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“if I can play any role in helping reduce the pernicious effects of colonialism, then, as a European, I must first seek out and question the colonizer within myself”

(Pennycook, 1998: 28)
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Abstract

This thesis examines the construction of “empire talk” in Rupert Murdoch’s UK newspapers: The Times, The Sunday Times, and The Sun. “Empire talk” is defined in this thesis as the discussion of imperialism in which imperialism as a concept and practice is explicitly referenced through a number of keywords. The context for this study is Brexit, thus only “empire talk” which references Britain, British subjects or the EU institution will be analysed, as “empire talk” not related to Britain is not relevant in this context. The thesis begins with a theoretical framework in which the historical relationship between empire and the media in Britain; the Brexit context and its discourse of nationalism; and lastly the links between imperialism and nationalism are explained, grounding the subject and context of the study within existing literature. The study uses critical discourse analysis to analyse relevant editorials from the three newspapers. It is found that the newspapers construct imperialist rhetoric in three main ways: they dismiss the anti-imperialism movement; express nostalgia for an imperial identity; and portray a “good” British neo-imperialism in opposition to the “bad” imperialism of the European Union. The “white past, multicultural present” paradigm by Littler and Naidoo (2004) is central to these findings. The findings therefore bear implications upon the understanding of a British national identity, as they suggest an inherent imperialism in this. Orientalism and othering is demonstrated through the representation of Empire, and of proponents of the anti-imperialism argument. It is ultimately suggested that the hegemonic structures of the media and its nexus with the State is one of the reasons as to why these three newspapers construct “empire talk” in these ways.
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Introduction

Empires and media outlets have co-existed for centuries. Yet, while much has been written about media imperialism, there has been relatively little scholarly interest in exploring the relationship between a specific nation’s empire and the content of its media. This thesis addresses this lacuna, analysing “empire talk” in Rupert Murdoch’s British newspapers during the context of Brexit. The term “empire talk” is coined in this thesis to refer to discourse about empire, both as a concept and practice. This will be elaborated on in the theoretical framework and methodology.

The reason for choosing Murdoch’s British newspapers for analysis stems from previous scholarly critiques of Murdoch which have accused him of media imperialism. Media imperialism is the concept that dominant, Western-based transnational media corporations impose their norms, values and culture onto the media structures and narratives of other, generally less dominant, nations. As a result, the media of non-dominant nations becomes heavily influenced by, and adopts, the styles, content and structures imposed by Western media. This can lead to the original media styles and culture of the non-dominant nation being eroded and replaced with Western versions, as it conforms to the hegemony of Western media. In addition, Western media may economically profit from this if they control the media platforms in non-dominant nations. Aspects of media imperialism have been identified by scholars in the ways that some of Murdoch’s foreign brands operate, especially in Asia (Thussu, 2007).

These accusations of media imperialism directed against Murdoch triggered a question: how do Murdoch’s newspapers discuss empire itself? In this study, Murdoch’s British newspapers were chosen as Britain has a long imperial history, having once conquered almost a quarter of the world (Encyclopaedia Britannica). Moreover, it was necessary for this study to research English-language media.

The time frame chosen for this study is the context of the Brexit referendum, from January 1st, 2016 to August 1st, 2017. The reasoning for choosing the Brexit context as the time frame for this study is explained in detail later in the methodology section. Briefly, having experienced the Brexit referendum first-hand – living in the UK during the campaign and the referendum – it was apparent that many discussions of national identity, pride, heritage and Britain’s role in the world were taking place. In some media at the time, the phrase “Empire 2.0” was used to refer to Britain’s trade dealings post-EU (The Times, 6

---

1 My own research paper, ‘Glocalisation, cultural imperialism and capitalism: Murdoch’s STAR in India’ (2017) further explores accusations of media imperialism within Murdoch’s Indian broadcasting platform.
March 2017; The Daily Mail, 13 March 2017). This context sparked interest in how the nation-state, its history, and its relations with other nations were articulated in the media; and how empire is discussed in a context where new relationships with other nations must be developed.

Therefore, the main purpose of this research is to analyse how Murdoch’s British newspapers – The Times, The Sunday Times, and The Sun – engage in “empire talk” during the context of Brexit. This thesis will achieve this through defining what “empire talk” means; exploring the relationship between empire and the media; and acknowledging the role that nationalism plays in relation to empire and the media. This research closely considers whether the newspapers favourably depict the former empire, and whether they gloss over negative perspectives of empire; how empire is constructed in relation to the nation state and national identity; and how this perspective of empire is manifested in the Brexit context specifically.

