ANTI-IMMIGRATION VS ANTI-EU:
POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF BREXIT DECISION OF THE UK

ANTİ-GÖÇMEN YA DA ANTİ-AB:
BİRLEŞİK KRALLIK'IN BREXİT KARARININ SİYASİ SÖYLEM ANALİZİ

DENİZ EROĞLU UTKU

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Trakya Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, Edirne, Türkiye

Asst. Prof., Deniz Eroğlu Utku, Trakya University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Political Science and Public Administration

denizeroglu@trakya.edu.tr
Orcid: 0000-0002-1823-699X

NERGİZ ÖZKURAL KÖROĞLU

Doç. Dr., Üsküdar Üniversitesi, İTBF / Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler, İstanbul, Türkiye

Assoc. Prof. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Political Science and International Relations Department.

nergiz.ozkuralkoroglu@uskudar.edu.tr
Orcid: 0000-0003-0893-4054

Makale dosyası   Makale ses dosyası

Anti-Immigration vs Anti-EU:
Political Discourse Analysis of Brexit Decision of the UK[1]

Abstract

United Kingdom's relation with the European Union has been always distant. Nevertheless, Britain's decision to leave the European Union, so-called the Brexit decision, has been one of the shocking developments happening in 2016. Prima facia the referendum result shows the electorate's historic decision to break away from the EU, however it is actually a product of a populist political discourse, which has been shaped by increasing anti-immigrant sentiments in the UK. In this paper, we argue that anti-immigrant discourses behind the Brexit campaign actually are a part of larger historical relations with the European Union. Following on from the literature, we argue that the role of the UK in the EU throughout the history of European integration has always been one of 'British exceptionalism'. The immigration question, on the other hand, provided an important opportunity for following this exceptionalist policy and leave the EU membership, but it resulted in racist and xenophobic attacks towards all "others" within society. In this process, discourses on the leave side contributed to anti-immigrant feelings and racism within society, although we cannot say this was the main aim. In this paper, we conduct the political discourse analysis developed by Teun van Dijk to examine the campaign of the United Kingdom Independence Party during the referendum process. Taken together, these aspects of the article show how the anti-immigration discourse has contributed to the racist and xenophobic actions, while the main aim has been to finalise the UK's long-standing distance from the EU.

Keywords: Politics, Brexit, Euroscepticism, Anti-immigration, Political Discourse, UKIP.

Summary

United Kingdom's relation with the European Union has been always distant. As literature mainly underlines, the UK has never been a full participant of certain policy areas; particularly in the area of 'justice and home affair' the UK showed limited enthusiasm to cooperate Nevertheless, Britain's decision to leave the European Union, so-called the Brexit decision, has been one of the shocking development happening in 2016 and both EU

---

and member state leaders expressed their disappointment. The process that started with David Cameron's signal for the referendum in 2013 ended with a vote to leave the EU by 52% to 48%. Prima facia the referendum result shows the electorate's historic decision to break away from the EU, however it is actually the/a product of a populist political discourse, which has been shaped by increasing anti-immigrant sentiments in the UK. In this paper, we argue that anti-immigrant discourses behind the Brexit campaign actually are a part of larger historical relations with the European Union. In this process, discourses on the leave side contributed to anti-immigrant feelings and racism within society, although we cannot say this was the main aim. In this paper, we conduct the political discourse analysis developed by Teun van Dijk to examine the campaign of the United Kingdom Independence Party during the referendum process. Although Nigel Farage was not the only figure to target migrants, his actions were the most radical and his anti-immigration discourse was quite effective therefore the analysis used his discourses during the referendum. The Brexit process is still ambiguous, but we have already witnessed the social consequences of the racist discourses of the referendum process. In this regard, the increases in racist attacks indicated in the official reports are worrying.

The study has four main parts. After the introduction part, the historical relation between the EU and the UK has indicated and distant relationship between the parts is highlighted. Following on from this part, Euroscepticism in Britain is explained and its role behind Brexit's decision is clarified as part of the main argument of this study. After this historical explanation, the main analysis started. The study is conducted by relying on Political Discourse Analysis developed by Teun van Dijk. At this point, clarification of "discourse" is somewhat important. According to van Dijk, discourse is essential to control people's minds, ideas, knowledge, opinions, and their personal and social representations. He also argues that discourses are significant to have power, dominance and the reproduction of racism within societies and political discourses tend to be future-oriented. The actors topicalise certain issues and use discourses to direct masses towards certain actions. During the referendum process, UKIP was not the only party supporting the leave campaign, Boris Johnson, for example, also encouraged the public to vote for Brexit. Nigel Farage allegedly persuaded more than 17 million people to vote to leave the EU[2].

---

[2]   BBCNews, "The Nigel Farage Story", 2016, access: 4 July 2018 , http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-36701855.

In the analysis, we first pointed the 'positive self-presentation' in Farage's discourses. Here, "WE" always represent the 'more democratic and civilised' one. Similar to this 'others' have negative meaning and correspond to threats to the coherence of the country. During the campaign, the party and the leader targeted immigrants and categorised their threat according to three aspects of life: the welfare system, the UK public's security, and social norms. However, Farage never accepted that he was being 'racist', even he argued he supported refugees by emphasising bogus/real refugee distinction. In addition, Farage's strategy was to justify his 'firm and fair' immigration control for the good of an inner circle, in other words in the interests of the British people. He tried to justify his actions by arguing they were the demands of British people. On top of all these, he indicated some real/unreal numbers to persuade masses.

After discourse analysis, the article indicates how racism within society was reproduced. By showing hate crime reports that indicate attacks peaked in the post-referendum, this study underlines discourses are not inefficient tools, in fact they can pave the way for some dangerous results. Both the National Police and UN reports prove the increase in the number of racist hate crimes, especially in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland.

All in all, we argue that the role of the UK in the EU throughout the history of European integration has always been one of 'British exceptionalism'. The immigration question, on the other hand, provided an important opportunity for following this exceptionalist policy and for leaving the EU membership, but it resulted in racist and xenophobic attacks towards all "others" within society. Without ignoring historical background, this study relied on data produced during the referendum process and post-referendum era and it aimed to contribute to both migration and Brexit studies literature. Since this article did not have room to account for the other parties' discourses and the long-run effects of referendum, it would be interesting to enlarge the inquiry by adding different party discourses, describing their influence on the public and how migrants are affected today.

Anti-Göçmen ya da Anti-AB:
Birleşik Krallık'ın Brexit Kararının Siyasi Söylem Analizi

Öz

Birleşik Krallık'ın Avrupa Birliği ile olan ilişkileri her zaman mesafeli olmuştur. Bununla birlikte, Britanya'nın Brexit kararı olarak isimlendirilen Avrupa Birliği'nden ayrılma kararı 2016'da meydana gelen şok edici gelişmelerden biri olmuştur. İlk bakışta referandumun sonucu seçmenlerin AB'den ayrılma konusundaki tarihi kararını gösteriyor olsa da aslında bu sonuç İngiltere'deki göçmen karşıtı duyguların artmasıyla şekillenen popülist bir siyasi söylemin ürünüdür. Bu çalışmada, Brexit kampanyasının arkasındaki göçmen karşıtı söylemlerin aslında Avrupa Birliği ile daha büyük tarihsel ilişkilerin bir parçası olduğunu iddia etmekteyiz. Literatürü takiben İngiltere'nin Avrupa entegrasyonu tarihi boyunca AB'deki rolünün her zaman 'İngiliz istisnacılığından biri olduğunu ileri sürmekteyiz. Göç sorunu ise, bu istisnacılık politikasını sürdürmeyi ve AB üyeliğinden ayrılma için önemli bir fırsat sağladı, ancak bu, toplumdaki tüm "ötekilere" karşı ırkçı ve yabancı düşmanlığıyla sonuçlandı. Bu süreçte ayrılma taraftarı söylemler, toplumdaki göçmen karşıtı duygulara ve ırkçılığa neden olmuştur, ancak bunun temel amaç olduğu söylenemez. Bu yazıda, referandum sürecinde Birleşik Krallık Bağımsızlık Partisi'nin kampanyasını incelemek için Teun van Dijk tarafından geliştirilen siyasal söylem analizini kullanmaktayız. Çalışmanın asıl amacı İngiltere'nin AB'den uzun süreli olan mesafesini ortaya koymak iken makale bir bütün olarak ele alındığında, göçmen karşıtı söylemin ırkçı ve yabancı düşmanlığına nasıl sebep olduğunu göstermektir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Siyaset, Brexit, Avrupa Şüpheciliği, Göçmen Karşıtlığı, Siyasi Söylem Analizi, UKIP

INTRODUCTION

Relations between the UK and continental Europe have always been distant, even though this country has been a member of the Union since 1973. In many sectors, the UK followed its own national policies and abstained from applying supranational norms. Particularly in the areas of justice and home affairs, which include policies regarding the Schengen rules, the abolition of intra-member state border controls, immigration of third-country nationals, the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) and criminal justice and police cooperation, the UK opted to secure its own policies[3]. Troitino et. al.

