.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2003b). "Critical discourse analysis". In B. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 352–371). Oxford: Blackwell.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2004). "Text and context of parliamentary debates". In P. Bayley (Ed.), *Cross-cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2005). *Racism and Discourse in Spain and Latin America*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Leeuwen, Theo & Wodak, Ruth (1999). "Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis". *Discourse Studies, 1* (1), 83–118.

Verschueren, Jef (2005). "Contributions of Pragmatics to the study of bilingualism". Paper presented at the *International Symposium on Bilingualism*, Barcelona, March 2005.

Villenas, Sophia (2001). "Latina Mothers and Small-Town Racisms: Creating Narratives of Dignity and Moral Education in North Carolina". *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 32* (1), 3–28.

Voloshinov, Valentin N. (1973). *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (trans. L. Matejka and I. R. Titunik, first published 1929). London/New York: Seminar Press.

Watts, Richard (1999). The ideology of dialect in Switzerland. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language Ideological Debates* (pp. 67–104). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Weiss, Gilbert & Wodak, Ruth (2003). "Introduction". In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.) *Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Palgrave.

Widdowson, Henry (1995). "Discourse analysis: A critical view". *Language and Literature, 4* (3), 157–172.

Widdowson, Henry (1998). "The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis". *Applied Linguistics, 19* (1), 136–151.

Widdowson, Henry (2000). "Critical practices: On representation and the interpretation of text". In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Theory, Interdisciplinarity and Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 155–169). London: Palgrave.

Williams, Raymond (1977). *Marxism and Literature.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, Ruth (2000). "Recontextualisation and the transformation of meanings: A critical discourse analysis of decision making in EU meetings about employment policies". In S. Sarangi & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Discourse and Social Life* (pp. 185–206). London: Longman.

Wodak, Ruth (2001). "The discourse-historical approach". In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 63–94). London: Sage.

Wodak, Ruth (2002). "Discourse and politics: The rhetoric of exclusion". In R. Wodak & A. Pelinka (Eds.), *The Haider Phenomenon in Austria* (pp. 33–60). New Brunswick/London: Transaction.

Wodak, Ruth, Menz, Florian, Mitten, Richard, & Stern, Frank (1994). *Sprachen der Vergangenheiten. Offentliches Gedenken in osterreichschen und deutschen Medien.* Frankfurt, Suhrkamp.

Wodak, Ruth, de Cillia, Rudolf, Reisigl, Martin, & Liebhart, Karen (1999). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Woodside-Jiron, Haley (2003). "Language, power, and participation: Using Critical Discourse Analysis to make sense of public policy". In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (pp. 173–206). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Woolard, Kathryn (1998). "Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry". In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, & P. Kroskrity (Eds.), *Language Ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3–47). New York: Oxford University Press.

Name index

A
Anderson, B. 39, 40, 43, 46
Antaki, C. 86

B
Baetens Beardsmore, H. 56
Bakhtin, M. 7, 14, 15, 16, 17, 80, 81, 82, 83, 88, 102, 127, 128, 132, 143, 156, 158, 161, 182, 183, 191, 197
Barbour, S. 40, 41
Bayley, P. 14
Bigler, E. 43
Billig, M. 40, 41
Blackledge, A. 13, 26, 31, 32, 36, 41, 44, 49, 60, 115, 147, 178, 185, 205, 209, 213
Bokhorst-Heng, W. 34
Bourdieu, P. 4, 32, 33, 39, 40, 42, 44, 45, 80, 90, 96, 113–115, 123, 147, 148, 174, 175–178, 181, 182, 190, 192, 203, 204, 207–212, 217, 218

C
Caldas-Coulthard, C. 12, 66
Chilton, P. 3, 7, 8, 9, 24, 61, 93, 95, 121, 155
Chouliaraki, L. 4, 7, 17, 121
Collins, J. 32
Creese, A. 13, 115, 178
Crick, B. 222
Cummins, J. 57, 229

D
Davies, B. 37
Dewaele, J.-M. 56
De Cillia, R. 18, 41
Dicker, S. 37
Doucet, R. C. 34, 37, 175
Dudley, J. 220

E
Elspass, S. 83, 84, 94
Essed, P. 47

F
Fairclough, N. 2, 4, 5–12, 16, 17, 24, 25, 37, 45, 72, 74, 75, 78, 86, 93, 96, 99, 100, 104, 105, 107, 121, 143, 158, 159, 199
Fetzer, A. 95
Fowler, R. 65, 80, 82, 83, 84, 134, 136

G
Gal, S. 31, 34, 35, 46, 79, 88, 105, 112, 147
Gardner-Chloros, P. 38
Gouveia, C. 17
Graham, P. 7
Gramsci, A. 45
Grice, P. H. 95
Grillo, R. 38, 46