This thesis is relevant for the present context as it highlights how forms of imperialist discourse are articulated in the media. As Kaul acknowledges, there are still “relatively few in-depth appreciations of the use of the metropolitan media to pursue imperial themes” (Kaul, 2006: 8). Similarly, Boyd-Barrett notes that since the beginning of the twentieth century, scholars have concentrated on “the place of media within the nation rather than media’s role in the construction of the nation” (Boyd-Barrett, 2016: 1). Much the same point can be made in terms of the relationship between media and empire. Scholars have concentrated on media imperialism and media empires, rather than on the role media plays in the construction and maintenance of empires.

Hall argues that “we suffer increasingly from a process of historical amnesia” (Hall, 1997: 19). It is important to address this, as the representation of British imperial history in the media is significant in indicating British media’s current view of imperialism. Especially at a time when Britain is preparing for its departure from the EU and finding an alternative role and identity for itself in the world, the way that empire is discussed in the British media is a vital indicator of how the nation perceives itself, its history, and its relations with others.

The thesis begins with a theoretical framework exploring previous literature. It analyses the media’s relationship to empire; firstly, by defining the different forms of imperialism, and then by exploring the historical links between media and the British empire. Scholars have suggested that the British empire and the British media grew up together (Potter, 2014; Potter, 2012; Winseck & Pike, 2007; Kaul, 2006). Studies of the News of the World and the BBC during the height of the British empire illustrate how imperial discourse
was articulated in media during this period (Kaul, 2016; Potter, 2012). This is important, as discourse shapes perceptions, and scholars recognise that how empire is presented in the media can influence the readership’s perception of empire. The theoretical framework moves on to acknowledge the links between nationalism and Brexit, firstly by explaining what Brexit and nationalism mean, and what sort of impact Brexit has had in Britain. Studies such as that by Seaton (2016) and Balthazar (2017) have identified nationalist rhetoric within pro-Brexit discourse, and it is important to note how the nation-state and national identity are articulated during this context. Furthermore, the concept of a “white past, multicultural present” may be applicable to describe how the imperialist past is perceived and framed during Brexit (Littler & Naidoo, 2004). Finally, the theoretical framework ends by explaining why nationalism and Brexit imply imperialist undertones. This is done through exploring the historical and conceptual links between nationalism and imperialism; and applying the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm to demonstrate that this paradigm contains both nationalistic and imperialistic implications in its view of history. Again, this section ties back to the concept of a national identity, and how the British national identity is linked to an imperial heritage.

In the second chapter, the sample and methodology are explained; detailing why these newspapers were chosen specifically for analysis, and why critical discourse analysis was chosen as the method of study. Following this, the findings are presented by theme; and finally, the discussion chapter analyses the findings in relation to the theoretical framework.

This study is important, as analysing imperialist discourse in the British media generally suggests the dominant narrative of imperialism within the nation’s government, media and public. The relevance of looking at imperialist discourse during the Brexit context is significant. The zeitgeist and media discourse during this time are likely to have influenced public and governmental sentiment, which could shape how Britain sees itself in the world at a time where it has to renegotiate its relationship with Europe and other continents. Further, the way imperialism is perceived on a public and institutional level could influence how the nation’s foreign relations are enacted in future.
1. Empire and the media

1.1 Defining empire

In order to discuss the media’s relationship with imperialism, it is first necessary to establish what imperialism means, and the forms it can take. Imperialism is defined by Galtung as “a type of relationship whereby one society (or collectivity in more general terms) can dominate another”; the raison d’être for imperialism being exploitation (Galtung, 1980: 107).

Historically, imperialism took place through physical invasion, occupation and exploitation of territories, and creating colonies. For example, the British invasion and rule of India. Yet, colonisation is a manifestation of imperialism, not imperialism itself. As Said argues, imperialism “means the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory; ‘colonialism’, which is almost always a consequence of imperialism, is the implanting of settlements on distant territory” (Said, 1993: 8). Nowadays, the terms neo-imperialism and neo-colonialism refer to new manifestations of the exploitation of a non-dominant territory by a dominant one; for example, even if a previously colonised nation attains political independence, this “may not signal any particular change in the economic imperialism to which a country may be subjected” (Pennycook, 1998: 34).

Further, Galtung argues that there are six types of imperialism; economic, political, military, communicative, cultural, and social (Galtung, 1980). The theory of communicative imperialism is relevant to the discussion of media and imperialism, as it describes imperialism as an interaction structure. By this, Galtung refers mostly to media imperialism, as he sees communication as being sold to non-dominant territories as part of a vertical structure, where the non-dominant territories always have “backwards” communication technology and rhetoric (Galtung, 1980). For example, all the main news agencies of the world belong to dominant countries, with feudal networks of communication whereby the news of the dominant nations takes up much space in the media of the non-dominant nations (Galtung, 1980). Yet, the concept of communicative imperialism can also be seen through rhetoric and discourse itself: how the narrative and discourse within communication may support or encourage imperialistic practices through the articulation of its ideology or maintenance of the status quo. This latter point will be returned to in the discussion of critical discourse analysis, and the effects of supporting systems within the status quo.