---

[3]   Sergio Carrera, et. al. "What Does Brexit Mean for the EU's Area of Freedom, Security and

have argued that this country does not understand the nature of the EU, it simply regards the union as an economic one.[4] Despite these semi-detached relations, the Brexit decision has stunned the world. The process that started with David Cameron's signal for the referendum in 2013 ended with a vote to leave the EU by 52% to 48%. Finally, Britain stopped being a member of this Union on 31 January 2020.

While the referendum result was surprising for many[5], some like Glencross found it 'inevitable'.[6] He rightly defined the UK's 40-year membership as 'neverandum' by indicating the policies of the UK which deviated from those of the EU.[7] However, this historical background has been mainly overlooked and current issues like the high migration rate of the country were indicated as one of the main reasons for voting leave.

Following on from Glencross, we argue that the role of the UK in the EU throughout the history of European integration has always been one of 'British exceptionalism'. The immigration question, on the other hand, provided an important opportunity for following this exceptionalist policy and leave the EU membership, but it resulted in racist and xenophobic attacks towards all "others" within society. In this process, discourses on the leave side contributed to anti-immigrant feelings and racism within society, although we cannot say this was the main aim.

In order to examine the process in relation to the historical background, we shall first explore the background of EU-UK relation and Euroscepticism in Britain. Then we shall move on to the methodology part to clarify what kind of discourse analysis method is utilised in this study. In the analysis, we shall explore how an anti-immigration discourse was utilised to actualise the already embedded policy of exceptionalism in the UK. At this point, we will conduct the political discourse analysis (henceforth PDA) developed by van Dijk to examine the campaign of the United Kingdom Independence Party (*henceforth UKIP*) during the referendum process. Although Nigel Farage was not the only figure to target migrants, his actions were the most radical and

---

Justice?", (*CEPS Commentary*, 2016), access: 19 July 2017, https://www.ceps.eu/ceps-publications/what-does-brexit-mean-eus-area-freedom-security-and-justice/

[4]   Ramiro Troitiño, et.al., *Brexit: History, Reasoning and Perspectives*, (Switzerland: Springer: 2018).

[5]   See some comments, BBCNews, "Brexit: Europe Stunned By UK Leave Vote", 2016, access: 9 July 2018 https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36616018.

[6]   Andrew Glencross, *Why the UK Voted for Brexit: David Cameron's Great Miscalculation*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 3.

[7]   Glencross, *Why the UK Voted for Brexit: David Cameron's Great Miscalculation*, 8.

his anti-immigration discourse was quite effective. Later on, we will indicate official reports and data showing the increase in racist attacks in the post-referendum period in the UK. Taken together, these aspects of the article will show how the anti-immigration discourse has contributed to the racist and xenophobic actions, while the main aim has been to finalise the UK's long-standing distance from the EU.

1. BACKGROUND OF EU-UK RELATIONS: FEDERALIST AND CONFEDERALIST CHALLENGES

In order to understand the background of the 2016 referendum result, it is vital to look at the relations between the UK and continental Europe. This history reveals Britain's confederalist position against the European dream of integration and its long-lasting federalist arguments. According to Dedman, even though Winston Churchill wrote many articles on the idea of a "United States of Europe" in the 1930's, Churchill thinks that Britain was not part of Europe and Britain should merely support any Franco-German attempt as an outside actor.[8] Between 1939 and 1941, federalist movements in Britain became strong all over the country. In the post-World War II period, negotiations by T. Roosevelt and Churchill concluded with Britain's decision to be in the Atlanticist wing with the United States.[9] In this regard, Churchill's declaration that "If Britain must choose between Europe and the open sea, she must always choose the open sea" quite clearly shows the UK's attitude towards the USA as well as towards Europe.[10] In this period, while Britain and the United States considered that the partial rearmament of Germany was possible against the Soviet Union, France believed that Germany's rearmament was a threat to her security. With the start of the Korean War in 1952, the polarisation between France and the Atlanticist wing increased and Rene Pleven, as head of the French government, put forward a project of European Common Defence. France and Germany, in the framework of a supranational structure, would create a common defence power in Europe. This plan laid the ground for the European Defence Treaty in 1952. However, in 1954 the French Assembly did not approve the project and it failed.[11]

---

[8]   Martin Dedman, *The Origins and Development of the European Union: 1945-2008*, (New York: Routledge, 2010), 7.

[9]   Dedman, *The Origins and Development of the European Union: 1945-2008*, 15-35.

[10]   Erica Moret, "Europe or the Open sea? Brexit and European Commentary, European Council on Foreign Security",2016, access: 18 January 2018, https://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_europe_or_the_open_sea_brexit_and_european_security7007>

[11]   Erhan Akdemir, "Avrupa Bütünleşmesi Tarihçesi", Avrupa Birliği: Tarihçe, Teoriler, Kurumlar ve Politikalar, ed. Belgin Akçay ve İlke Göçmen. (Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi, 2012), 35-62.

Churchill's attitude could explain Britain's position on the European defence issue in the post-war period. Churchill's idea was based on the long history of the British Empire and also Britain's close relations with the United States, which Jones describes as the "special relationship".[12] "Churchill described the Western world's defence against communism as being a project dependent upon three concentric circles (where these three circles intersected with Britain): the United States, the Empire, and Europe".[13] Britain was one of the winning powers in World War II and also the inheritor of a big British Empire. "Britain's role as a world power, based on a global Empire of nations, which it managed to maintain until the end of the 1950s and by maintaining its distance from Europe Britain sought to perpetuate the notion that it was different from the continent".[14] Britain attached more importance to having a special relationship with the United States than to establishing good relations with Europe.[15]

Britain led to the establishment of the European Free Trade Area (EFTA) as an alternative organisation to the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1960. Founder countries left EFTA when they became EU member states, but EFTA was a competitor to the EEC until Britain became one of the EU member states. When Britain applied for EEC membership, De Gaulle's administration in France had a negative attitude towards Britain's membership and Britain's application was refused. The main reason behind this negative attitude was Britain's Atlanticist position, which could damage the federalist idea of Europe. Also, Britain was a strong power that could change the balance of power inside the EEC. After De Gaulle's death, Britain became an EEC member state with the approval of her second application for membership in 1973. Britain continued to be an alternative pole to the Franco-German axis. Also, Britain's EEC membership created polarisation and discussions in Britain[16]. While the right-wing conservative parties supported Britain's entrance into the EEC, left-wing parties viewed EEC membership in a negative way. Britain, as an industrial country, challenges with France which is an agricultural country, throughout the history of European integration on agricultural subsidies. "In 1984, Margaret Thatcher corrected what was seen as an injustice, negotiating a

---

12   Alistair Jones, Britain and the European Union, (UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 2.

13   Jones, Britain and the European Union, 2.

14   Christian Schweiger, Britain, Germany and the Future of the European Union, (UK: Palgrave Macmillian, 2007), 15.

15   Jones, Britain and the European Union, 2.

16   Sam Wilson, "Britain and the EU: A Long and Rocky Relationship", 2014, access: 7 January 2016 http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-26515129.

permanent rebate for Britain on its EC contributions, because it received much less in agricultural subsidies than some other countries, notably France".[17]

In 1992, the Maastricht Treaty created a three-pillar structure and also the EC became the European Union in a step towards political integration. Britain had never been a supporter of the federalist attempts of the European Union. Therefore, "at the time of Maastricht Treaty, Britain was considered as the 'awkward' or 'reluctant' partner, exceptional in the EC for the ambivalence of its political class and general public towards a project it had joined belatedly".[18]

Throughout the history of European integration, there was a big clash between federalist and confederalist ideas. This clash created the main divergence between France-Germany and Britain. The main difference between the Franco-German axis and Britain is shaped by the discussion on supranationalism and inter-governmentalism. The Franco-German axis was based on a pro-European idea with supporting federation which could succeed with political integration. However, Britain supported the idea of strong nation-states in a confederation. Britain showed her attitude by not signing the Schengen Agreement in 1985 through an *opt-out* and also did not join the Eurozone area after the ratification of the Euro in 1995. Britain became a remarkably Eurosceptic member state in the EU by having no part in these crucial policies.

It should be noted that Britain is not the scapegoat for the EU's failure to be a political actor. There have been many discussions and much opposition in the process of widening and deepening. For example, in the case of the deepening dilemma, the EU Constitution was rejected by a referendum in France and another in Holland in 2005. At that point, the democracy deficit in the EU and its negative reflection on public opinion in the EU member states is the other side of the coin. The Lisbon Treaty was a reform treaty after the failure of the EU Constitution. Britain had many objections to this Treaty. Britain did not want the Charter of Fundamental Rights to be legally binding on all member states and also objected to the establishment of an EU Foreign Minister. The other objection was to abolish the right to veto some policies (like social security) in the area of justice and home affairs, and because of these objections concessions were offered to Britain.[19] In the case of the widening dilemma, Turkey started accession negotiations and this was

---

[17] Wilson, "Britain and the EU: A Long and Rocky Relationship".

