

A Critical Analysis of Anti-Islamisation and Anti-immigration Discourse: The Case of the English Defence League and Britain First

Noha Abdel Kader

PhD student

Linguistics and English Language, Lancaster University

E-mail: n.abdelkader@lancaster.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper examines the discursive strategies employed by two of the far-right movements in the UK, specifically in the English Defence League (EDL) and Britain First, when dealing with immigration and what they term as the “Islamisation of Britain”. The paper will demonstrate how these movements frame their arguments by employing strategies of positive-self and negative-other representation. The analysis will rely on the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) as a framework for examining the mission statements of both movements in relation to three discursive strategies, namely nomination, predication and argumentation. The analysis will reveal how both movements put themselves forward as defenders of British society and basic liberal values, while negatively portraying “the other” either as a threat to such values or as a burden on Britain’s resources.

Keywords: English Defense League, Britain First, Islamisation, Discourse Historical approach, mission statements, discursive strategies.

1. Introduction

The Discourse Historical Approach considers the historical context of a problem and advocates the integration of available knowledge about the historical sources and the background of the social and political fields in which discursive “events” are embedded (Wodak, 2001:65). The discursive construction of immigrants and the issue of the “Islamisation of Britain” will be examined within the mission statements of the British right-wing movements Britain First and the EDL using the DHA (Reisigl & Wodak 2001; Reisigl & Wodak 2009; Wodak 2001). The principal objective of this paper is to lay bare the ideological aims of Britain First and the EDL in the context of their discourse, which, as the DHA will show, relies on the positive representation of “the self” and the negative representation of “the other”. In addition, the DHA will reveal how the nature of the arguments employed by such movements is interdiscursive, emphasising nationalism and identity, while serving to represent immigrants and the Muslim population as “the other”. Brophy et al. (1999) identify a range of conceptual positions that prevail in right-wing¹ discourses, the most important of which are racist, homophobic, fascist, and social Darwinist ideologies. They also point

¹ Cameron (2001:15) refers to “discourses” in the plural form when he maintains that “reality is “discursively constructed”, made and

out that far-right groups aim for respectability by emphasising identity over more explicit inflammatory terms, establishing historical linkages through their use of such ideologies, and explain the transformations that this terminology has undergone in recent years.

The historical dimension in this paper will be examined in two ways, first by historically contextualising the afore-mentioned mission statements as part of right-wing discourses on immigration and the “Islamisation of Britain”. Second, the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses will be investigated, i.e., the history of terms and concepts that are used by right-wing movements (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:90).

2. The EDL and Britain First: An historical overview

The past decade has witnessed the emergence of an increasingly sophisticated anti-Islamic and anti-immigrant social movement in post-industrial democracies ranging from the USA to Australia and across Western Europe. Explanations of “radical right-wing populism” emerged in the 1990s as scholars of the far right in Western Europe gradually noticed that labels like “fascist”, “neo-fascist” or even necessarily “extremist”, were no longer appropriate designations for new political movements. Not only were “contemporary” parties on the far-right actively distancing themselves from the infamy of fascism and Nazism, they strategically harnessed popular anxieties by advancing populist rhetoric and platforms. These new right-wing populist parties were committed to democratic institutions and ideals, but they disdained political elites and exploited the public’s increasing distrust of mainstream political parties and hostility toward immigrants and non- natives.

Opposition toward immigrants is so embedded within the radical populist right that some scholars see the term “anti-immigration groups” as a more appropriate designation. In the last decade, this notable antagonism towards immigration has been intensified and focused on Muslim immigrants, with the “Muslim question” placing Islam front and center in anti-immigrant platforms and transcending the immigration debate more generally (Pupcenoks & McCabe 2013: 172). In case of the present paper, the portrayal of immigrants and the “Islamisation of Britain” will be explored within the mission statements of two British right-wing movements, namely the EDL and Britain First.

The EDL was formerly a group known as the “United Peoples of Luton” (UPL) and now presents itself as a social movement promising to defend the English working class from the threats of both the elite-led policies of multiculturalism and the Islamisation of Britain (ibid:175). As for Britain first, it is described as a far-right British nationalist movement comprised of former members of the British National Party (Liang 2007). Both movements claim to defend Britain against policies of multiculturalism and the Islamisation of Britain.

remade as people talk about things using “the discourses” they have access to”. This definition considers discourse as a means of constructing a single version of reality and, will, thus be used throughout the paper.

Hall et al. (1992:298) point out that recently certain biological notions of race have been replaced by cultural definitions that draw on discourses of national belonging and national identity. This suggests that the DHA provides a useful framework for investigating right-wing discourses possibly embedded within a context advocating identity and nationalism, as the DHA assimilates knowledge about “historical sources and the background of the social and political fields within which discursive events are embedded” (Richardson & Wodak 2009: 255).

3. Data: Mission statements

In the world of business, mission statements abound on the walls and halls of the world's leading organizations. They are these appealing phrases and slogans that consist of general statements, claims and conclusions. This type of genre usually stresses values, positive beliefs and guideline principles of the corporation's belief system and ideology. Very little evidence exists, however, which proves their true value. In fact, most previous studies, have tended to focus almost exclusively on their content (Kissler 1991; Swales 1990). The power of mission statements, nonetheless, derives from the fact that such a genre may be considered a carrier of culture and ideology (Swales & Rogers 1995). In addition, Swales & Rogers note that even though mission statements are institutional, in the hands of powerful luminaries they could become individual, and hence move away from the systems of genres that get things done and fall more under the category of non-routine (ibid:225). As a result, mission statements could become part of the “the recursive processes that produce and reproduce everyday social and institutional customs (Giddens 1979).

In the case of the present paper, the EDL and Britain's First mission statement could be seen to have a discursive dimension so that even though its discourse emphasises the defense British liberal values, its real aim may be to position Muslims and immigrants as “the other” within the British society. In addition the discursive dimension of the mission statements could be argued as a means to legitimise what could be considered racist practices against immigrants and the Muslim population in Britain where legitimisation is understood as the “widespread acknowledgement of the legitimacy of explanations and justifications of how things are done” (Fairclough 2003: 219).

Racism can be defined as a “complex, multifaceted system which is (re)produced by social practices of dominant groups including their discourses and by shared social representations” (Moscovici 1981: 16). Such social representations, as Van Der Valk (2003:13) explains, “permeate these practices with meaning and thus serve to legitimise social inequality and the daily organisation of dominance”. The author also adds that new racist practices are now legitimised on the basis of the so-called “principal otherness”, so that presumed biological–genetic differences are replaced by differences between cultures, nations or religions (ibid).