The changing manifestations of imperialism lead Galtung to define three phases of imperialism in history; firstly, the colonialism of the past whereby a dominant nation physically occupied a non-dominant one. Secondly, the neocolonialism of the present, in
which dominant nations interact with non-dominant ones via international organisation(s).
And finally, the neo-neocolonialism of the future, where dominant nations will interact with non-dominant ones via international communication (Galtung, 1980). Galtung’s theory was devised in 1980, and it may be questioned as to whether we can see aspects of neo-neocolonialism now in terms of media and news communication; both in the ways that media imperialism operates, but also in the media discourse itself. As yet, there has been no discussion or update of Galtung’s theory in this context.

Imperialist discourse does not necessarily refer to the literal exploitation of a distant territory by the dominating metropolitan centre, but rather expresses an attitude substantiating this theory and practice. Pennycook argues that “imperialism must also be seen in terms of practices, theories and attitudes as well as material exploitation and control”, and goes on to argue that imperialism can also be seen as a state of mind rather than a status, as it is a “context of existence” for people subject to international power (Pennycook, 1998: 34-35). It may be added that it is also a context of existence for those holding international power and “doing” the imperialism. In this thesis, imperialism is discussed in the context of discourse; imperialist attitudes within discourse are identified as those which demonstrate support for imperialism in any of its forms. Discourse about imperialism in the media will hereby be referred to as “empire talk”.

1.2 Empire and the media
“Empire talk” in British newspapers has been identified since the start of the former British Empire, beginning with the simultaneous development of the press and the empire. The British Empire originated in the late sixteenth century, peaking in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; by 1920, almost a quarter of the world’s land mass was ruled by the British (Encyclopaedia Britannica). It was during the height of Empire that the press grew rapidly, too: “new journalism” developed at the same time as new imperialism in the late nineteenth century (Potter, 2014). With the development of technology, industry, transport and communication – crucial aspects to maintaining and developing empire – the press also developed, and many historians and media scholars note that imperial communication and transport networks were the foundation for many news agencies, such as Reuters (Potter, 2014). Following this, Winseck and Pike conclude that “imperialism was one of the most, if not the most, significant factors driving the development of international communications” as, during new imperialism, government subsidies given to private communications companies significantly increased, and the amount of state-owned cables doubled (Winseck
Further, they argue that inter-imperial rivalry and nationalist sentiment escalated, and that imperialism expanded (Winseck & Pike, 2007).

It is this context of the symbiotic growth of media and empire that leads Kaul to argue that, as well as being shaped by empire, the press also shaped the empire. As he argues, it “was communication media power that helped create and sustain imperial power, and this power in turn reinforced and shaped the development of communication media power” (Kaul, 2006: 5). This argument is substantiated by other scholars, with historian Harold Innis writing in 1950 that empires both shape and are shaped by human communication flows (Innis, 1950).

Further, it can be argued that the press encouraged and supported the maintenance and growth of empire. MacKenzie notes that the “rapidly expanding paper, printing, photographic, display, and advertising agencies … were well placed to serve the ideological convergence of the day by creating for the Establishment what were in effect the first embryonic mass media” (MacKenzie, 1984: 3). It is plausible that imperial rule used the press for its own gain. For instance, as the empire began to face a status of precarity, Potter questions whether the imperial communication links could be manipulated by imperialist rulers in order to strengthen the empire (Potter, 2012). If Britain’s imperial role was supported domestically, Marshall suggests that this would likely not be reflected in political debates necessarily, but rather in the “imperialising” of British institutions (Marshall, 1995). As a matter of fact, arguments do point towards the “imperialising” of the press.