H
Hansen, R. 10, 62, 64
Harré, R. 37
Harris, R. 54
Heller, M. 34, 39, 41, 42, 43, 46, 89, 90, 148, 205
Housen, A 56
Hymes, D. 46

I
Irvine, J. 34, 46, 79, 88, 105, 112

J
Jaffe, A. 34
Jessop, B. 7
Joppke, C. 63, 64

K
Kanno, Y. 148
Koopmans, R. 63
Kristeva, J. 10
Kroskrity, P. 31, 46

L
Leung, C. 54, 225
Liebhart, K. 18, 41
Li Wei 56

M
Martin, J. 2, 19
Martin, P. 115, 148, 230
May, S. 40, 42, 44, 48, 176, 216
Mertz, E. 37
Meyer, M. 2, 17, 121
Miller, J. 148
Mills, J. 148
Morawska, E. 63, 64
Muntigl, P. 94

O
Ouseley, H. 82

P
Parekh, B. 49, 62, 64, 185, 229
Pavlenko, A. 31, 32, 36, 38, 43, 44, 115, 147, 205, 213
Philips, S. 45
Pietikäinen, S. 67
Piller, I. 50, 52

R
Rampton, B. 40, 54, 55, 65, 148, 225

Reisigl, M. 4, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 41, 48, 67, 68, 74, 97, 110, 144, 169
Richardson, J. 47, 49, 67
Rogers, R. 1, 95, 115

S
Sauer, C. 95, 102
Schaffner, C. 8, 24, 121, 155
Schegloff, E. 17
Schieffelin, B. 34, 37, 175
Schmidt, R. 43, 47, 48, 89, 176, 216
Silverstein, M. 46
Spitulnik, D. 34
Statham, P. 63
Sum, N.-L. 7

T
ter Wal, J. 67,
Titscher, S. 3, 17, 121
Turner, G. 220

V
van Dijk, T. A. 3, 9, 10, 17, 18, 24, 47, 59, 61, 66, 67, 68, 86, 123, 124
van Leeuwen, T. 12, 122, 124, 134, 144
Verschueren, J. 19, 31, 38, 46, 89, 134
Vetter, E. 17, 121
Villenas, S. 43
Voloshinov, V. N. 10, 14, 16, 85, 87, 159, 162

W
Wacquant, L. 210
Watts, R. 34
Weiss, G. 2, 4, 5, 18, 61
Wetherell, M. 86
Widdowson, H. 7, 17
Williams, R. 46
Wodak, R. 2, 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20–24, 26, 41, 48, 61, 67, 68, 74, 83, 97, 110, 121–124, 134, 144, 161, 169
Woodside-Jiron, H. 97
Woollacott, S. 220
Woolard, K. 31, 32

Subject index

A
argumentation 24–25, 67–72
arranged marriages 112
assimilation 57
assumption 96–97, 158

B
Bengali 65
bilingualism 56–58
Blunkett, David 132–133, 137
Bradford Review, The 157–162
British National Party 167–168
Burnley Task Force Review 157, 168–170

C
Cantle Report, The 170–173
certification 191–192
citizenship 131–132, 187, 194–196, 213–215
Commission for Racial Equality 139
Commission on British Muslims and Islamophobia 47
common sense 40, 84–85, 123, 176, 212
Community Pride, Not Prejudice 157
consensus 86–88, 132
context 9–13
critical discourse analysis 2–29
  criticism of 17–18
  discourse-historical approach 26–27
crossing 55
Cryer, Ann 97–115
cultural practices 185–187

D
deixis 101
democracy 189–191
discourse 7–8
  chains 12–13
  dialogic 100–102
  and discrimination 73–82
  double voiced 16–17, 79–81, 102
  primary 16, 72–73
  secondary 17, 72–73
  strategies 21–29
discrimination 65–67, 73–76

E
epolitix.com 124–126, 142, 149
erasure 112
extended holidays abroad 106

F
field 210
Foreign Policy Centre 193–198

G
gender 127–131, 218–220
genre 8–9, 158–159
Germany 50
Guardian, The 134–135, 149
Gujarati 65

H
habitus 32–35, 210, 212
Hansard 93–94
hegemony 45–47, 90
Hindi 65
Home Office, The 132–133
Home Secretary 132–133
homogeneity 115

I
iconic representation 105
ideologies 146–147
identities 35–40
  national 40–44
  negotiation of 36–37
imagined communities 40, 46–47
immigration 57, 61–64
inclusion 64
Independent, The 134, 139–141, 151
Independent on Sunday, The 134, 136, 142, 152
Integration with Diversity 193–203
interdiscursivity 6, 11–12
intertextuality 6, 10–11
Islamophobia 47, 116, 159