De-legitimisation, on the other hand is “the essential counterpart” strategy that serves to detract legitimacy from “the other” by presenting them negatively (Chilton 2004:46). Within the DHA's framework, these are macro-strategies that utterers use to manage their interests (ibid:78). With this dichotomy, the analysis is

expected to reveal how both movements use strategies of positive-self construction seeking to achieve legitimisation, while discursively delegitimising “the other”, i.e., immigrants and Muslims through negative presentation.

4. Theoretical and Methodological framework:

The DHA is a multidisciplinary approach that seeks to “integrate as many as of the genres of discourse referring to a particular issue as possible, as well as the historical dimension of that issue” (Van Leeuwen & Wodak 1999:91). Four dimensions are central to the discourse: 1) historical method; 2) the content of the data; 3) the discursive strategies employed; 4) the linguistic realisations of these contents and strategies (see table 1 below for examples of linguistic strategies) . All four levels will be covered in the analysis.

The DHA approach is designed for critical analysis and, hence, provides a means for a social critique of texts exhibiting patterns of dominance and inequality (ibid). Its intention then is to clarify the subject under investigation and the analyst’s own position with an aim to explain why certain interpretations of discursive events seem more valid than others (Reisigl & Wodak 2009: 88). In this regard, for the purposes of the present research, the analyst’s position is to problematise the mission statements of Britain First and the EDL to demonstrate the presence of a latent discursive dimension. There is precedent for using the DHA for such a purpose, such as research concentrating on parliamentary discourse (e.g., Der Valk 2003; Wodak & Van Dijk 2000) or political speeches (e.g., Graham et al. 2004). The subject of the present paper will be the groups’ respective mission statements, the analysis of which will show that the discourse used in such statements while emphasising nationalism and the defense of secular values, arguably has its real aim to establish the Muslim population and immigrants and as “the other” within English society. The analysis of that discourse will reveal the discriminatory, anti-immigration sentiment embedded within a context of vows to undertake the defense of Britain’s identity and liberal values.

Reisigl and Wodak (2001:93-95) point out five types of discursive strategies², involved in the positive self- and negative other-presentation. These are: 1) nomination; 2) predication; 3) argumentation; 4) perspectivisation; 5) intensification/mitigation. Due to space restrictions, this research is confined to only three of the strategies, most salient as they occurred most frequently in my analysis, namely nomination, predication and argumentation. Nomination strategies look at how social actors, objects, phenomena and events are named and referred to linguistically; predication examines which characteristics and features are attributed to the actors, objects and phenomena.

Argumentation, on the other hand, is a process used to justify claims of truth and often relies on topoi, i.e., argument schemes, used to connect the premise of an argument to its conclusion. In addition, the analysis will also consider the contextualising of utterances in relation to other discourses, historical contexts and

² Strategy refers to “a more or less intentional plan of practices (including discourse practices) adopted to achieve a particular social, political, psychological or linguistic aim” (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001: 44).

events, by investigating elements of intertextuality and interdiscursivity as part of the historical facet that is essential to the DHA (ibid:90)

Table 1. Strategies and linguistic devices employed in the DHA

Strategy	Objectives	Devices
Nomination	discursive construction of social actors, objects/phenomena/ events and processes/ actions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership categorization devices, deictics, anthroponyms, etc. • tropes such as metaphors, metonymies and synecdoches (pars pro toto, totum pro parte) • verbs and nouns used to denote processes and actions, etc.
Predication	discursive qualification of social actors, objects, phenomena, events/ processes and actions (more or less positively or negatively)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • stereotypical, evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits (e.g. in the form of adjectives, appositions, prepositional phrases, relative clauses, conjunctive clauses, infinitive clauses and participial clauses or groups) • explicit predicates or predicative nouns/adjectives/pronouns • collocations • explicit comparisons, similes, metaphors and other rhetorical figures (including metonymies, hyperboles, litotes, euphemisms) • allusions, evocations, and presuppositions/implicatures, etc.
Argumentation	justification and questioning of claims of truth and normative rightness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • topoi (formal or more content-related) • fallacies
Prescriptivization	positioning speaker's or writer's point of view and expressing involvement or distance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deictics • direct, indirect or free indirect speech • quotation marks, discourse markers/ particles • metaphors • animating prosody, etc.
Intensification/ mitigation	modifying (intensifying or mitigating) the illocutionary force and thus the epistemic or deontic status of utterances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • diminutives or augmentatives • (modal) particles, tag questions, subjunctive, hesitations, vague expressions, etc. • hyperboles, litotes • indirect speech acts (e.g. question instead of assertion) • verbs of saying, feeling, thinking, etc.

5. Analysis

5.1 Nomination and predication:

Strategies of self- and other-presentation are among those utilised in actor and participant representation (see Van Leeuwen 1996). Ethnic minority actors, for example, can be included or excluded; named or unnamed; negatively or positively portrayed; depicted in homogeneous categories or subdivided and differentiated in specific groups (ibid). The same holds for the description of in-group actors and participants. The analysis of nomination and predication is thus expected to reveal how variations in actor descriptions, and specifically variation for in-groups and out-groups, may reveal dimensions of the opinions of the speakers or writers in relation to the topic in question.

Starting with the EDL's mission statement, there are five main social actors that are discursively addressed: 1) "The EDL"; 2) "Islam"; 3) "policy makers/ decision makers/law-enforcement personnel"; 4) "Radicals"; 5) "Muslims/ Muslim community/Muslim Population /British Muslims". The nomination strategies of social actors include "collectivising" such as with "Muslims", (Van Leeuwen, 1996:49) using combinations of "Muslim community/population" as clear in the examples below:

- 1- Radical Islam keeps British **Muslims** fearful and Isolated...
- 2- ... Intolerance and barbarity that are thriving among certain sections of the **Muslim population** in Britain...

The use of collectivised terms is intended to imply that all Muslims are the same and belong to a homogenous group (Baker et al., 2013:123). Thus, the strategy of collectivisation could be said to facilitate the creation of generalisations about the designated group.

The mission statements also contains deictic expressions such as "we", "our" and "they". Deixis can prompt the perceptual relation of uttered indexical expressions to various situational features (Chilton, 2004:56). The first person plural "we", for example, can be used to make the perceivers conceptualise group identity as insiders, whereas "they" would designate an outsider (ibid). The pronouns "we" and "our" in this case refer to the "EDL" and "the British", while "they" or "their" alternates between "Muslims" and "decision/policy-makers" as in the following examples:

- 1- Although these actions were certainly those of a minority, **we** believe that they reflect other forms of religiously inspired intolerance...
- 2- **We** believe that the opponents of radical Islam have a strong hold on British Muslims.
- 3- British Muslims should be able to safely demand reform of **their** religion...It is important that **they** completely reject the views of those who believe that Islam should be taken in tis "original" t7th century form...

4- ...Decision makers are held responsible for their policy- making choices, choices that affect the harmony and security of the nation.