[18] David Baker- Poulina Schnapper, *Britain and the Crisis of the European Union*, (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 61.

[19] Akdemir, "Avrupa Bütünleşmesi Tarihçesi", 55.

a big challenge for the EU. The idea of "unity in diversity" was questioned by member states.

1.1. Euroscepticism in Britain and Brexit

In this part, the concept of Euroscepticism will be looked at by considering Britain's role in the EU as a Eurosceptical one. After that, the route to Brexit will be examined. Some authors, like Leconte, mention that Euroscepticism "originated in a specific context, that of British public debate on the EC in the mid-1980s and was popularised by Margaret Thatcher's so-called 'Bruges speech' given in 1988 at the College of Europe".[20]

Taggart and Szczerbiak categorise Euroscepticism into two forms: "hard" and 'soft' Euroscepticism. Hard Eurosceptics support leaving the EU and they are against EU integration as a whole. Soft Eurosceptics are reformers and they object to some policy areas which might be against the national interest.[21] In fact, in Britain, it is obvious that most of the parties are Eurosceptic, either soft or hard.

In Britain, Euroscepticism has evolved in parallel to the developments in European integration. The Lisbon Treaty instituted Article 50 and this Article gave member states the right to withdraw from the EU. This was a sticking point for Britain because all the Eurosceptic ideas which had developed since 1945 culminated in the idea of leaving the Union. Just after the signing of the Lisbon Treaty, a euro crisis appeared in the EU and this was another turning point for Euroscepticism in Britain. After the euro crisis, Britain started to complain about the margin of the British contribution and its subsidy to the EU. Also, migration flow inside the EU after the euro crisis became another vital problem for Britain. After 2010, in David Cameron's period of office, Euroscepticism in Britain grew.

Also, the international conjuncture is crucial in analysing Euroscepticism in Britain. The political division between pro-American and pro-European member states during the Iraq war showed EU's incapability to be an actor in international politics and this event triggered Euroscepticism in Britain. In addition, the evolution of the Arab Spring in the Middle East, the big migration flows to Turkey and, at the same time, Turkey's accession process was also

---

[20] Cecile Leconte, *Understanding Euroscepticism*, (UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 3.

[21] Paul Taggart- Aleks Szczerbiak, "Europeanization, Euroscepticism and Party Systems: Party-based Euroscepticism in the Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe", *Perspectives of European Politics and Society*, (2002): 29-30.

crucial developments in understanding the high level of Euroscepticism in public opinion in the EU.[22]

Before the 2015 elections, UKIP started to organise big campaigns for Brexit and David Cameron promised to hold a referendum on Brexit. Cameron's main intention was not that Britain should leave the EU but that the EU be forced to make reforms. He also wanted to boost his own popularity.[23] Cameron sought to get "special status" for Britain, which would have a braking system for social welfare for migrants.[24] The referendum campaign was fought between Britain Stronger in Europe, Vote Leave and Grassroots Out. In the process, Britain Stronger in Europe argued that Britain should stay in the EU 'to protect jobs, lower prices, workers' rights and a stronger, safer and better off Britain'[25]; the Labour Party, the Liberal Democrats, the Scottish National Party, and the Green party campaigned for the EU's remain in the union. On the other hand, "vote leave" side argued that Britain should leave the EU to save money, control migration, to charge of borders, to control domestic politics[26]. As a result, on the 24th of June, 2016 the referendum was held and Britain decided to leave the EU with 52% votes for "yes". England and Wales decided to leave, but Scotland decided not to leave the EU to the tune of 62% of the votes.

In this study we follow the argument that the history of the UK's EU membership has always been one of 'British exceptionalism', therefore we see the referendum process as part of this tendency. However, political actors in the campaigns contributed to the reproduction of racist and anti-immigrant attitudes in society while they followed the historical policy of 'exceptionalism'. In this regard, the discourses of one of the leading Brexit figures, Nigel Farage, and his party UKIP are scrutinised in the following parts. When we say 'the process of the referendum', it would be possible to go back very far. However, we will take the 23rd of January 2013 as a starting point, as Prime Minister David Cameron discussed the future of the EU and

---

[22] Nergiz Özkural Köroğlu- Sinem Yüksel Çendek, "Toplumsal Güvenlik, Kimlik, Bütünleşme Bağlamında Avrupa Şüpheciliği: Cameron Dönemindeki Avrupa Şüpheciliğinin İçerik Analizi", *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi*, (2015) : 201.

[23] Özkural–Çendek, "Toplumsal Güvenlik, Kimlik, Bütünleşme Bağlamında Avrupa Şüpheciliği: Cameron Dönemindeki Avrupa Şüpheciliğinin İçerik Analizi", 191-216.

[24] Glencross, *Why the UK Voted for Brexit: David Cameron's Great Miscalculation, 29-32.*

[25] See Stronger in Europe, "Britain Stronger in Europe", access: 10 July 2017, http://www.strongerin.co.uk.

[26] see why vote leave, access: 10 July 2017, http://www.voteleavetakecontrol.org/why_vote_leave.html.

gave the signal of an in-out referendum on the future of the UK's membership of the union.

2. METHODOLOGY: POLITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

This qualitative study aims to display the critical association between the elite's anti-immigration discourse and the post-Brexit attacks. The primary data used in this analysis comprises of statements made by Nigel Farage during the propaganda process of the referendum. In the analysis, we focus on the language choices by approaching them from the (Political Discourse Analysis) PDA developed by van Dijk. This method enables researchers to uncover the elite's role in producing everyday racism.[27] In this regard, the relationships between language, politics, and action are scrutinised in the study.

The term 'discourse' is simply defined as 'a coherent or rational body of speech or writing; a speech, or a sermon'.[28] When it comes to academia, it is hard to find a common definition of this word as various theoretical and disciplinary perspectives formulate their own definitions.[29] What's more, "as the notion of discourse becomes popular, so, naturally enough, it took on different meanings for different people".[30] While the definition of discourse is not an agreed one, many[31] approve Stubbs' point that 'it is above the sentence'[32]. Therefore, discourse analysis should go beyond analysing sentences. In this regard, "It encompasses both spoken and written forms of language, and is employed in an endeavor to understand how actions are performed, goals realised, and meanings produced across various layers of context (local, conversational, social, cultural, ideological, cognitive, etc.)"[33]

---

[27] Teun A. van Dijk, "Denying Racism: Elite Discourse and Racism", *Racism and Migration in Western Europe,* ed. John. Wrench,–John. Solomos (UK:Berg Publishers, 1993), 179-193; Teun A van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, vol. 6, (UK: Sage, 1993).

[28] Stuart Hall, "The West and the Rest Discourse and Power", *The Indigenous Experience: Global Perspectives*, ed. Roger Maaka–Chris Andersen, (Canada: Canadian Scholars Press Inc., 2006), 165.

[29] Norman Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2006), 3.

[30] Henry G. Widdowson, "Discourse Analysis: *a Critical View*", *Language and Literature 4/3* (1995), 157.

[31] Eg. Deborah Cameron, *Working With Spoken Discourse*, (London; Thousand Oaks; Delhi:S age, 2001); Rebecca Rogers, "Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis in Educational Research", *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education,* ed Rebecca Rogers , (UK: Routledge, 2011).

[32] Michael Stubbs, *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis Of Natural Language*, (US:University of Chicago Press, 1983), 1.

[33] Zohar Kampf, "Political Discourse Analysis", *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, ed. Karen Tracy–Cornelia Ilie, (US:Wiley-Blackwell, 2015), 2-3.

Discourses have mutual relations with social life. On the one hand, situational, institutional, and social contexts are important in the formation of discourses.[34] On the other hand, they have the power to shape institutional settings[35]. Discourses might be circulated in several ways (such as through the media, politicians, forms of popular culture, education) and they come to influence people's understanding of social life and construction of their identity and sense of belonging.[36]

When a question is influenced by discourses and circulation, van Dijks' studies are quite eye-opening for social science researchers as he explores cognition, power, and discourse relations[37] (van Dijk, 1988). His approach is inspired by the French philosopher Michel Foucault as van Dijk also places power at the centre of his analysis and speaks of 'the reproduction of power and dominance through discourse'[38]. However, while Foucault's sense of power is 'productive', van Dijk understands it as abuse.[39] In his analyses, van Dijk shows how discourse is essential to control people's minds, ideas, knowledge, opinions, and their personal and social representations.[40] By highlighting the top-down process of social control, van Dijk's studies are quite informative for those who wish to understand the reproduction of racism within societies by comprehensively drilling down into discursive formations.

While investigating power, dominance, and the reproduction of racism within societies, van Dijk points out powerful social groups and institutions that have active control over different types of discourses, such as scholarly discourse, educational discourse, media discourse, legal discourse, political discourse.[41] In this study, we approach the issue from his PDA perspective,

---

[34] Norman Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*, (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2006), Joanna Krotofil–Dominika Motak, (2018). "A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Media Coverage of the Migration Crisis in Poland", *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis, 28*: 92-115. Andrea Mayr, *Language And Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*, (London&New York: Continuum, 2008).