The imperial networks used by the press are seen by Ballantyne and Lester as having been used to help sustain “pervasive, hierarchical, and oppressive structures of imperial and settler dominance” (in Potter, 2007: 638). Imperial communication networks were limited to white, English-speaking communities; thus, all information about the colonies came from the mouths of the colonisers (Potter, 2007). British news outlets have therefore been argued to have supported imperial rule, at least implicitly. Reuters news agency, for example, has been argued to have supported British imperial interests (Potter, 2007: 637). Reuter focused the agency on becoming connected to important cities of the time, such as Bombay in 1870, Hong Kong in 1872, Shanghai in 1873, and Buenos Aires in 1874; among other places, these cities were connected to British imperial interests (Winseck & Pike, 2007: 3). After studying Reuters, Read argues that it remained an imperial institution (Read, 1992). The purpose of highlighting Reuters is not to argue that it supported imperialism in theory; but in practice, it arguably used imperial connections for its own benefit and imperialism itself also benefitted from being able to transfer information from the colonies to the mainland via Reuters.
1.3 An imperial discourse

It is partly the commercialisation and industrialisation of the press during empire that, according to Potter, resulted in restricted access to the public sphere – replacing it with an “imperial public sphere” (Potter, 2007: 638). Potter’s “imperial public sphere” also contends that not only were communication structures seen as supporting imperialism, but that the discourse and discussion within the press and public sphere was restricted to supporting imperialist rhetoric, too. At the time, “empire acted as a key source of the exoticism and thrills that the New Journalism relied on to titillate readers” (in Potter, 2014: 35), and empire was framed in a certain way. Chalaby claimed that popular papers covered and advocated for Britain’s imperial role instead of producing partisan comment on controversial issues at home (in Potter, 2014: 35), and Conboy argues that this generated imperialistic and nationalistic discourses (in Potter, 2014: 35).

Conboy’s argument is, to an extent, reflected in case studies of British media outlets during the height of the British empire. Kaul’s 2016 study of News of the World largely illustrates pro-imperial sentiment in the paper. The paper advocated for the superiority of Christianity, expressing “outrage” at the “barbaric” rebels during the Mutiny of 1857-8, and the heroicness of the British counter-forces (Kaul, 2016: 103). A quote from the paper at this time reads, “We have to construct an England in India; and evidently we must throw into that vast dependency a must larger proportion of our own race” (Kaul, 2016: 107). This suggests a view of superiority and, not merely justification of but encouragement for, colonialism. Of course, context is needed to address the nuances of the meaning of the discourse at the time. That is why Kaul notes that the paper was brought up in a cultural environment “infused with imperial rhetoric”, and in fact the paper “displayed a keen sense of perspective at a time when the majority of its compatriots were pandering to hysteria and jingoism” (Kaul, 2016: 100; 103). For example, the paper stood out as it was not as divided among racial lines as other British press, and it distinguished between the general population of Indians and the rebellious Mutineers (Kaul, 2016: 103). Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that despite its nuances, the paper reflected support and justification for imperialism.

The BBC has also been seen as reflecting support for British imperialism. Potter explains how, during the mid-twentieth century, the BBC used radio and television as “tools of empire”, in order to “promote enthusiasm at home for Britain’s imperial role” and to link British people with the diaspora in the colonies (Potter, 2012: 1). He concludes that, as the BBC sought to “reflect and ensure the continued existence of a transnational community of
Britons, the BBC inevitably assigned a secondary status to others”, thus actively othering people who were not British (Potter, 2012: 14). Substantiating this, MacKenzie found that senior administrators for the BBC saw it as their duty to promote imperial sentiment (MacKenzie, 1986); and Hajkowsi argued that millions of listeners “found comfort in the ‘rosy vision of Empire’ projected by an enthusiastic BBC, a vision ‘that implicitly confirmed British superiority’” (in Potter, 2012: 16).

It is not the aim of this paper to charge the British press with being imperialist, but rather to note the historical relationship between British imperialism and the role of the press. As Pennycook argues, “there is an inability to see that colonial contexts were in themselves complex domains of competing discourses and that liberal doctrines were as much an aspect of colonialism as illiberal ones” (Pennycook, 1998: 29). By this, Pennycook means that readers must take caution in dismissing the role that liberalism and more “progressive” ideologies of the time played within imperialism. This is useful to bear in mind when considering both the historical and present contexts.

1.4 Shaping perceptions
The purpose of outlining these case studies is not only to highlight the need to consider the press’ relationship to imperialism during the British empire, but to point to the significance of this rhetoric within the press. For example, Pratt argues that the press coverage during the Mutiny was mostly of the horrific atrocities faced by British soldiers at the hands of Indians and, further, that this information “has commonly been seen as having united the country in following and supporting the dramatic counter-insurgency operation … and helped shape and harden perceptions of an essential British racial, martial and cultural supremacy over its imperial subjects” (Pratt, 2006: 89). In short, discourse has consequences; at this time, the press was “the context within which people lived and worked and thought, and from which they derived their (in most cases quite new) sense of the outside world” (Shattock & Wolff, 1982: xiv-xv) As will be discussed later when explaining critical discourse analysis in the methodology section, discourse not only says things but does things; and since, generally, the only information about empire received by the public was via the press, the public’s opinion about empire would very likely be shaped by how the press framed it.