These last, the “decision/policy-makers” or the people responsible for authorising laws, are a one of the types of “other” referred to using terms in discourse analysis called “actionyms”. Actionyms is a category similar to what Van Leeuwen (1996:54) terms as “functionalisation”, referring to social actors by “an activity, in terms of something they do, for instance an occupation or role”. Actionyms can be used in discourse to qualify the role that these actors play as “other”, especially if negatively applied, such as condescendingly to Muslims and immigrants vis-à-vis British citizens as discussed below in terms of predication strategies.

The predication strategies are revealed through attestations of mainly positive traits using participle clauses, which are used to construct the EDL as a movement that protects human rights, promotes democracy and presents a balanced picture of Islam in contrast to what is depicted by the “policy-makers”. The EDL’s role is also seen as having an international dimension as it is depicted as “resisting” what is termed a “global Jihad”, i.e., the global demand for the application of Sharia.

The “they” or the “other group” are qualified in the predicates in negative terms. Policy-makers, to start with, are blamed for making decisions that are meant to serve their own rather than the public’s interests, as well as weakening British culture and values. “Policy-makers” are also negatively qualified as condescending to the Muslim population for fear of being accused of racism.

The “other group” attribution also includes “radicals” and “Muslims” or “British Muslims”, who are negatively evaluated and qualified through undesirable adjectives such as “fearful” and “isolated”. “Muslims” are also linked to negative predicate nouns such as “intolerance”, “barbarity”, “homophobia”, and “antisemitism”. Similarly, “radicals” are attributed a significantly detrimental role since they are said to dominate the Muslim mentality and thus damage Muslim institutions in Britain by causing British Muslims to adopt extreme and hardline views. This process further results in the inability to seclude the radicals.

Moving to the predicate qualification of objects and phenomena, “Sharia law” and “Islam” are negatively described and in stark contrast to Western liberal values through the use of predicative adjectives such as “undemocratic”, predicative nouns such as “a threat to our democracy” and explicit predicates, like “seeks to dominate all non-believers”. British values, on the other hand, are compared to Muslim traditions, the former being liberal but deprived of the right to exist, whereas the latter are described as anti-democratic, yet imposed on the British society. The phenomenon of “Islamisation” is depicted as a process, suggesting a consistent and deliberate insinuation into the British society predicated through the metaphorical “creeping Islamisation of our country”, meaning that Islam is sneaking into British life. In another example, Betz explains (1994: 76) the introduction of Halal meat products into British markets as qualified

through a predicative noun, “an intrusion of the religious into secular society”, a furtive imposition on Britain as far-right movements usually campaign against the introduction of halal meat into European markets.

As for Britain First, the principal social actors that are discursively constructed include: “Britain First”, “Britain”, “Christianity”, “Islam”, “asylum seekers”, “migrants”, “left-wing policies”, “our people”, “British citizens”, “Christians”, “left-wing policies”. Britain First, is associated with the deictic “we”, the possessive “our” and the reflective “us”. The group that is identified as “they”, on the other hand, includes “foreigners”, “asylum-seekers” and “immigrants”, who are referred to using actionyms, as clear in the examples below:

- 1- Britian First movement is not just a normal political group, **we** are a patriotic resistance and “frontline” for **our** long suffering people.
- 2- We want our people to come first, before **foreigners, asylum seekers or migrants** and we are overtly proud of this stance.

As Van Leeuwen (1996:55) notes, using actionyms emphasises the assigned role at the expense of identity. In the case at hand, what is given precedence is not who these people are, but the fact that they come from a different country. As for “the British, they are collectivized as “our people” or British citizens. The collectivisation representing the British as one homogenous group has the opposite effect of the use of the same strategy with Muslims mentioned earlier. The use of this strategy regarding the “Muslims” essentially paves the way for extending negative qualities to the whole group. In this case, signifying the British as a uniform group enables the EDL to claim to speak on behalf of all British citizens of different ages and backgrounds, thus validating its practices on a popular basis. As Van Der Valk (2003:337) points out, in right-wing discourses, legitimacy is asserted on the grounds of claiming to represent the interests of the whole population.

As for predication, it could be suggested that Britain First attains a positive quality predicates like a “patriotic political party”, or a “street defense organisation”, meaning that its concern is the defence of British citizens, history, and traditions. Britain itself is constructed as needful of defence by using adjectives and predicative adjectives like ‘small’ and a “densely populated country” and through a prepositional clause “with barely enough space and resources” to sustain large numbers of immigrants.

“Christianity” and “Christians” on the other hand, are pictured as under threat and facing persecution by extreme ideologies. Moreover, Betz & Meret (2009:328) suggest that some right-wing movements assert Christian values and Christian culture in speeches, party programmes and election pamphlets maintaining that Europe will only be able to face the challenge posed by the advance of Islam if it “defends its Christian humanist values and norms”. “Islam”, on the other hand, is negatively represented through the adjective “militant” and is said to be responsible for oppressing human rights. In addition, the effect of Islam on

British citizens is described through explicit predicates rendering the latter as second class or a minority and as “desperately” in need of employment because of increased immigration. As for “asylum-seekers”, “migrants” and “foreigners”, these are qualified as appearing at the expense of British citizens.

Another social actor “left-wing liberal policies” - a metonymic toponym signifying left-wing politicians - is similarly predicated as being responsible for relegating British citizens to a second class. As the analysis clarifies, such politicians are delegitimised by their depiction in a negative role, i.e., encouraging laws and policies in favour of immigrants at the expense of British citizens. Van Der Valk (2003:337) argues that in right-wing discourses “the Left is systematically delegitimized” and is constantly “represented as only motivated on ideological grounds”.

As for the most prominent phenomena discursively constructed, “immigration” and “unemployment” are the biggest actors. Immigration going out of control is constructed as acting as an instrument that places undue burdens on the country’s resources, thus causing many social problems, including unemployment.

As clear from the above, it appears that both movements seek to construct inside and outside groups through deixis, and to achieve positive presentation of the “self” and negative presentation of the “other” through relying on various nomination and predication strategies. Such strategies could also be relevant elements of the text’s argumentation structure as will be demonstrated below.

5.2 Argumentation

It could be suggested that anti-immigration discourse relies to a great extent on the use of topoi (see, for example; Gabrielatos & Baker 2008; Khosravi Nik 2010; Van Dijk 2000; Wodak and Van Dijk 2000). Topos is an old rhetorical notion referring to “content related warrants which connect premises with conclusions” (Wodak 2001:75). Thus topoi are a type of “stereotypical” arguments based on socially shared opinions generally implying “common sense reasoning schemes” for the sake of persuasion (Van Dijk 2000), where persuasion is defined as “the means of intentionally influencing a person so that she or he adopts, fixes or changes her or his ways of perception, attitudes and views” (Reisigl & Wodak 2009:69). There are a number of topoi that occur frequently in discourse about immigration (see Reisigl & Wodak 2001; Reisigl & Wodak 2009 for a full list of topoi) in the mission statements, the most of which are the topoi of: *history; usefulness; threat; authority; responsibility; burdening; and numbers*. Table (1) and Table (2) below contain a number of claims as well as the topoi that function to justify such claims. The paraphrasing of the topoi in the table follows that of Reisigl & Wodak (2001: 75-80).