[35] Mayr, *Language And Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*, 1.

[36] Nazı Sıla Cesur et.al. "The 'European Turks': Identities Of High-Skilled Turkish Migrants in Europe", *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies* 18/1 (2018), 4.

[37] Teun A. van Dijk, "Social Cognition, Social Power And Social Discourse", Text 8 (1988), 129-157.

[38] Teun A. van Dijk, "Discourse, Power And Access", *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, ed. Carmen Rosa Caldas- Malcolm. Coulthard, (London: Routledge, 2003), 102.

[39] Marianne Jørgensen- Louise Phillips, *Discourse Analysis As Theory And Method*, (Sage: London, 2002), 91.

[40] Teun A.van Dijk, *Discourse and Power*, (London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008), 9.

[41] Teun A. van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis", *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, ed.

therefore we analyse how political discourse is effective in influencing people's minds and attitudes.

Political discourse is defined as "talk and text produced in regard to concrete political issues (language in politics) or through the actual language use of institutional political actors, even in discussions of non-political issues (language of politicians)".[42] van Dijk increases the number of discourses by adding non-verbal structures and interactions to the list.[43]

In this sense, both the producers and the recipients are important in discursive practices. While the recipients can be defined as different groups, such as 'the public, the people, citizens, the masses', producers are usually politicians who produce in the process of political communication[44]. In this relationship, political actors are aware of the role of language and the effects of their language[45]. Discourse is an important political tool for them and eventually the elite discourse becomes the natural and dominant discourse which organises social reality.[46] Since a topic can be constructed in a certain way through discourses[47], the politician's choice of words is of the utmost importance in affecting people's attitudes towards the point in question. Particularly, as regards ethnic affairs, political discourse and decision making somewhat influence public debate and opinion formation.[48] In this regard, the immigration topic appears as one of those affairs which politicians need to control people's minds and attitudes.

The past decades have witnessed a growing interest in investigating the discursive aspects of the immigration topic.[49] In particular, van Dijk's critical

---

Deborah, Tannen, Heidi. E. Hamilton-Deborah, Schiffrin , (Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 2015), 470.

[42] Kampf, "Political Discourse Analysis", 3.

[43] Teun A. van Dijk, "Discourse and Racism", *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*. ed. David Theo. Goldberg–John. Solomos, (Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing), 147; Teun A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Power*, 3.

[44] Teun A. van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* (1997), 13.

[45] Poul Chilton, *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*, (London: Routledge, 2004).

[46] Norman Fairclough, *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, (New York: Routledge, 2003). Pınar Yazgan -Deniz Eroglu Utku, "News Discourse and Ideology: Critical Analysis Of Copenhagen Gang Wars' Online News", *Migration Letters,* (2017), 149.

[47] Hall, "The West and the Rest Discourse and Power", 165.

[48] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, 50.

[49] e.g. Rosa Capdevila, -Jane E. Callaghan,. (2008), "'It's not racist. It's Common Sense'. A Critical Analysis Of Political Discourse Around Asylum And Immigration in The UK", *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology 18*(1): 1-16. Christopher Hart, *Critical Discourse Analysis And Cognitive Science: New Perspectives On Immigration Discourse,* (Palgrave Macmillan:London,

discourse analyses are important for exploring how the elites take advantage of popular resentment against new immigrants and minorities and how discourses are important for them to reproduce racism throughout society.[50] Ontologically, he takes racism as a socially learnt concept and the discourses of elites are important in the process of producing and reproducing it.[51]

Following on from the literature that emphasises the power of language and claims it is able to create norms and attitudes, we apply the PDA approach to examine Nigel Farage's referendum campaign speeches. By doing so, we try to understand how the political discourse on immigration is used to justify the UK's long-term policy of British exceptionalism and the desire to leave the EU.

3. UKIP AND ITS POLITICAL DISCOURSE ON ANTI-IMMIGRATION

During the referendum process, UKIP was not the only party supporting the leave campaign. However, we have intentionally selected this party as UKIP played a key role in inspiring British people to vote leave. The leader of the party at that time, Nigel Farage, allegedly persuaded more than 17 million people to vote to leave the EU[52]. Although it is not surprising that UKIP has anti-immigration discourse since it is a right-wing populist party, it is still important to examine the party campaigns before the referendum as this issue was indicated as "key to the Brexit vote".[53]

UKIP has developed its political discourse based on criticism of the European Union and mass migration, as well as of the elites in Westminster and Brussels.[54] Among all these criticisms, the anti-immigration discourse was more direct and apparent even before discussions regarding the UK

2010). Luisa Martion Rojo–Teun A. van Dijk, "'There Was A Problem, And it Was Solved!': Legitimating the Expulsion of Illegal 'Migrants in Spanish Parliamentary Discourse" *Discourse & Society 8/4* (1997): 523-566. Ineke van Der Valk, "Right-wing parliamentary discourse on immigration in France", *Discourse & Society 14/3* (2003): 309-348.

[50] van Dijk, "Denying Racism: Elite Discourse and Racism", van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism.*

[51] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, Teun A. van Dijk, "Elite Discourse and the Reproduction of Racism", *Hate Speech*, ed. Rita Kirk Whillock -David Slayden. (UK: Sage Publications, 1995), 1-27.; Teun A. van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", *Belgian Journal of Linguistics 11/1* (1997), 11-52.

[52] BBCNews, "The Nigel Farage Story", 2016,

[53] Harold Clarke et.al., *Brexit: Why Britain Voted To Leave The European Union*, (Cambridge: UK, 2017).

[54] Andrea Pareschi- Alessandro Albertini, "Immigration, Elites and the European Union: How UKIP Frames Its Populist Discourse", *Comunicazione Politica 19/2* (2018), 247-272.

---

remaining in the EU began. Farage's sharp stance can be seen in his declaration after the November 2015 Paris attack.

"The thing that makes me angry about what happened in Paris is frankly the fact that it was so utterly and entirely predictable," said Farage. "I think we've reached a point where we have to admit to ourselves, in Britain and France and much of the rest of Europe, that mass immigration and multicultural division has for now been a failure."[55]

As is shown in the above quote, the anti-immigration discourse has a particular place in the party's political stance. In fact, this discourse formed the manifesto the party published in 2015. Mandelson identifies this attitude of the party as a kind of obsession and says 'Why is the Brexit camp so obsessed with immigration? Because that's all they have'[56]

UKIP claimed that immigration into the UK was far too high and should be controlled as soon as possible. In its manifesto, the party argued that the UK would never be able to control migration while it remained a member of the EU[57]. Accordingly, the party received support for this discourse as the polls showed that '70 percent of UKIP supporters identify immigration as the most important issue facing the United Kingdom, compared to 45 percent of Conservative voters and just above 25 percent of Labour voters'[58].

In 2013, when David Cameron declared that the British people should have a say on Europe, it was a long-waited opportunity for the rise of UKIP. Immediately after Cameron's declaration, Nigel Farage said "Winning this referendum, if and when it comes, is not going to be an easy thing but I feel that UKIP's real job starts today"[59]. Afterwards, UKIP under the leadership of Nigel Farage started to pursue the 'leave campaign' by putting anti-immigration at the centre of its political discourse.

---

[55] Rowena Mason, "Nigel Farage Accuses Muslims in UK Of 'Split Loyalties'", 2015, access: 10 December 2018, http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/nov/16/nigel-farage-accuse-british-muslims-conflicting-loyalties.

[56] Peter Mandelson, "Why is the Brexit Camp so Obsessed with Immigration? Because That's All They Have", 2016, access: 8 August 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/may/03/brexit-camp-immigration-economic-vote-leave.

[57] UKIP Manifesto. "Beleive in Britain UKIP Manifesto", 2015, access: 08 October 2017, https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/ukipdev/pages/1103/attachments/original/1429295050/UKIPManifesto2015.pdf?1429295050, 12.

[58] Will Somerville, "Brexit: The Role of Migration in the Upcoming EU Referendum", 2016, access: 20 October 2018, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/brexit-role-migration-upcoming-eu-referendum.

[59] BBCNews "David Cameron promises in/out referendum on EU", 2013, access: 16 October 2018, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-21148282.

3.1. PDA of Nigel Farage and UKIP during the Referendum Process

In looking at UKIP's efficient role during the referendum process and the anti-immigration discourse shaping the party's campaign, we apply the PDA analytical method meticulously developed by van Dijk.

To begin with, van Dijk underlines the importance of carefully differentiating between what is 'political discourse' and what is not.[60] Our task was relatively easy as we set out to analyse one of the politicians, Nigel Farage', campaign speeches during the referendum process, which means from 2013 to 2016. However, van Dijk highlights that being a politician is not enough to be involved in political discourse; the politician must have 'functions' and 'implications'.[61] This is an important distinguishing feature of PDA, because any text or talk can be analysed through PDA as long as it can be "politically contextualised".[62] PDA fits our analysis, since discourses during the referendum had an important political function and implications and their aim was to affect the public's decision regarding one important political question. Therefore, they definitely fall into the category of 'political discourse'. Also, the 'predicates of the macrostructures of political discourse tend to be future-oriented'[63]. He emphasises that discursive structures are chosen not only to obey official rules but also for specific purposes, to 'emphasise or de-emphasise political attitudes and opinions, garner support, manipulate public opinion, manufacture political consent, or legitimate political power'.[64] During the campaign, the UKIP had the aim of constructing its anti-immigration discourse. While fuelling anti-immigrant resentments, British citizens were targeted to be influenced to vote for Brexit.