This explanation of the historical relationship between media and empire demonstrates the media’s previous framing of empire, which is useful to consider when looking at current media discourse. After all, discourse does not emerge from a vacuum; as critical discourse analysts note via the concept of intertextuality, every text, even indirectly,
builds on other texts (Fairclough, 1995). As Pennycook argues, “there is the concomitant inability to see that discourses of the present may have direct lineages to the colonial past” (Pennycook, 1998: 29). The history of the press’ development as both a consequence and cause of the growth of empire, and further, how the press historically framed empire in this context, is insightful when analysing current “empire talk” in British newspapers.
2. Brexit and nationalism

2.1 Defining terms

This paper analyses “empire talk” in British newspapers in the context of Brexit. This context has been chosen, as much scholarly work has shown connections between Brexit and nationalism (Balthazar, 2017; Seaton, 2016; Kyriakidou, 2016). The next chapter will illuminate the significance of nationalist rhetoric with regards to imperialism; but first, this chapter must explain Brexit and its relationship with nationalism.

“Brexit” is the term coined to describe the withdrawal of the United Kingdom (UK) from the European Union (EU). The referendum on whether Britain should leave the EU was held on 23rd June 2016, with a result of 51.9% of voters siding with Leave. During the campaign, the Leave rhetoric focused on the money given to the EU by the UK; the state of Britain’s national sovereignty, both within the EU and the EU’s “red tape” in the UK; Brexit’s “positive” impact on NHS funding; employment in Britain; and immigration levels – all reasons which have been identified by The Telegraph as being crucial in swaying votes (Kirk, 2017). Indeed, one of the main Leave slogans was “Take Back Control” (Richards, 2016). It is arguable that pro-Leave rhetoric such as this reflects nationalistic sentiment.

Nationalism began with the consolidation of nation-states, and is manifested in multiple ways; politically, socially, and economically, with the aim of promoting the interests and sovereignty of a specific nation-state (Smith, 2012). The focus on the sovereign and self-determined nation also solidifies the concept of a national identity, based on shared characteristics including heritage, race, language, culture, political goals, and religion (Triandafyllidou, 1998).

2.2 A certain view of history

Case studies have linked nationalism with Brexit through the paradigm of “white past, multicultural present”. This is a paradigm coined by Littler and Naidoo, used to describe a view of history characterised by nostalgia and lament: a homogeneously white, “traditional”, and nationalist past. This perception of history is contrasted with a view of the present riddled with anxiety, due to the addition of non-white, non-traditional, non-homogeneous “others” to Western society (Littler & Naidoo, 2004). This concept is substantiated by other scholars; Pennycook argues that a “common conception of history seems to posit a simple past in comparison with a complex present” (Pennycook, 1998: 29).
This paradigm is demonstrated in Brexit studies. For instance, Balthazar interviewed working class Brexiteers, and found that the traditional working class who voted to Leave the EU were preoccupied with the past (Balthazar, 2017). One interviewee argued that, “the people who fought for Britain in World War I and World War II to defend it from the Germans, they wouldn’t like this”; “this” meaning the current political climate of the UK within the EU, including multiculturalism and what has been perceived to be a decline in British sovereignty (Balthazar, 2017: 221). This testimony suggests a nostalgic view of history in contrast to anxieties of the present. Similarly, Kyriakidou argues that the Brexit vote is “predominantly a blow against immigration, refugees and transnational solidarity inspired by fear, resentment, nationalism and a historical sense of superiority” (Kyriakidou, 2016: 1). This statement directly reflects the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm as history is seen from a nostalgic and nationalist perspective, contrasted with the threats that non-British “others” have brought into the present. Black concludes that the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm in media coverage “has resulted in an insular, parochial and, at times, xenophobic, display of England” (Black, 2016: 787)

The “multicultural present” concept of anxieties due to globalisation and immigration links to the identification of a “white backlash” in society. Roger Hewitt argues that a “white backlash” is the response to official policies aimed at providing equality for minority ethnic groups, and a perceived “unfairness” to whites (Hewitt, 2005). As Rhodes explains, “in a political landscape in which difference and cultural specificity were increasingly articulated, there emerged a perceived sense of ‘unfairness’ amongst some whites, who argued that it was their own culture lacking political recognition” (Rhodes, 2010: 80). This concept has been identified in the press; Rhodes argues that since the turn of the century, “the right-wing press … [has] reignited notions of ‘unfairness’ towards the indigenous ‘white’ population in a context of declining national sovereignty and dual ‘threats’ of asylum and terrorism” (Rhodes, 2010: 95-96). He continues, that the media vociferously rejected “an excessively liberal left, whose promotion of multicultural policies threatened the hegemony of the (white) British Nation” (Rhodes, 2010: 95). This “white backlash” may be perceptible in media coverage around Brexit. Kyriakidou detects “overtly nationalistic tendencies of the media”, arguing that there has been “decades of racist and xenophobic media coverage, especially in the tabloid and right-wing press” (Kyriakidou, 2016: 1). Especially during Brexit, “this xenophobic discourse was further enabled by a sustained coverage of the European Union as the ‘other’ of UK politics” (Kyriakidou, 2016: 1). Similarly, Seaton notes that “the tabloid campaign emphasised … the otherness of foreigners”, reflecting a nationalist us vs. them
polarisation between white British people and non-white, non-British people (Seaton, 2016: 334).