Table 2. Claims and Topoi of the EDL

Claims	Topoi
<p>Claim one: The EDL is founded to struggle against Islamic intolerance of Western cultures because history warns us against leaving these matters unattended to.</p>	<p><i>Topos of history:</i> Because history teaches that specific actions have specific consequences, one should perform or omit a specific action comparable with the historical example referred to. e.g. The world is a dangerous place to live in; not because of the people who are ...” Albert Einstein, refugee from Nazi Germany</p>
<p>Claim two: Militant Islam is a growing threat, and therefore the EDL, which serves the interests of British people, will work to combat it.</p>	<p><i>Topos of advantage/usefulness:</i> subtype “pro bono publico” (to the advantage of all): if an action under a specific relevant point of view will be useful, then one should perform it.</p> <p>e.g. The EDL will continue to work to protect the inalienable rights of all people...</p>
<p>Claim Three: Dangerous and divisive radical Islamic views are prevailing among the Muslim population and Muslim organisations.</p>	<p><i>Topos of threat (topos of threat of radicalism):</i></p> <p>If there are specific dangers and threats, one should do something against them.</p> <p>e.g. resentment is already beginning to grow, and could create dangerous divisions...</p> <p>e.g. Sharia law makes a fundamental distinction between Muslims and non- Muslims...</p>
<p>Claim four: Sharia is incompatible with the principles of democracy and hence it cannot be accommodated within liberal western norms.</p>	<p><i>Topos of authority:</i></p> <p>X is right or X has to be done or X has to be omitted because A (= an authority) says that it is right or that is has to be done or that it has to be omitted.</p> <p>e.g. The European Court of Human Rights has declared that ‘sharia is incompatible with the fundamental principles of democracy”</p>
<p>Claim five: decision- makers misinform the public to serve their own interest, and hence they should be held accountable for this.</p>	<p><i>Topos of responsibility:</i> because a state or a group of persons is responsible for the emergence of specific problems, it or they should act in order to find solutions of these problems.</p> <p>e.g. The British political and media establishment have, for a long time, been presenting a very sanitised...view of Islam, shaped by the needs of policy-makers.</p>

<p>Claim six: Law –enforcement personnel hesitate before applying the rules in relation to immigrants for fear of being accused of racism, which is against the simple rules of justice.</p>	<p><i>Topoi of justice:</i> if persons/actions/situations are equal in specific respects, they should be treated/ dealt with in the same way.</p> <p>e.g. Law-enforcement personnel must be able to enforce the rule of law thoroughly without prejudice or fear.</p>
--	--

Table 3.Claims and Topoi of Britain First

Claims	Topoi
<p>Claim one: Britain First will serve the interests of British citizens, combat militant Islam and advance British traditions.</p>	<p><i>Topos of usefulness/advantage</i> :subtype “pro bono publico ” (to the advantage of all): see table three.</p> <p>e.g. -Britain First is a patriotic political party...</p> <p>e.g. Britain First has a proven track record of opposing Islamic militants...</p> <p>e.g. We want British history, traditions and to be respected...</p>
<p>Claim two: left-wing policies are responsible for advancing the interests of immigrants at the expense of British citizens.</p>	<p>Topos of responsibility: see table (three above)</p> <p>e.g. We will not stand back and watch as our people are made second class citizens by left-wing-liberal...</p>
<p>Claim three: Christianity is under attack, and Christians face discrimination.</p>	<p><i>Topos of Threat:</i> see table three.</p> <p>e.g. Christianity in Britain is under ferocious assault: many Christians now face discrimination and persecution</p>
<p>Claim four: Militant Islam is growing rapidly and leading to the suppression of human rights.</p>	<p><i>Topos of threat:</i></p> <p>e.g. The rapid growth of militant Islam is leading to the suppression of women,...</p>
<p>Claim five: increased immigration is placing loads on the country’s resources.</p>	<p><i>Topos of burdening or weighing down:</i></p> <p>If a person, an institution or a “country” is burdened by specific problems, one should act in order to diminish these burdens.</p> <p>e.g. - Immigration is spiralling out of control placing ...</p> <p>-Britain is a small, overcrowded, densely ...</p>
<p>Claim six: A large number of British citizens are unemployed because of increased immigration.</p>	<p><i>Topos of numbers:</i> if the numbers prove a specific topos, a specific action should be performed/not be carried out.</p> <p>e.g. We have millions of British citizens born here who...</p>

As clear from both the tables above, the movements in question utilise the topos of usefulness to persuade the public of the credibility of their actions, i.e., combating militant Islam and also, in Britain first’s case, controlling immigration. To justify their establishment and give credence to their actions, both movements exploit the topos of threat that represents radical Islam as a growing force in Britain that requires fighting back. The EDL further uses the topos of history by citing an example related to the devastating actions of the Nazi regime in World War II to warn about similar precarious consequences from failing to combat extreme ideologies in the present time. This use of topoi generally links to tradition, whereby lessons of

earlier times are revived around new issues, based in custom or originating in authoritative sources (Van Der Valk 2003:319). To provide additional validity to its claims about the threat of Islam, the EDL uses the topos of authority, a specific form of legitimisation related to “authorization”, citing the European Court of Human rights that categorises Sharia as “incompatible” with democracy. This is a specific form of “legitimisation by reference to authority” (Van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999:104).

In addition, Britain First further employs the topoi of burdening, since immigrants are viewed as a burden on the country’s resources, and that of numbers to justify why certain measures should be taken to curb immigration. In addition, both movements make use of the topos of responsibility, which constructs decision-makers as not properly doing their job by siding with foreigners and immigrants at the expense of British citizens. The use of this topos is significant in that it renders political authority inactive. Thus, these movements may legitimise their existence by promising to undertake responsibilities and constructing a positive self-image in contrast with those who otherwise neglect them.

5.3 Intertextuality and interdiscursivity

Richardson & Wodak (2009a:255) note that the DHA attempts to contextualise utterances in relation to discourses in social and institutional contexts, as well as socio-political and historical events. Thus, the DHA approaches the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses, i.e., the history and intertextual references of terms and concepts that are used (ibid).