Another step is to check the topics of discourses, which should be topically political and also have implications for other social domains. The immigration question is one of these, as it is related to social domains and several actors. In addition, the actors topicalise this in a future-oriented way.[65] Again, immigration fits this criterion, as the political actors first reveal today's conditions and then outline what should be done for the future.

---

[60]   van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?".
[61]   van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 14.
[62]   van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 24.
[63]   van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 27.
[64]   van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 25.
[65]   van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 25-28.

Political discourses also have their own style and lexical choices and a subtle syntax designed to create we/other distinctions. In this distinction, 'we' is always related to 'political position, alliances, solidarity, and other socio-political positions of the speaker'.[66] In addition to this, political discourses can also be labelled as 'rhetoric'. In some cases, they are 'typically verbose, hyperbolic, dishonest and immoral'.[67] This is what we are faced with when the topic is migration, as the numbers are mostly exaggerated in order to increase manipulative power. Expressions are also important, as politicians rely on certain images, headlines, big type, striking colours or eye-catching photos to support their argument.[68]

After checking the components of immigration discourse, an examination of the contextual functions of the various structures and strategies of text and speech is required for a systematic and explicit PDA.[69] In order to achieve this, we will once again follow van Dijk's approach step by step and examine Nigel Farage's political discourse during the referendum process in the UK.[70]

When we take as our road map van Dijk's method of analysis, we start by looking at the structures and the general strategies of the discourse. Just like he rightly emphasises in his parliamentary debate analysis, politicians' speeches are highly 'self-controlled', as they are aware that these speeches are recorded.[71] The same can be said of Farage, as every single word has a purpose for the 'leave campaign', therefore it is possible to say these words were deliberately chosen.

3.1.1. Positive Self-representation

van Dijk underlines the 'positive self-presentation' of politicians' discourses, especially when the topic is immigration and ethnic affairs.[72] From the discourses of Nigel Farage, this kind of presentation is quite clear. Europe, Muslims and even Westminster politics represent 'others' in his discourses. In his speeches, the word "we" always represent the 'more democratic and civilised' side.

---

[66] van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 34.
[67] van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 34.
[68] van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 36.
[69] van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 38.
[70] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments".
[71] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments", 36.
[72] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, 72; van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments", 35.

"Let us send an earthquake through Westminster politics and Let us stand up and say: Give us our country back!"[73]

"It's actually rather simple: do you wish the US to be a self-governing, independent, democratic nation or part of a bigger, broader, European Union?"[74]

When the topic is immigration and ethnic issues, UKIP has a tendency to show positive self-representation, referring to 'hospitality, tolerance, equality, democracy, and other values' just like van Dijk points out.[75]

"The British people accept immigrants and are among the most welcoming and tolerant people in the world. UKIP's policies recognise the new openness in our world and the positive benefits controlled immigration has brought and can continue to bring to our nation."[76]

3.1.2. Negative Other-representation

Besides self-glorification, negative other-representation is another aspect of the discourses of politicians to support restrictions on immigration.[77] While blaming the EU as something that has changed and eliminated the UK's real identity, Farage blamed the EU for not curbing immigration. When the leader delivered his main speech to persuade the British people to vote for Brexit, the main argument was controlling mass immigration while Britain remains in the EU is simply impossible'.[78] In these discourses, the main targets are immigrants. The we/them discrimination is considerably apparent. Farage uses the categorisation of our/their and by doing so his discourses show a 'positive evaluation of us and OUR actions in positive terms and of THEM

---

[73] Andrew, Sparrow, "Ukip Conference And Godfrey Bloom "Sluts" Row: Politics Live Blog", 2013, access: 16 October 2018, http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/sep/20/ukip-conference-and-reaction-to-the-damian-mcbride-revelations-politics-live-blog.

[74] BBCNews, "Immigration Focus is Turning Point in EU Campaign, says Farage",2016, access: 09 Ekim 2018, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36444014.

[75] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments", 36.

[76] UKIP Manifesto, 13.

[77] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments", 36.

[78] Macer Hall,–David Maddox, "Farage Speech: Controlling Mass Immigration While Britain Remains Part Of EU is Impossible", 2016, access: 10 October 2017, http://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/665446/Nigel-Farage-Ukip-control-immigration-leave-EU-referendum-June.

and THEIR actions in negative terms' as expected.[79] In this categorisation, immigrants represent 'them'.

During the campaign, the party and the leader targeted immigrants and categorised their threat according to three aspects of life: the welfare system, the UK public's security, and social norms. To begin with, indicating migrants as a threat to jobs and the welfare state was quite apparent in the process of the referendum. The party manifesto stated that immigrants created problems for housing and public services, such as schools, hospitals, transport networks, power, and water supplies. Therefore, it was important to control them.[80] Furthermore, the manifesto pledged to end access to benefits and free NHS treatment for new immigrants until they had paid tax and National Insurance for five years. What is more, the manifesto proposed to require all visitors and new immigrants to the UK to have their own health insurance.

In line with the party's manifesto, Farage claimed that immigrants abused the welfare system of the UK. He suggested that immigrants be barred from receiving any benefits until they had been resident in the UK for five years[81]. Farage said the vast majority of people who had come into Britain since 2004 had not been of net benefit to society. Therefore, he had a suggestion a five year ban on immigration coming to Britain, alongside an Australian-style system of temporary work permits.[82]

As well as pointing to immigrants as a threat to the welfare state, characterising them as a threat to public security was also common in the anti-EU campaign. Farage argued that 'the issue of open borders and mass immigration is no longer simply an issue of social problems and the impact on British workers, it is fast becoming one of national security.'[83] During the campaign, he mainly associated terrorist attacks with migration. After the Brussels attack, he pointed to the EU's immigration rules as the main cause

---

[79] van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?", 28.

[80] UKIP Manifesto, 11.

[81] BBCNews, "Nigel Farage Calls for Five-year Ban on Migrant Benefits", 2014, access: 15 Ekim 2017, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-25630036 .

[82] Patrick Wintour, "Nigel Farage: Ukip Wants Five-Year Ban On İmmigrants Settling in UK", 2014, access: 05 Ekim 2018, http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/jan/07/ukip-ban-immigrants-nigel-farage.

[83] The Telegraph, "Nigel Farage: Immigration will be the defining issue of this EU referendum campaign", 2015, access: 05 October 2018. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/11817508/Nigel-Farage-Immigration-will-be-the-defining-issue-of-this-EU-referendum-campaign.html.

of insecurity by saying "EU border rules" had led to "the free movement of terrorists, of criminal gangs and of Kalashnikovs"[84]. In line with positive evaluations of US (Britons) and negative evaluations of THEM (immigrants), immigrants were also targeted as a threat to Britain's norms. Mr. Farage, said:

> "British women could be at risk of sexual assaults from immigrants if Britain voted to remain in the European Union"[85]

> "The majority that are coming are economic migrants. In addition, we see, as I warned earlier, evidence that Isis are now using this route to put their jihadists on European soil.....We must be mad to take this risk with the cohesion of our societies"[86]

Here, Farage added another category: EU immigrants and non-EU immigrants. In line with his we/them distinction, non-European people always constitute the worst category. The scenario of more people coming from non-European countries is always categorised as the worst-case, therefore the possible accession of Turkey to the EU was part of his political discourse. Farage said that even though the UK was not part of the Schengen system, if Brussels came to a visa-free agreement with this country, they would eventually have a chance to come to the UK.[87]

Among the immigrants, refugees had a particular place in the party's discourse. It is possible to see that party discourse around refugees is formed to strengthen 'positive self-representation'. van Dijk shows that indicating refugees as 'fake refugees' achieves the aim of combining 'positive self-representation' with 'negative other representation'.[88] Farage's argued:

> "I think refugees are a very different thing to economic migration and I think that this country

---

[84] BBCNews, access: 05 October 2018, "Nigel Farage Defends Linking Brussels Attacks and EU Migration Rules", 2016, https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-35879670.

[85] Erlanger Steven, "Britain's 'Brexit' Debate Inflamed by Worries That Turkey Will Join E.U", 2016, access: 15 September 2017, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/14/world/europe/britain-brexit-turkey-eu.html.

[86] BBCNews, "Migrant Crisis: Farage Says Eu 'Mad' To Accept So Many", 2015, access: 09 October 2017, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-34197707.

[87] Rebecca Perring, "EU Loophole Could See 77 Million Turks Head To Britain, Warn Farage And Johnson, 2016 , access: 07 October 2017, http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/661387/Migrant-crisis-Nigel-Farage-Turkey-EU-visa-free-travel.