Further, this argument implicates Benedict Anderson’s concept of the imagined community. The “imagined community” theory portrays the nation as a socially constructed community, as members of the nation perceive themselves to be connected to other members of the nation through their shared nationality, despite having never met most of them; thus, an “imagined” community (Anderson, 1983). Within this, Anderson regards media consumption as a mass ceremony whereby print language becomes associated with national identity (Anderson, 1983). This argument reflects Potter’s conviction that there are echoes of a “profound underlying connection” between mass media and national identity (Potter, 2007: 623).

Thus, it is clear that the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm; the concept of a “white backlash”; and the articulation of an exclusive British national identity have been identified in media discourse around Brexit. Moreover, this articulation of national identity and history implies nationalistic discourse, as it others non-white, non-British people and nations as well as implying that the British identity and nation is exclusive and superior. The following chapter will address the significance of these concepts and a nationalistic media discourse in terms of their relationship to “empire talk”.
3. Imperialism and nationalism

3.1 Historical links

Imperialism and nationalism have convincing historical ties to one another. Firstly, it is argued that nationalism and the supremacy of the nation, in part, contributed to the growth of imperialism. Some scholars view the Enlightenment as positing nationalism against imperialism. They argue that liberals of the time such as John Stuart Mill and Lord Macaulay, who defended imperialism, felt “the need to justify empire against the more ‘natural’ principle of nationality”; interpreting this to mean that the end-goal should always be national autonomy for colonies once they became “educated enough” (Kumar, 2006: 2). Yet, this is a decontextualized interpretation; after all, Mill and Macaulay still advocated for British imperialism and even British superiority, as suggested by Macaulay’s “Minute Upon Indian Education” (Macaulay, 1835).² In addition, the emphasis on the sovereignty of the British nation and supremacy of the British identity can be seen as nationalist: even if this British sovereignty and identity transcended the borders of Britain, new territories became part of the “British” empire and can still be interpreted as contributing to a British nationalism, as they were seen under British sovereignty and included in the British nation-state. Thus, Kumar tells another account: “empire and nation are not set against each other but appear as twin expressions of the same phenomenon of power” (Kumar, 2006: 2). Substantiating this, Bayly sees nationalism as propelling new imperialism, arguing that both nationalism and imperialism were “part of the same phenomenon” (Bayly, 2004: 230). Indeed in 1916, Low wrote of British nationalism as being tied to the promotion of British superiority and strength, itself dependent on Empire, and that further, this nationalism made the British empire prosper (Low, 1916). Therefore, Kumar concludes that “nineteenth-century imperialism can then appear as an extension, perhaps a hypertrophy, of nationalism; by the same token the nation can come to conceive itself in the image of empire” (Kumar, 2006: 3). It can be argued that just as nationalism shaped imperialism, so imperialism shaped nationalism.

Kumar argues that the British nation itself is a result of conquest and colonisation and that nation-states themselves are “mini-empires” (Kumar, 2006: 4). This is plausible in the examples of Scotland and Ireland (and even Wales and Cornwall), which became joined to England through expansion and invasion of the dominant territory; and by the same token

² In the ‘Minute Upon Indian Education’, Macaulay argued that support for Sanskrit, Arabic, and traditional education for Indian people should be withdrawn; replacing it with Western subjects taught in English. He states, ‘who could deny that a single shelf of a good European library was worth the whole native literature of India and Arabia’ (Macaulay, 1835).
Spain, China and Russia would not have the territory they possessed today without historical imperialism. That is not to mention the extra territories existing under the rule of a dominant nation, for example the Falklands and Gibraltar, ruled by the British. Therefore, it is not a huge leap for Black to argue that historically, “English nationalism has been closely aligned with a British identification underpinned by its hegemonic position in matters related to the British constitution and economy” (Black, 2016: 787).