Fairclough defines intertextuality as “the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth” (Fairclough, 1992: 84). Fairclough further notes that intertextuality examines variation in representational processes at different levels of text production leading to the circulation of different discourses (Fairclough, 1995:61). Analysis in an intertextual framework is, thus, is not carried out merely at the linguistic level, but also on the discourse practice level where an analyst examines “the traces of the discourse practice” in a given text (ibid).

Fairclough (1992:85) further distinguishes between two types of intertextuality: *manifest intertextuality* and *constitutive intertextuality*. Manifest intertextuality means a text contains other texts explicitly incorporated by means such as quotation marks. Constitutive intertextuality or *interdiscursivity*, on the other hand, designates texts that can be composed of diverse elements such as discourse types, register, style, etc. (ibid: 104).

Intertextuality means that texts are linked to other texts, both in the past and in the present, which is established in different ways: through explicit reference to a topic or main actor, through references to the same event; by allusions or evocations; or by the transfer of arguments from one text to another (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009:90). If an element is taken out of a specific context, we observe the process of

de-contextualization; if the respective element is then inserted into a new context, we witness the process of recontextualization (ibid).

The EDL's mission statement starts with a clear example of manifest intertextuality where Albert Einstein, identified as a refugee from Nazi Germany, is quoted explaining that the world will remain a dangerous place as long as people refrain from doing something about it. The historical incident of the atrocities of Nazi Germany during World War II could be considered as part of the historical topos (see table 1 above), and thus rhetorically might be intended as persuasion. The attempt to persuade the public of its validity is further asserted through following the quotation with a question, which the EDL assumes people ask with regards to the reason why this movement exists and "what is it all about?" The reader therefore is led to establish a link between the current events and the historical ones and come to the conclusion that the EDL is a movement with patriotic objectives to combat religious extremism that might have similar horrific consequences if left undealt with.

Nonetheless, the choice of this quotation could be considered significant in the context of far-right discourses on Islam and Muslim in Europe. Betz and Meret (2009:320) note that depicting Islam as a totalitarian ideology has become central to right-wing parties and movements in making their case against Western Europe's Muslim community. They argue that some "have gone so far as to compare Islam to Nazism", and they also cite examples of European party leaders who compare the Quran (Muslim holy book) to Hitler's *Mein Kampf* (ibid).

Another example of intertextuality in the EDL's mission statement is in its use of the term "apartheid" to designate Sharia's distinction between Muslims and non-Muslims. This is borrowing a term that came into usage in the 1930s and signified the political policy under which citizens in South Africa were subject to segregation on the basis of race (Falola 2002). The use of "apartheid" in this context represents a case of "recontextualisation" since, as explained above, the term is taken from its original context and inserted into a new one. The term here acquires new meaning, which is segregation on the basis of religion, and is employed to indicate the extreme doctrine practiced under Sharia law compared to the tolerance that the EDL argues should prevail in British society.

On the other hand the movement's logo³ (figure 1 below), pictures the cross, a basic symbol of Christianity, and the motto: *In hoc signo vinces*, meaning "in this sign you will conquer". This classical Latin slogan was used by Constantine the Great in a battle that marked what is considered a pivotal event in the history of Christianity (see Fisk 2002). Using religious symbols as well as referring to religious incidents is an example of interdiscursivity since it involves intermixing two different types of discourse, religious and political. It has been noted that one of the developments in relation to far-right discourses has been the growing relevance of Christian motifs and themes in the narratives set forth by a substantial

³ Richardson and Wodak (2009b:49) also speak of visual Topoi, with the possibility of images or symbols offering "visual arguments", i.e., to "advance and defend standpoints". Accordingly, the logo could be taken as part of the *topos of advantage* as it highlights Christian motifs to convince readers that it stands for and protects Christian values and traditions as a means of combating the growing threat of radical Islam.

number of European extreme-right parties (Zuquete 2008:324). Pupcenoks & McCabe (2013:174) explain this phenomenon on the grounds that parties on the far right who are said to fuel anti-Islamic sentiment in their discourses call for “a renewal of Europe’s Christian roots” as a means of combatting what they believe as the spread of radical Islam in Europe.



Figure (1)

Similarly, Britain First also makes reference to Christianity, depicting it as a religion under ferocious attack and thus reiterating what could be considered a familiar theme used in right wing discourses as mentioned above. There is also an example of intertextuality represented by its use of the slogan “British jobs for British workers”. Richardson and Wodak (2009a:246) describe such slogans as part of nativist job rhetoric, which could be traced back to anti-Semitic, nationalistic, and fascist ideologies from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. This implies that the slogan has been taken out of its original context and has been “recontextualised” to apply to a different group of outsiders. As such, the British worker referenced in such a slogan could be defined on an ethnic basis as “white, and only white...” (ibid).

6. Conclusion:

The present paper sought to explicate the discourses employed by some far-right movements, namely the EDL and Britain First in their mission statements on the issue of immigration and what is termed “the Islamisation of Britain”. The analysis was produced by using the DHA to investigate discursive strategies of nomination and predication as well as argumentation.

The DHA approach revealed that the discourse used by both movements appears to be organised by a global strategy of positive self- and negative other-presentation. One discovery is that negative presentation of the other does not merely involve immigrants and the Muslim population in Britain, but also includes their supposed allies, such as “decision makers” or politicians who advocate leftist policies deemed harmful to the interests of British citizens.

The analysis also revealed several linguistic categories that contribute to the strategy of negative other-presentation such as the use of deixis to establish two distinct groups, with the “us-group” including the EDL, Britain First and the British people, and the “them-group” comprising immigrants, the Muslim population and leftist policy makers. The “other” group was either represented in terms of a staggering load

like “immigrants”, collectivised and negatively qualified as a threat to the integrity of the British society like “Muslims” or in conflict with British interests as is the case with “policymakers”.

The DHA also allowed investigating argumentation, which demonstrated that both movements resorted to different topoi to justify and legitimise what could be considered discriminatory acts against “the other”. This legitimisation was established using the topos of usefulness to establish grounds for existence as part of a larger quest that aims at protecting liberal values from totalitarian aspirations of radical Islam, serving the interests of the British citizens, and promoting British culture and traditions. Topoi employed to negatively derogate and, hence, deligitimise the other include the topos of threat to describe the growing radical Islam as a hazard, and the topos of burden and numbers to designate immigrants as another danger that threatens to drain the resources of Britain.

In addition, the analysis of the discursive strategies clarified that the strategies of the EDL and Britain First also diverge. The EDL seems fixated on problematising the Muslim population through different discursive strategies, while Britain First creates a nexus between immigration and radical Islam. According to Liang (2007:21), in the last decade, opposition to immigration has been intensified and focused on Muslim immigrants, with the “Muslim question” placing Islam front and center in anti-immigrant platforms and transcending the immigration debate more generally.