[88] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, 79.

should honour the spirit of the 1951 declaration on
refugee status that was agreed "[89]

Through a combination of negative other representation and positive self-representation, politicians engage racist talk without making it explicit. However, as van Dijk notes, they sometimes need an apparent denial of racism[90].

3.1.3. Denial of Racism

While positive presentation and negative othering are clear in his discourses, Farage never accepted that he was being 'racist'. Although during the referendum campaign he was accused of being racist, he complained that people calling UKIP 'racist' and he claimed that it was "simply not true".[91]

During the campaign, the extreme action of UKIP was preparing a poster showing thousands of refugees on the border of Slovenia and blaming the EU for not curbing this flow. This poster was considered by some quite xenophobic and racist. However, after the poster event, he declared 'That poster reflects the truth of what's going on'[92]. He only withdrew the poster, branded 'racist' by critics, because of the 'unfortunate timing' of its publication just two hours before the killing of MP Jo Cox[93]. After this event, he himself argued that he was the 'victim' of hatred.[94]

3.1.4. Apparent Sympathy

When we analyse UKIP's former leader's discourses, we are unlikely to encounter sympathy towards immigration, even in 'apparent' sense. However, it is possible to see that migration control policies are suggested as if they are necessary 'for their own good' as well as for the sake of harmony in society.[95]

---

[89] He refers to UN The Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees.

[90] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*.

[91] Independent , "I've Had Enough Of People Insinuating That Ukip is Racist – it's Simply Not True", 2015, access: 20 July 2018, http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/i-ve-had-enough-of-people-insinuating-that-ukip-is-racist-its-simply-not-true-10182747.html.

[92] Skynews, "Farage Defends "Vile And Racist" EU Poster", 2016, access: 10 October 2018, https://news.sky.com/story/farage-defends-vile-and-racist-eu-poster-10318659.

[93] For further information regarding Jo Cox's murder, check BBCNEWS, "Jo Cox Murder", access: 19 October 2018, https://www.bbc.com/news/topics/cn1r4rw9qz4t/jo-cox-murder.

[94] Oliver Wright, "Nigel Farage Says He is A Victim Of Political Hatred in Response To Jo Cox Question From", 2016, access: 11 October 2017, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/nigel-farage-jo-cox-dead-murdered-peston-brexit-eu-referendum-ukip-political-hatred-a7089996.html.

[95] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments", 37.

Once again, Farage categorises refugees as either 'fake' or 'genuine', and this categorisation enables him to justify stricter border control and Brexit. He says:

"If we want to help genuine refugees, if we want to protect our societies, if we want to stop the criminal trafficking gangs from benefiting as they are, we must stop the boats coming as the Australians did and then we can assess who qualifies for refugee status ".[96]

3.1.5. Fairness

van Dijk shows that politicians prefer to show political decisions as if they are the results of 'reality' and they are compelled to take them.[97] In other words, policy measures are suggested as 'firm but fair' decisions.[98] This kind of discourse is seen when Farage defends his anti-immigration policy by defending his 'own' society. Just like van Dijk defines it, Farage's strategy is to justify his 'firm and fair' immigration control for the interests of the British people[99].

> "It doesn't mean I'm against anybody of different backgrounds or different cultures–far from it. I want us to have a sensible, open-minded immigration policy. But I think that what we've got, or what we've had, certainly, and what we continue to have when it comes to the EU is just wholly irresponsible. …. I think it's done great damage to the cohesion of our society and the well-being of working people in this country".[100]

van Dijk underscores 'harmony' as a key word for avoiding opposition.[101] In Farage's discourse, 'cohesion' takes the place of harmony and indicates other discourses – such as pro-immigration or pro-EU – as supporters of chaos.

---

[96] BBCNews, "Migrant crisis: Farage says EU 'mad' to accept so many", 2015, access: 09 October 2017, https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-34197707.

[97] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments".

[98] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, 93.

[99] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, 97.

[100] Christopher Hope, "Mass Immigration has Left Britain 'Unrecognisable', says Nigel Farage", 2014, access: 15 October 2017, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/ukip/10668996/Mass-immigration-has-left-Britain-unrecognisable-says-Nigel-Farage.html.

[101] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, 97.

3.1.6. Top-down Transfer

van Dijk's analysis of PDA continues by showing how racism is preformulated by elites. In other words, there is a top-down transfer of racism.[102] However, van Dijk also shows the elite's strategies to express it as if the public demands these attitudes from politicians. He rightly argues that 'for the political elites, racism always is elsewhere'.[103] This means that politicians do not accept the accusation of being racist, but instead claim that other factors influence their decisions. In this regard, they mainly indicate the resentment of the public or the culture and behaviour of 'others' which irritate native people.[104] As van Dijk's predicts, Farage argues that there is rising concern regarding immigration[105]. Then he approves of this concern by adding a securitisation discourse:

> "There is an especial problem with some of the people who've come here and who are of the Muslim religion who don't want to become part of our culture. So there is no previous experience, in our history, of a migrant group that comes to Britain, that fundamentally wants to change who we are and what we are. That is, I think, above everything else, what people are really concerned about".[106]

3.1.7. Justification

van Dijk underlines the idea that elites prefer to indicate some 'facts' to justify negative decisions, such as the 'number of refugees'[107]. While Farage was pursuing his political campaign by acknowledging immigration, the net migration statistics were published by the Office for National Statistics in February 2016[108]. Accordingly, the difference between the number of people leaving and arriving was 323,000 in the year to September, which was one of

---

[102] van Dijk, *Elite Discourse and Racism*, 4.

[103] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments", 38.

[104] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments", 38.

[105] Rowena Mason, "Nigel Farage: British Muslim 'Fifth Column' Fuels Fear of Immigration", 2015, access: 18 May 2018, http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/mar/12/nigel-farage-british-muslim-fifth-column-fuels-immigration-fear-ukip.

[106] Mason, "Nigel Farage: British Muslim 'Fifth Column' Fuels Fear of Immigration".

[107] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments", 38.

[108] Office for National Statistics, "Migration Statistics, Quarterly Report", 2016, access: 05 July 2018, http://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/migrationstatisticsquarterlyreportfebruary2016.

the records. After the publication of this report, Farage relied on the migration numbers in the report and said:

> "As I've said for years, we cannot control immigration into Britain while we remain inside the EU. The government pledge to reduce net migration to tens of thousands continues to be laughable.… I am pleased that there are now lots of voices agreeing with me, that we must leave the European Union to control our borders."[109]

In addition to empirical data, Farage also relied on numbers that actually did not represent reality. In one speech he claimed that if Turkey became a member of the EU 'its population of 75 million to come to Britain along with the millions of Syrian migrants who are in refugee camps there'.[110] In other words, "rhetorical manipulation of numbers"[111] also strengthened the anti-immigration discourse of the UKIP leader during the campaign.

Taken together, the Brexit campaign pursued by UKIP concentrated on the migration question and mostly characterised migrants as a threat to several aspects of British life. Farage carefully constructed his discourses, circulated to society and created new realities, eventually the party discourses affected public attitudes.

4. AFTER THE REFERENDUM: INCREASE IN ATTACKS ON IMMIGRANTS

For the second time in their history, the British people had to decide the country's relationship with Europe[112], and the result was completely different this time. The referendum results were announced on the 24th of June. The UK had voted to leave the EU by 52% to 48%. Although the difference was quite small, the result indicated that the British people wanted to leave Europe.

The referendum result not only paved the way for further discussions regarding the UK's departure, but several attacks on migrants from different origins took place. The attacks began as soon as the referendum results

---

[109] BBCNews, "Net Migration at 323,000 Prompts EU Referendum Row", 2016, access: 19 October 2018, http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-35658731.

[110] David Maddox, "Nigel Farage: We Can Only Control Our Borders By Leaving The EU", 2016, access: 19 October 2018, http://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/642617/Nigel-Farage-Immigration-defining-issue-EU-referendum-campaign-politics.

[111] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments",46.

[112] Glencross, A. *Why the UK Voted for Brexit: David Cameron's Great Miscalculation*, 8.

were announced and they led to fatalities. In September 2016, the National Police Chief announced that hate crime reports had peaked at nearly 60% post-referendum. This rate was 14% higher than at the same point in the previous year. Just after the week following the referendum, the number of incidents rose by 58%. 2,778 hate crime incidents were recorded up to the 18th of August.[113] It was stated that 'the number of reported hate crimes for the July to September quarter rose from 10,793 in 2015 to 14,295 for the same period last year'.[114]

In particular, migrants originating in Eastern European countries were targeted. In this regard, it was the Polish community that suffered the most racist and xenophobic attacks. Their houses were attacked and they were verbally assaulted[115]. One Polish man who had lived in the UK for four years was killed in a suspected hate crime.[116] Due to the increasing risk to Poles' lives in the UK, the Polish Foreign Minister, Witold Waszczykowski, explained the relationship between the referendum and these attacks and said:

"Over dozens of years that big Polish community in the United Kingdom has not suffered any problems. Then a couple of months ago after the very heated campaign preceding the referendum on the staying or leaving of Great Britain some incidents started to happen against the Polish community".[117]

Besides attacks on European immigrants, religion or belief-based hate crimes also increased in the post-referendum period. According to the hate crime report of the National Police, there was a considerable increase in the number of religious-motivated offences after the Brexit vote. "The number of racially or religiously aggravated offences recorded by the police in July 2016 was 41% higher than in July 2015'.[118]

---

[113] Caroline Mortimer, "Brexit caused lasting rise in hate crime, new figures show", 2016, access: 01 June 2018, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/brexit-hate-crime-racism-eu-referendum-poland-islam-more-in-common-a7231836.html.