Conceptually, it is self-evident that a sense of national superiority and national pride is implicated in the invasion and rule of another country. Othering is actively implied in both nationalism and imperialism, as a sense of national identity is created against which foreign others are distinguished; and thus, via imperialism, this grows into a sense of supremacy of one’s own national identity. MacKenzie speaks of “an imperial nationalism, compounded of monarchism, militarism, and Social Darwinism, through which the British defined their own unique superiority vis-à-vis the rest of the world” (MacKenzie, 1984: 253). MacKenzie argues that this “was projected by the new visual culture, by advertising, the theatre, the cinema, broadcasting …[etc]” (MacKenzie, 1984: 253). Thus, it is suggested here that media in fact played a role in the projection of a nationalism tied to imperialism, and this will be discussed further later.

3.2 White past, multicultural present

The historical context is a crucial foundation in order to explore the relationship between contemporary nationalism and imperialism. Black argues that “post-war representations of England have remained ambiguously tied to Britain’s imperial legacy and to wider insecurities regarding English national identity” (Black, 2016: 787). Elaborating on this, he argues that understandings of Britain were once seen through an imperial lens, but are now defined by anxieties in the European context and Euroscepticism, as well as Britain’s post-imperial status (Black, 2016: 788). This again reflects the concept of “white past, multicultural present”, suggesting that this concept also includes imperialist connotations.

Revisiting the concept, Black reminds us that past “reflections of England/Britain were presented as a ‘safe’ and legitimate source of belonging that had subsequently been lost and undermined amidst the diversity of the ‘present’” (Black, 2016: 786). The past is nostalgically perceived as white, homogeneous, and safe amidst the anxieties of the multicultural present, and this is implicated in Balthazar’s findings that claims on the past “have often been described by scholars as the longing for a distant and nostalgic imperialist past” (Balthazar, 2017: 222). Nostalgia is defined as an excessively sentimental longing for
an irrecoverable past, and can be argued to reflect imperialism as it is suggested that British people hereby long for a past in which the British empire flourished, with the British safely in a “white” sphere free from anxieties of a multicultural society and of threats to British sovereignty. The idea of a British nostalgia for the imperial past, tied to nationality, is substantiated by Gilroy, who argues that there is a post-imperial melancholia within the nation (Gilroy, 2004). Skey agrees, that there has been a “sense of loss … linked to the actions or presence of ‘other’ groups who [have] threatened established identities, traditions and ways of life” (Skey, 2012: 13). Black interprets this as England/Britain being “paralysed by colonial guilt, yet nostalgically invested in images drawn from its colonial history” (Black, 2016: 787).

In this post-imperial nation, nostalgia for the imperial past is partly manifested through the ways in which both the empire and the present are portrayed. For example, the former Empire is rarely reflected on and especially not from an anti-imperialist perspective. When studying press coverage of the 2012 Olympics, Black notes that “references to Britain’s imperial history were noticeably absent”, and De Chickera sees this as revealing “a very convenient – selective – history. All good. All celebration. No bad. No reflection” (in Black, 2016: 792). Further, imperial nostalgia can be seen in Rhodes’ argument of a “white backlash”; he argues that during Thatcherism, an “us vs. them” was created of white British people against non-white others and Leftists, who were seen as a threat to the nation (Rhodes, 2010). If “white hegemony, and, by the same token, the nation, was to be maintained, diversity and multiculturalism was something that had to be manage” (Rhodes, 2010: 80). Nowadays, anxieties about multiculturalism and its relationship to the British nation can be seen in the context of Brexit; understandings of the nation were once seen through imperialism, but are now marked by anxieties and Euroscepticism tied to Britain’s post-imperial status (Black, 2016: 788).

3.3 A national identity

Both an imperial heritage and nostalgia, alongside the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm, are implicated in the understandings of a British national identity. Firstly, MacKenzie argues that imperialism created for the British “a worldview which was central to their perceptions of themselves … imperial status set them apart, and united a set of national ideas” (MacKenzie, 1984: 2). He argues that empire regenerated the British, creating for them a national purpose, and this contributed to the sense of a national identity (MacKenzie, 1984). Pennycook agrees, that “colonialism was a significant site of cultural production: it was
indeed in this context that many constructions of Self and Other were produced” (Pennycook, 1998: 8). By this, Pennycook suggests that imperialism created a sense of the British self in opposition to the non-British other; and this is reflective of Said’s theory of othering within Orientalist thought. Said conceives Orientalism as a “style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between the Orient and, most of the time, the Occident” (Said, 1978: 2). The East is conceptualised as the “different”, other, inferior and unknown; and Western society as essentially superior (Poole, 2002). Said applies this concept to the practice of imperialism, and in applying this theory to British views of national identity, it can be argued that British national identity is seen as essentially superior when set against the radically different and inferior non-British other. This argument is supported by Kumar who, during public debate in the 1990s over the topic of British national identity, states that “what I wish to suggest is that we consider the English state as primarily an imperial state, and the English people as an imperial people” (Kumar, 2006: 5). Kumar rationalises this via the example of England itself being imperialist, in that it rules the UK and the British Isles; England was and is primarily in control of the parliament, monarchy, law and language. Kumar goes on to argue that “this role is no less imperial than in the former, more familiar, case” (Kumar, 2006: 5). Thus, it is argued that through an imperial heritage, British national identity implicates a sense of imperialism.