The analysis also considered intertextual and interdiscursive relations, linking some utterances that occur in the mission statements to historical contexts. It appeared that the use of some slogans, terms and quotations have been recontextualised into current political rhetoric, while carrying historical context-dependent connotations.

To conclude, the discursive strategies proposed by the Discourse Historical Approach can provide a fruitful framework for the analysis of discourse on immigration and the ‘anti-Islamisation of Britain’. Though this paper analyses a limited sample of extracts, it could be taken to demonstrate how the discourse of some far-right movements in Britain can be considered ideological, discriminatory and anti-immigrant, through relying on different strategies of positive – self and negative- other representation to achieve their aims.

References

- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., & McEnery, T. (2013). *Discourse analysis and media attitudes: the representation of Islam in the British press*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Betz, H. G. (1994). *Radical right-wing populism in Western Europe*. New York, St. Martins Press
- Betz, H. G., & Meret, S. (2009). Revisiting Lepanto: the political mobilization against Islam in contemporary Western Europe. *Patterns of Prejudice*. 43, 313-334.
- Brophy, Peter, Jenny Craven and Shelagh Fisher (1999) *Extremism and the Internet*. British Library Research and Innovation Report 145. Manchester: Centre for Research in Library and Information Management (CERLIM).

- Cameron, D (2001) *Working with spoken discourse*. London: SAGE.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: textual analysis for social research*. London, Routledge.
- Falola, T. (2002). *Africa. Volume 4, Volume 4*.
- Fisk, B. C. (2009). *Understanding Christian history*. Sandy, Bright Pen.
- Giddens, A. (1979) *The constitution of Society: outlines of the theory of structuration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graham, P., Keenan, T., & Dowd, A. M. (2004). A Call to Arms at the End of History: A Discourse–Historical Analysis of George W. Bush’s Declaration of War on Terror. *Discourse & Society*. 15, 199-221.
- Hall, S., David H., and Anthony, M. (eds.) 1992. *Modernity and Its Futures*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press/Open University.
- Khosravi Nik, M., (2010) The Representation of Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Immigrants in British Newspapers : a Critical Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 9 (1).
- Kissler, G.D (1991) *The Change Riders: Managing the Power of Change*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Liang, C. S. (2007). *Europe for the Europeans: the foreign and security policy of the populist radical right*. Aldershot, England, Ashgate.
- Moscovici, S. (1981) “On Social Representations”, in J.P. Forgas (ed.) *Social Cognition, Perspectives on Everyday Understanding*, pp. 181–209. *European Monographs in Social Psychology* 26. London: Academic Press.
- Pupcenoks, J., & McCabe, R. (2013). The Rise of the Fringe: Right Wing Populists, Islamists and Politics in the UK. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*. 33, 171-184.
- Reisigl, M. and R. Wodak (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and anti-Semitism*. London: Routledge.
- Reisigl, M & Wodak, R. (2009) The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds), *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Sage (2nd revised edition), London, pp. 87-121.
- Richardson, J. E., & Wodak, R. (2009a). Recontextualising fascist ideologies of the past: right-wing discourses on employment and nativism in Austria and the United Kingdom. *Critical Discourse Studies*. 6, 251-267.
- Richardson, J. E., & Wodak, R. (2009b). Richardson, J.E., & Wodak, R., (2009). The impact of visual racism: Visual arguments in political leaflets of Austrian and British Far-right Parties. *Controversia*, 6, 2, pp. 45-77.
- Swales, J.M (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Swales, J.M. & Rogers, P.S. (1995). Discourse and the projection of corporate culture: The mission statements, *Discourse and Society*, 6, 223-224.

Van Der Valk, I. (2003). Right-wing Parliamentary Discourse on Immigration in France. *Discourse & Society*. 14, 309-348.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In M. Reisigl and R. Wodak (eds.), *The semiotics of racism: Approaches to critical discourse analysis*. Vienna: Passagen Verlag. pp. 85-103.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In Caldas-Coulthard, C. R., & Coulthard, M. (1996). *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis*. London: Routledge.

Van Leeuwen, T. and R. Wodak (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse Studies* 10 (1): 83-118.

Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage. pp. 63-94.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of CDA*. London: Sage. pp. 1–33.

Wodak, R., & Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Racism at the top: Parliamentary discourses on ethnic issues in six European States*. Klagenfurt, Drava Verlag.

Zuquete, J.P. (2008). The European extreme-right and Islam: New directions? *Journal of Political Ideologies*. 13, 321-344.

Appendix

Appendix 1.

Table (1) Nomination and predication strategies used by the EDL

Strategy	linguistic devices
Nomination strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Social actors - Party name (synecdoches): The English Defense League (EDL) – Deictics: we, our, they. - Actionyms: policymakers/ decision makers,/law-enforcement personnel. - Negative ideologonyms: Radicals - Collectives: Muslims, Muslim community, Muslim Population /British Muslims. □ Objects/phenomena/events: -Ideological anthroponym Sharia Law; Halal meat -Metonymies: Muslim tradition; British Culture -Verb denoting process Islamisation.
Predication Strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Social actors: Evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits: <u>1) The EDL:</u> - Predicative adjective: A human rights organisation

	<p>-Participial clauses Protecting and promoting human rights; promoting democracy; ensuring that the public get a balanced picture of Islam; contributing to the global struggle against Islamic intolerance of Western cultures...etc.</p> <p><u>2) Policy-makers, decision makers etc. :</u> Participle clauses: presenting a view of Islam shaped by their needs rather than the needs of the public. Infinitive clauses To undermine our culture and impose non-English cultures.</p> <p><u>3) Radicals:</u> - Explicit Predicates dominate Muslim organisations remain key figures in British mosques are increasing their influence</p> <p><u>4) Muslims, Muslim community...etc.:</u> Adjectives: Fearful- isolated Nouns: Intolerance- Barbarity-- homophobia- antisemitism.</p> <p>▫ objects/phenomena/events: <u>1) Sharia law:</u> Adjective undemocratic Predicative adjectives: an alternative to our existing legal...systems. undemocratic alternative to our cherished way of life Predicative nouns: a threat to our democracy the demand for Sharia is global Explicit predicate: makes a fundamental distinction between Muslims and non-Muslims Participle clause being adopted, and enforced, in our society Metaphor: Creeping into our lives.</p> <p><u>2) Islam:</u> Participle clause: taken in its “original” seventh century form;</p>
--	--