[114] Shafik Mandhai, "Protests in UK Against Post-Brexit Racism", 2017, access: 01 September 2018, http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/03/protests-uk-post-brexit-racism-170318140636538.html.

[115] See the news , BBCNews "Polish Media In Uk Shocked By Post-Brexit Hate Crimes", 2016, access: 19 October 2018, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36656348.

[116] May Bulman, "Brexit vote sees highest spike in religious and racial hate crimes ever recorded", 2017, access: 17 October, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/racist-hate-crimes-surge-to-record-high-after-brexit-vote-new-figures-reveal-a7829551.html.

[117] Josh Lowe, "Polish Foreign Minister: Brexit Has Fueled Anti-Polish Hate Crime", 2016, access: 20 October 2018, https://www.newsweek.com/poland-poles-uk-polish-immigrants-hate-crime-brexit-rise-post-ref-racism-496028.

[118] Hannah Corcoran- Kevin Smith, "Hate Crime, England and Wales", *The National Police Chiefs' Council*, 2015/16, UK. 2016, access: 01 April 2017, <http://www.report-it.org.uk/files/

The rising xenophobic attacks on all immigrants in the country also attracted the attention of the United Nations. The UN Committee on Eliminating Racial Discrimination published a critical report (2016) and expressed the Committee's concern regarding the sharp increase in the number of racist hate crimes, especially in England, Wales, and Northern Ireland, after the referendum on membership of the EU. The Committee's report also criticised the attitudes of politicians and prominent political figures for pursuing anti-immigrant and xenophobic rhetoric and creating entrenched 'prejudices, thereby emboldening individuals to carry out acts of intimidation and hate'.[119]

Taken together, a number of hate crimes have been reported since the Brexit decision of the UK. This is not a claim that all these fatal events are a consequence of the Brexit campaign, but it is also impossible not to see the effects of political discourse to galvanise racist attacks. Similarly, van Dijk[120] shows how elite discourses are influential in fuelling everyday racism. Solely UKIP's discourse did not create anti-immigrant feelings within society, but during the referendum campaign, the party leader took advantage of popular resentments against immigrants.

CONCLUSION

British citizens decided to leave from the European Union, and the country left the Union on 31 January 2020. Today, many commentators, political scientists, economists, and several experts from different fields have asked the same question: What happens now? The answer to this question is somewhat difficult to find, but we have already witnessed the social consequences of the referendum. In this regard, the increases in racist attacks indicated in the official reports are worrying.

Before jumping into a discussion about the results of the referendum, we wished to contribute to discussions by examining the process that led to the Brexit decision. In this regard, we tackled the historical background and leave campaign discourses together. Following on from the studies that look at 'British exceptionalism', we argued that this referendum was a way to achieve the country's historical policy of distant relations with Europe. The migration

---

hate-crime-1516-hosb1116.pdf , 18.

[119] UN. "International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination", 2016, access: 09 September 2018, http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/icerd-_concluding_observations.pdf.

[120] van Dijk, "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments",53.

question was pointed out during the referendum, although the main aim was to fulfil this objective. However, the anti-immigration discourse formulated by the leave campaign (specifically by UKIP and in Nigel Farage's discourse) contributed to anti-immigrant feelings and racism, while fulfilling the UK's long-standing distance from the EU. In order to shed some light on this, the PDA method developed by van Dijk was beneficial in showing the specific linguistic choices that Farage made in the campaign process. In the detailed analysis, we explored how the words, frames, posters, and numbers were manipulated to achieve his Brexit goal.

This article mainly examined the discursive dimension of the Brexit campaign by taking the historical background into consideration. We only examined UKIP and its leader's discourse. However, the leave campaign did not involve only this party. Since this article did not have room to account for the other parties' discourses, it would be interesting to enlarge the inquiry by adding different party discourses and describing their influence on the public.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akdemir, Erhan. "Avrupa Bütünleşmesi Tarihçesi". *Avrupa Birliği: Tarihçe, Teoriler, Kurumlar ve Politikalar*. Ed. Belgin Akçay- İlke Göçmen. 35-67. Ankara: Seçkin Yayınevi, 2012.

Baker, David–Schnapper, Poulina. *Britain and the Crisis of the European Union*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

BBCNews. "Immigration Focus is Turning Point in EU Campaign, Says Farage". Access: 09 October 2018. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36444014.

BBCNews. "Brexit: Europe Stunned By UK Leave Vote". Access: 9 July 2018. https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-eu-referendum-36616018.

BBCNews. "The Nigel Farage Story". Access: 4 July 2018. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-36701855.

BBCNews. "Migrant Crisis: Farage Says EU 'Mad' to Accept So Many". Access: 09 October 2017. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-34197707.

BBCNews. "Nigel Farage Defends Linking Brussels Attacks and EU Migration Rules". Access: 05 October 2018. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-35879670.

BBCNews. "David Cameron Promises In/Out Referendum on EU". Access: 16 October 2018. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-21148282.

BBCNews. "Net Migration at 323,000 Prompts EU Referendum Row", Access: 19 October 2018. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-35658731.

BBCNEWS. "Jo Cox Murder". Access: 19 October 2018. https://www.bbc.com/news/topics/cn1r-4rw9qz4t/jo-cox-murder.

BBCNews. "Polish Media In UK Shocked By Post-Brexit Hate Crimes". Access: 19 October 2018. https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-36656348.

Bulman, May. "Brexit Vote Sees Highest Spike in Religious And Racial Hate Crimes Ever Recorded", Access: 17 October 2018. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/racist-hate-crimes-surge-to-record-high-after-brexit-vote-new-figures-reveal-a7829551.html.

Cameron, Deborah. *Working With Spoken Discourse*. London: SAGE, 2001.

Capdevila, Rosa–Callaghan, Jane E. "'It's not Racist. It's Common Sense'. A critical Analysis of Political Discourse around Asylum and Immigration in the UK". *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology 18/*1(2008): 1-16.

Carrera, Sergio Guild, Elspeth and Ngo Chun Luk "What Does Brexit Mean for the EU's Area of Freedom, Security and Justice?" CEPS Commentary, 2016. Access: 19 July 2017. https://www.ceps.eu/ceps-publications/what-does-brexit-mean-eus-area-freedom-security-and-justice/.

Cesur, Nazı Sıla. Lourie Hanquinet- Duru, Deniz Neriman. "The 'European Turks': Identities of High-Skilled Turkish Migrants in Europe". *Southeast European and Black Sea Studies 18/1* (2018): 127-144.

Chilton, Poul. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Christopher, Hart. *Critical Discourse Analysis And Cognitive Science: New Perspectives On Immigration Discourse.* Palgrave Macmillan: London, 2010.

Clarke, Harold- Goodwin, H., Matthew – Whiteley, Paul. *Brexit: Why Britain Voted To Leave The European Union*. Cambridge: UK, 2017.

Corcoran, Hannah- Smith, Kevin. "Hate Crime, England and Wales". Access: 01 April 2017. http://www.report-it.org.uk/files/hate-crime-1516-hosb1116.pdf.

Dedman, Martin. *The Origins and Development of the European Union: 1945-2008*. New York: Routledge, 2010.

Fairclough, Norman. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* Abingdon, New York: Routledge, 2003.

Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social Change*. UK: Polity Press, 2006.

Glencross, Andrew. *Why the UK Voted for Brexit: David Cameron's Great Miscalculation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Hall, Macer–Maddox, David. "Farage Speech: Controlling Mass Immigration While Britain Remains Part of EU is Impossible". 2016. Access: 10 October 2017. http://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/665446/Nigel-Farage-Ukip-control-immigration-leave-EU-referendum-June.

Christopher, Hope. "Mass Immigration Has Left Britain 'Unrecognisable', Says Nigel Farage". 2014. Access: 15 October 2017. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/ukip/10668996/Mass-immigration-has-left-Britain-unrecognisable-says-Nigel-Farage.html.

Independent. "I've had Enough of People Insinuating That UKIP is Racist – It's Simply Not True". 2015.Access: 20 July 2018. http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/i-ve-had-enough-of-people-insinuating-that-ukip-is-racist-its-simply-not-true-10182747.html.

Jørgensen, Marianne–Phillips, Louise . *Discourse Analysis As Theory And Method*. London: Sage, 2002.

Jones, Alistair. *Britain and the European Union*. UK: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.