J
Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants 139, 143

L
Lancashire Evening Telegraph 73–88
language ideologies 31–35, 44–54, 88–90
language testing 50–54, 223–225
legislation 202–203
liberalism 97–98
linguistic ethnography 115

M
metaphor 84, 136
metonym 23–24, 143–144

misrecognition 34, 114, 208–209, 212
mitigation 25–26
modality 82
monolingualism 225–228
multiculturalism 61–64
multilingualism 55–58, 211, 228–231
and the State 64–65, 211–212
and citizenship 213–215
and gender 218–220
and symbolic racism 216–217
Muslims 49, 185–187

N
nationhood 40–44, 179–180
Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002 1, 202–203
native speaker 54–55
New and the Old, The 220–223
newspapers 66–67
editorials 82–83
headlines 135–136

O
Oath of Allegiance 215
Observer, The 134, 136, 153
Office for Standards in Education 107
Oldham Review 162–168
Oldham Independent Review, The 157

P
Parekh Report, The 62, 63, 64
parents 160
participation 160, 186
pluralism 57–58
political correctness 198–202
political speeches 94–97
polyphony 156, 161, 217–218
practical knowledge 209–211
presupposition 66, 158
primary purpose 62
Prime Minister 144, 155
Punjabi 65

R
racialisation 48, 78
racism 48, 168–170, 217–218
new racisms 48, 176
recontextualisation 12–13, 82–84, 121–122, 126–127, 134–136
addition 144–145
deletion 124
rearrangement 125
substitution 139–142
representation 72–73, 136–138, 157, 160–162
researcher 59–61
rhetorical questions 86–88, 100–102
Rooker, Lord 124–133, 142

S
schizophrenia 197–198
school underachievement 106
Secure Borders, Safe Haven 182–191
show concessions 85–86
social segregation 158
social practice 4–5
spouses 139–142
Sun, The 22
Sylheti 208
symbolic domination 207–208, 211–212
symbolic power 34–35, 181–182
symbolic racism 47–49, 216–217
symbolic violence 39–40
synecdoche 23–24

T
topoi 67–72

U
U.K. Linguistic Ethnography Forum 205
Urdu 65

V
voice 6, 14–17, 76–77

W
women 218–220

In the series *Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society and Culture* the following titles have been published thus far or are scheduled for publication:

17 **SAUSSURE, Louis de and Peter SCHULZ (eds.):** Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century. Discourse, language, mind. *Expected December 2005*

16 **ERREYGERS, Guido and Geert JACOBS (eds.):** Language, Communication and the Economy. viii, 229 pp. + index. *Expected December 2005*

15 **BLACKLEDGE, Adrian:** Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World. 2005. x, 252 pp.

14 **DIJK, Teun A. van:** Racism and Discourse in Spain and Latin America. 2005. xii, 198 pp.

13 **WODAK, Ruth and Paul CHILTON (eds.):** A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis. Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity. 2005. xiv, 322 pp.

12 **GRILLO, Eric (ed.):** Power Without Domination. Dialogism and the empowering property of communication. 2005. xviii, 247 pp.

11 **MUNTIGL, Peter:** Narrative Counselling. Social and linguistic processes of change. 2004. x, 347 pp.

10 **BAYLEY, Paul (ed.):** Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse. 2004. vi, 385 pp.

9 **RICHARDSON, John E.:** (Mis)Representing Islam. The racism and rhetoric of British broadsheet newspapers. 2004. vi, 277 pp.

8 **MARTIN, J.R. and Ruth WODAK (eds.):** Re/reading the past. Critical and functional perspectives on time and value. 2003. vi, 277 pp.

7 **ENSINK, Titus and Christoph SAUER (eds.):** The Art of Commemoration. Fifty years after the Warsaw Uprising. 2003. xii, 246 pp.

6 **DUNNE, Michele Durocher:** Democracy in Contemporary Egyptian Political Discourse. 2003. xii, 179 pp.

5 **THIESMEYER, Lynn (ed.):** Discourse and Silencing. Representation and the language of displacement. 2003. x, 316 pp.

4 **CHILTON, Paul and Christina SCHÄFFNER (eds.):** Politics as Text and Talk. Analytic approaches to political discourse. 2002. x, 246 pp.

3 **CHNG, Huang Hoon:** Separate and Unequal. Judicial rhetoric and women's rights. 2002. viii, 157 pp.

2 **LITOSSELITI, Lia and Jane SUNDERLAND (eds.):** Gender Identity and Discourse Analysis. 2002. viii, 336 pp.

1 **GELBER, Katharine:** Speaking Back. The free speech versus hate speech debate. 2002. xiv, 177 pp.