	<p>Predicative adjectives political and social ideology</p> <p>Explicit predicates seeks to dominate all non-believers imposes a harsh legal system runs counter to democracy</p> <p>Relative clause that rejects democracy and human rights</p> <p>explicit comparison the antithesis of Western democracy.</p> <p><u>3) Muslim tradition, foreign cultures/non-English cultures:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explicit dissimilation (e.g. xenonyms) Non-English cultures -Infinitive clause to impose non-English cultures -Participle expected to respect -Explicit predicate promote anti-democratic ideas refuse to accept the authority of the nation. <p><u>4) British culture/values:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Adjective: Liberal, cherished -Participle clause: Has the right to exist and prosper <p><u>5) Halal meat:</u></p> <p>Predicative nouns Stealthy incursion.</p> <p><u>7) Islamisation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Metaphor: the creeping Islamisation of our country
--	--

Table 2. The nomination and predication strategies used by Britain First

Strategy	Linguistic devices
Nomination strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Social actors: - Party name (synecdoches): Britain First

<p>Predication strategies</p>	<p>-Toponyms used as metonymies: Britain -Religionyms: Christianity, Islam. -Deictics and phoric expressions: we, our, us, they. -Actionyms: asylum seekers, migrants -De-toponymic anthroponyms Foreigners -Collectives, including metonymic toponyms: Our people, British citizens, Christians, Lift-wing liberal policies ▫ phenomena: -Nouns denoting Phenomena immigration, unemployment - Negative ideologonyms Militant Islam ▫ Social actors: Evaluative attributions of negative or positive traits : <u>1)Britain First:</u> -Adjectives e.g. Patriotic, political -Predicative adjectives patriotic resistance, pro-British -Predicative nouns street defence organisation, ; British resistance -Explicit predicates opposes and fights injustices; love our people; will defend them; seeks to demonstrate on behalf of the people; want British history; traditions and to be respected. <u>2) Britain:</u> -Adjectives e.g. Small; overcrowded, Predicative adjectives e.g. densely population island Prepositional phrase e.g. with barely enough space and resources.</p>
--------------------------------------	---

3) Christianity:

-Prepositional phrase

e.g. under ferocious assault

-Predicative nouns

the bedrock and foundation of our national life.

4) Islam:

-Adjective:

Militant

- Explicit predicate

leads to the suppression of women, freedom of speech and racist attacks.

5) Asylum seekers, migrants, Foreigners:

- Explicit predicate

come first before our people.

4) Our people, British citizens:

- Explicit predicates

are made second class

desperately need employment

became a minority in our own country.

5) Christians:

-Explicit predicates

face discrimination and persecution.

6) Lift-wing policies:

-Explicit predicates

make our people second class citizens.

▫ **Phenomena:**

1) Immigration:

-Participial clause

spiralling out of control

placing unsustainable demands upon this country's resources,

2) Unemployment:

Participial clause

caused by out-of control immigration

Appendix 2

1) The EDL's mission statement

The world is a dangerous place to live in; not because of the people who are evil, but because of the people who don't do anything about it. – Albert Einstein, refugee from Nazi Germany

People have been asking what the EDL is all about, what does it want to achieve, how will it achieve those things?

Well now the English Defence League has a Mission Statement.....

(1) HUMAN RIGHTS: Protecting And Promoting Human Rights

The English Defence League (EDL) is a human rights organisation that was founded in the wake of the shocking actions of a small group of Muslim extremists who, at a homecoming parade in Luton, openly mocked the sacrifices of our service personnel without any fear of censure. Although these actions were certainly those of a minority, we believe that they reflect other forms of religiously-inspired intolerance and barbarity that are thriving amongst certain sections of the Muslim population in Britain: including, but not limited to, the denigration and oppression of women, the molestation of young children, the committing of so-called honour killings, homophobia, anti-Semitism, and continued support for those responsible for terrorist atrocities.

Whilst we must always protect against the unjust assumption that all Muslims are complicit in or somehow responsible for these crimes, we must not be afraid to speak freely about these issues. This is why the EDL will continue to work to protect the inalienable rights of all people to protest against radical Islam's encroachment into the lives of non-Muslims.

We also recognise that Muslims themselves are frequently the main victims of some Islamic traditions and practices. The Government should protect the human rights of individual British Muslims. It should ensure that they can openly criticise Islamic orthodoxy, challenge Islamic leaders without fear of retribution, receive full equality before the law (including equal rights for Muslim women), and leave Islam if they see fit, without fear of censure.

British Muslims should be able to safely demand reform of their religion, in order to make it more relevant to the needs of the modern world and more respectful of other groups in society. It is important that they completely reject the views of those who believe that Islam should be taken in its "original", 7th century form, because these interpretations are the antithesis of Western democracy. The onus should be on British Muslims to overcome the problems that blight their religion and achieve nothing short of an Islamic reformation. In line with this, we should do all that we can to empower those who are willing to take this path. We must also ensure that they do not fear reprisals from those who, in line with these 7th century interpretations, would force sharia law upon them.

The EDL calls upon the Government to repeal legislation that prevents effective freedom of speech, for freedom of speech is essential if the human rights abuses that sometimes manifest themselves around Islam are to be stopped. We believe that the proponents of radical Islam have a stranglehold on British Muslims. These radicals dominate Muslim organisations, remain key figures in British mosques, and are steadily increasing their influence. Radical Islam keeps British Muslims fearful and isolated, especially the women

that it encases in the Burqa. It misrepresents their views, stifles freedom of expression, and indoctrinates their children, whilst continually doing a discredit to those who do wish to peacefully co-exist with their fellow Britons.

(2) DEMOCRACY AND THE RULE OF LAW: Promoting Democracy And The Rule Of Law By Opposing Sharia

The European Court of Human Rights has declared that ‘sharia is incompatible with the fundamental principles of democracy’. Despite this, there are still those who are more than willing to accommodate sharia norms, and who believe that sharia can operate in partnership with our existing traditions and customs. In reality, sharia cannot operate fully as anything other than a complete alternative to our existing legal, political, and social systems. It is a revolution that this country does not want, and one that it must resist. Sharia is most definitely a threat to our democracy.

The operation of Islamic courts, the often unreasonable demand that Islam is given more respect than it is due, and the stealthy incursion of halal meat into the food industry, all demonstrate that sharia is already creeping into our lives. Resentment is already beginning to grow, and could create dangerous divisions if nothing is done. The primacy of British courts must be maintained and defended, fair criticism of religious and political ideologies must be permitted, and consumers must be provided with the information necessary to avoid halal produce should they wish.

Restaurants and fast food chains that do offer halal options should offer non-halal alternatives as well, in order to show respect for other people’s religions, customs, and possible concerns about animal welfare issues (surrounding ritual slaughter). No one should be made to consume halal produce unwittingly, so it must always be labeled – in supermarkets, in restaurants, in schools, and in hospitals – wherever it is available. Free choice in these matters is, after all, a fundamental human right for everybody, not just the Muslim community.