Kampf, Zohar. "Political Discourse Analysis". *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. Ed. Karen Tracy–Cornelia Ilie. 1-17. US: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015.

Krotofil, Joanna–Motak, Dominika. "A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Media Coverage of the Migration Crisis in Poland". *Scripta Instituti Donneriani Aboensis 28*(2018): 92-115.

Leconte, Cecile. *Understanding Euroscepticism*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Lowe, Josh . "Polish Foreign Minister: Brexit Has Fueled Anti-Polish Hate Crime". 2016. Access: 20 October 2018. http://www.newsweek.com/poland-poles-uk-polish-immigrants-hate-crime-brexit-rise-post-ref-racism-496028 .

Maddox, David. "Nigel Farage: We Can Only Control Our Borders By Leaving The EU". 2016. Access: 19 October 2018, http://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/642617/Nigel-Farage-Immigration-defining-issue-EU-referendum-campaign-politics.

Mandelson, Peter. "Why is the Brexit Camp so Obsessed with Immigration? Because That's All They Have".2016. Access: 08 August 2017. https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/may/03/brexit-camp-immigration-economic-vote-leave.

Mandhai, Shafik. "Protests in UK against Post-Brexit Racism". 2017. Access: 01 September 2018. http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2017/03/protests-uk-post-brexit-racism-170318140636538.html.

Mason, Rowena. "Nigel Farage: British Muslim 'Fifth Column' Fuels Fear of Immigration".2015. Access: 18 May 2018. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/mar/12/nigel-farage-british-muslim-fifth-column-fuels-immigration-fear-ukip.

Mason, Rowena. "Nigel Farage Accuses Muslims in UK of 'Split Loyalties'". 2015. Access: 10 December 2018. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/nov/16/nigel-farage-accuse-british-muslims-conflicting-loyalties.

Mayr, Andrea. *Language And Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. New York: Continuum, 2008.

Mortimer, Caroline. "Brexit Caused Lasting Rise İn Hate Crime, New Figures Show". 2016. Access: 01 June 2018. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/brexit-hate-crime-racism-eu-referendum-poland-islam-more-in-common-a7231836.html.

Moret, Erica. "Europe or the Open sea? Brexit and European Commentary, European Council on Foreign Security". 2016 Access: 18 January 2018. https://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_europe_or_the_open_sea_brexit_and_european_security70.

Office for National Statistics. "Migration Statistics, Quarterly Report". 2016. Access: 05 July 2018. http://www.ons.gov.uk/releases/migrationstatisticsquarterlyreportfebruary2016.

Özkural Köroğlu, Nergis -Yüksel Çendek, Sinem. "Toplumsal Güvenlik, Kimlik, Bütünleşme Bağlamında Avrupa Şüpheciliği: Cameron Dönemindeki Avrupa Şüpheciliğinin İçerik Analizi". *Akademik İncelemeler Dergisi* 10/2(2015): 191-216.

Pareschi, Andrea–Albertini, Alessandro. "Immigration, Elites and the European Union: How UKIP Frames Its Populist Discourse". *Comunicazione Politica* 19/2(2018): 247-272.

Perring, Rebecca. "EU loophole could see 77 MILLION Turks head to Britain, warn Farage and Johnson. 2016. Access: 07 October 2017. http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/661387/Migrant-crisis-Nigel-Farage-Turkey-EU-visa-free-travel.

Rogers, Rebecca. "Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis in Educational Research". *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. Ed. Rebecca Rogers. 29-48. UK:Routledge, 2011.

Rojo, Luisa Martion –van Dijk, Teun. A. "'There Was A Problem, And It Was Solved!': Legitimating the Expulsion of Illegal 'Migrants in Spanish Parliamentary Discourse" *Discourse and Society 8*/4, (1997): 523-566.

Schweiger, Christian. *Britain, Germany and the Future of the European Union*. UK: Palgrave Macmillian, 2007.

Skynews, "Farage Defends "Vile And Racist" EU Poster". 2016. Access: 10 October 2018. https://news.sky.com/story/farage-defends-vile-and-racist-eu-poster-10318659.

Somerville, Will. "Brexit: The Role of Migration in the Upcoming EU Referendum". 2016. Access: 20 October 2018. http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/brexit-role-migration-upcoming-eu-referendum.

Sparrow, Andrew. "UKIP conference and Godfrey Bloom "sluts" row: Politics live blog". 2013. Access: 16 October 2018. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/sep/20/ukip-conference-and-reaction-to-the-damian-mcbride-revelations-politics-live-blog.

Steven, Erlanger. "Britain's 'Brexit' Debate Inflamed by Worries That Turkey Will Join E.U".2016. Access: 15 September 2017. http://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/14/world/europe/britain-brexit-turkey-eu.html.

Stuart, Hall. "The West and the Rest Discourse and Power", *The Indigenous Experience: Global Perspectives*. Ed. Roger Maaka–Chris Andersen, Canada: Canadian Scholars Press Inc., 2006.

Stubbs, Michael. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis Of Natural Language*. US: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Stronger in Europe, "Britain Stronger in Europe". Access: 10 July 2017. http://www.strongerin.co.uk.

The Guardian. "Nigel Farage Calls On Government To Let Syrian Refugees into UK". 2013. Access: 10 October 2018. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/dec/29/nigel-farage-syrian-refugees-uk.

Taggart Paul–Szczerbiak, Aleks "Europeanization, Euroscepticism and Party Systems: Party-based Euroscepticism in the Candidate States of Central and Eastern Europe", *Perspectives of European Politics and Society* 3/2 (2002): 23-41.

The Telegraph. "Nigel Farage: Immigration Will Be The Defining Issue Of This EU Referendum Campaign".2015. Access: 05 October 2018. http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/immigration/11817508/Nigel-Farage-Immigration-will-be-the-defining-issue-of-this-EU-referendum-campaign.html.

Ramiro, Troitiño- David, Kerikmäe- Tanel, Chochia- Archil A. *Brexit: History, Reasoning and Perspectives*, Switzerland: Springer, 2018.

UKIP Manifesto. "Beleive in Britain UKIP Manifesto". 2015. Access: 08 October 2017. https://d3n8a8pro7vhmx.cloudfront.net/ukipdev/pages/1103/attachments/original/1429295050/UKIPManifesto2015.pdf?1429295050.

UN. "International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination". 2016. Access: 09 September 2018. http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/icerd-_concluding_observations.pdf.

van Der Valk, Ineke. "Right-Wing Parliamentary Discourse on Immigration in France". *Discourse & Society 14*/3 (2003): 309-348.

van Dijk, Teun. A."Denying Racism: Elite Discourse and Racism". *Racism and Migration in Western Europe.* Ed. John Solomos–John Wrench. 179-193. UK: Berg Publishers, 1993.

van Dijk, Teun A. *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Vol. 6. UK: Sage, 1993.

van Dijk, Teun A. "Elite Discourse and the Reproduction of Racism". *Hate Speech*. Ed. Rita. Kirk. Whillock–David. Slayden . 1-27. UK: Sage Publications: 1995.

van Dijk, Teun, A. "Discourse, Power and Access". *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis.* Ed. Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm. Coulthard, 84-104. London: Routledge, 1996.

van Dijk, Teun A. "Political Discourse and Racism: Describing Others in Western Parliaments". *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse* 2(1997):31-64.

van Dijk, Teun. A. "What is Political Discourse Analysis?". *Belgian Journal of Linguistics 1/1, (*1997): 11-52.

van Dijk, Teun. A. "Discourse and Racism". *A Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies. Ed.* D. T. Goldbridge–J. Solomos. 145-159. UK: Blackwell Cambridge, 2002.

van Dijk, Teun A. "Social Cognition, Social Power And Social Discourse". Text 8/1-2 (1988):129-157.

van Dijk, Teun A. *Discourse and Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

van Dijk, Teun A. "Critical Discourse Analysis". *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* Ed. Deborah, Tannen Heidi. E. Hamilton-Deborah, Schiffrin. 466-487. UK: John Wiley and Sons, 2015.

Wright, Oliver. "Nigel Farage Says He is A Victim of Political Hatred in Response to Jo Cox Question from". 2016. Access: 11 October 2017. http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/nigel-farage-jo-cox-dead-murdered-peston-brexit-eu-referendum-ukip-political-hatred-a7089996.html.

Wilson, Sam. "Britain and the EU: A Long and Rocky Relationship". 2014. Access: 7 January 2016. http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-26515129.

Widdowson, Henry G. "Discourse Analysis: A Critical View". *Language and Literature* 4/3 (1995): 157-172.

Why Vote Leave. Access: 10 July 2017. http://www.voteleavetakecontrol.org/why_vote_leave.html.

Patrick, Wintour. "Nigel Farage: UKIP wants five-year ban on immigrants settling in UK". 2014. Access: 05 October 2018. http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/jan/07/ukip-ban-immigrants-nigel-farage.

Yazgan, Pınar–Deniz, Eroglu Utku. "News Discourse And Ideology: Critical Analysis of Copenhagen Gang Wars' Online News". *Migration Letters 14*(1)/1 (2017): 145-160.