Sharia law makes a fundamental distinction between Muslims and non-Muslims, and the EDL will never allow this sort of iniquitous apartheid to take root in our country. The EDL will therefore oppose sharia appeasement in all its forms, and will actively work to eradicate the sharia-compliant behaviours that are already being adopted, and enforced, in our society.

(3) PUBLIC EDUCATION: Ensuring That The Public Get A Balanced Picture Of Islam

A central part of the EDL’s mission is public education. The British political and media establishment have, for a long time, been presenting a very sanitised and therefore inaccurate view of Islam, shaped by the needs of policy-makers rather than the needs of the public. This has acted as a barrier to informed policy-making and made finding the solution to real problems impossible. In pursuing this self-defeating and destructive policy, the Government has effectively been acting as the propaganda arm of the Muslim Brotherhood. Whether or not is aware of the predicament that it has put itself in, it has so far failed to honestly admit its failures.

We are committed to a campaign of public education to ensure that all aspects of Islam that impact on our society can be debated in an open and honest way. Demonisation of Muslims, or of Islam’s critics, adds

nothing to the debate. We believe that only by looking at all the facts can society be most effectively and humanly governed. If there are aspects of Muslim tradition that encourage the activities of Islamic radicals and criminals then these need to be properly addressed without fear of accusations of racism, xenophobia, or the even the disingenuous term “Islamophobia”.

The public must be provided with a more realistic and less sanitised view of Islam that allows it to ensure that decision-makers are held to account for their policy-making choices, choices that affect the harmony and security of the nation.

The EDL promotes the understanding of Islam and the implications for non-Muslims forced to live alongside it. Islam is not just a religious system, but a political and social ideology that seeks to dominate all non-believers and impose a harsh legal system that rejects democratic accountability and human rights. It runs counter to all that we hold dear within our British liberal democracy, and it must be prepared to change, to conform to secular, liberal ideals and laws, and to contribute to social harmony, rather than causing divisions.

(4) RESPECTING TRADITION: Promoting The Traditions And Culture Of England While At The Same Time Being Open To Embrace The Best That Other Cultures Can Offer

The EDL believes that English Culture has the right to exist and prosper in England. We recognise that culture is not static, that over time changes take place naturally, and that other cultures make contributions that make our shared culture stronger and more vibrant. However, this does not give license to policy-makers to deliberately undermine our culture and impose non-English cultures on the English people in their own land.

If people migrate to this country then they should be expected to respect our culture, its laws, and its traditions, and not expect their own cultures to be promoted by agencies of the state. The best of their cultures will be absorbed naturally and we will all be united by the enhanced culture that results. The onus should always be on foreign cultures to adapt and integrate. If said cultures promote anti-democratic ideas and refuse to accept the authority of our nation’s laws, then the host nation should not be bowing to these ideas in the name of “cultural sensitivity”. Law enforcement personnel must be able to enforce the rule of law thoroughly without prejudice or fear. Everyone, after all, is supposed to be equal in the eyes of the law. The EDL is therefore keen to draw its support from people of all races, all faiths, all political persuasions, and all lifestyle choices. Under its umbrella, all people in England, whatever their background, or origin, can stand united in a desire to stop the imposition of the rules of Islam on non-believers. In order to ensure the continuity of our culture and its institutions, the EDL stands opposed to the creeping Islamisation of our country, because intimately related to the spread of Islamic religion is the political desire to implement an undemocratic alternative to our cherished way of life: the sharia.

Our armed forces stand up and risk their lives every day in order to protect our culture and democratic way of life. They are also reflective of England’s diversity, and are a shining example of what a people can achieve when united together. The EDL is therefore committed to opposing any and all abuse that our men and women in uniform are subjected to, and will campaign for legal remedies to ensure that those working within these important institutions are not exposed to abuse or aggression from within our country.

(5) INTERNATIONAL OUTLOOK: Working In Solidarity With Others Around The World

The EDL is keen to join with others who share our values, wherever they are in the world, and from whatever cultural background they derive. We believe that the demand for sharia is global and therefore needs to be tackled at a global as well as national level, so that this demand will never be succumbed to. The EDL will therefore have an international outlook to enhance and strengthen our domestic efforts, whilst at the same time contributing to the global struggle against Islamic intolerance of Western cultures, customs, religions, politics, and laws. The time for tolerating intolerance has come to an end: it is time for the whole world to unite against a truly Global Jihad.

2) Britain's First Mission statement

Britain First is a patriotic political party and street defence organisation that opposes and fights the many injustices that are routinely inflicted on the British people.



Our policies are pro-British, our approach is no-nonsense and our principles are not open to compromise.

We love our people, our nation, our heritage and culture and will defend them at all times and no matter what odds we face.

The Britain First movement is not just a normal political group, we are a patriotic resistance and “frontline” for our long suffering people.

We require only the most stern, dedicated, loyal, steadfast and incorruptible men and women to help us build a future for our nation.

We want a Britain that is strong, proud, free, sovereign and independent, in which our people live in a healthy, moral and ethical society.

We want our people to come first, before foreigners, asylum seekers or migrants and we are overtly proud of this stance.



We will not stand back and watch as our people are made second class citizens by leftwing-liberal policies and political correctness.

We want British history, traditions and to be respected, promoted and taught to our young folk who deserve a decent future.

We want to eradicate corruption in our democracy, to end the ongoing expenses scandal and restore principles and decency to politics in general.

Christianity in Britain is under ferocious assault: many Christians now face discrimination and persecution because of their beliefs in many areas such as employment, business, and adoption.

We will restore Christianity as the bedrock and foundation of our national life as it has been for the last one thousand years.

We want British jobs for British workers and will make sure that our workers come first.

Immigration is spiralling out of control placing unsustainable demands upon this country's resources, with health care, housing and the environment are all being seriously damaged by these unbearable and unfair burdens.

Britain is a small, overcrowded, densely population island with barely enough space and resources for our own people.

We have millions of British citizens born here who are unemployed and desperately need employment, so for these reasons we will slam shut the door to any further immigration.

The rapid growth of militant Islam is leading to the suppression of women, freedom of speech and racist attacks.



Britain First has a proven track record of opposing Islamic militants and hate preachers and this fightback will continue.

Britain First seeks to lobby, cajole, expose, demonstrate and organise on behalf of our beleaguered people.

We will make Britain a beautiful country once again where you can leave your door unlocked and your children can play in the streets.

Do you share our vision of a Britain that is restored to our own people and where we come first, where our politicians stand up for us, where we will not become a minority in our own country?

Do you share our vision of Britain where pensioners don't freeze in winter, where billions of our money doesn't get sent abroad in foreign aid, where crime is stamped out, where British history and discipline is taught in schools, where sexual degeneracy is not the norm but the exception, where jobs go to British workers and where the United Kingdom is united and strong?

If you share our vision of Britain, then now is the time to join the true British resistance!