Secondly, Black argues that the perception of the “white” past, as well as the anxieties of the multicultural present, have shaped understandings of multiculturalism, immigration, and national identity (Black, 2016). An us vs. them polarity is created from this perception of imperial history as “communities ‘from somewhere else’ are simply added to national stories that fail to acknowledge the complex and entwined histories that have enveloped the British state and former empire” (Black, 2016: 788). This is substantiated by Kumar, who embeds the context of the EU into this perception of history and identity, arguing that:

the transnational causes that gave the English a sense of identity – Protestantism, industrialism, imperialism – are either weak or absent. The European Union, to many English people, is as much a threat as a promise. The presence of a large minority of non-European, non-white, citizens continues to be a source of anxiety to a considerable section of the white majority in the country (Kumar, 2006: 10)

This sense of anxiety directly applies the concept of a “white past, multicultural present” to the idea of a British national identity. If a British identity is reconfigured in the context of a
perceived threat to its national sovereignty by foreign “others”, this identity likely reflects aspects of othering tied to an imperial heritage, nationalism, and continuing notions of exclusivity and superiority. It is worth noting here that in the week following Brexit, racially-motivated hate crime rose five-fold (Parveen & Sherwood, 2016); and it is undeniable that this recent context demonstrates active othering at work.

National identity and imperialistic connotations are also reflected in media discourse. Historically, Potter notes that during Empire, newspapers “courted the loyalty” of readers by “playing consciously on ideas about community”; and very often on ideas about national identity (Potter, 2007: 622). For example, the purpose of public service broadcasting is argued to be to actively “shape society”, and so Potter argues that “applied overseas, these ideas came to mean that the BBC would also seek actively to reinforce the bonds of empire” in its aim to restore national unity (Potter, 2012: 5). Further, the examples from Black, amongst others previously given, can also be seen to connote imperialist ideas alongside the concept of national identity, following the “white past, multicultural present” argument.

Finally, it must be noted that the framing of imperialism is not identical when discussing every empire, however. MacKenzie notes that during the First World War, propaganda showed a struggle between a good, righteous empire versus a bad, undeserved empire (MacKenzie, 1984: 35); thus, it must be kept in mind how empires are framed in different ways, depending on the nations they originate from and who they are framed by.

This theoretical framework has explained the relationship between imperialism and the media; between Brexit and nationalism; and between nationalism and imperialism, ending with a reflection on imperial connotations implicated in a sense of national identity. It is suggested by this theoretical framework that a sense of imperialism underlies the nationalistic sentiment present in much media coverage during Brexit. With this in mind, this paper goes on to assess whether this theory is applicable when studying British newspapers during Brexit.
4. Methodology

In order to justify why these specific newspapers have been chosen as the object of study, it is first necessary to outline the position of their owner; and the brief histories of each newspaper relating to imperialism, nationalism and Brexit.

4.1 Rupert Murdoch

The newspapers analysed in this study are all owned by Rupert Murdoch, and this is a deliberate choice. The media giant is known for a media empire spanning the globe, and it is this that sparked the interest for this study: with all the talk of media imperialism, it is worth asking the question of imperialism within media and what “empire talk” looks like in the newspapers of an owner associated with media imperialism.

Firstly, it is worth overviewing Murdoch and his media empire. After taking on a number of news outlets in Australia and New Zealand, Murdoch expanded into the U.K. market, closed followed by the U.S. and then into Asia. With a net worth of $12 billion, Murdoch owns Fox News and the Wall Street Journal; and he is also the Chairman and CEO of News Corp., of which News International is a subsidiary (Forbes). In the U.K., Murdoch owns The Times, The Sunday Times and The Sun as well as Press Association news agency. Further afield, Murdoch’s Star TV in Asia enables News International to broadcast in Hong Kong, India, China, Japan and over 30 other countries in Asia (Witzel, 2005). It is this global reach and high profit that leads McChesney to argue that Murdoch’s News Corp. may be the “most aggressive global trailblazer” in the media (McChesney, 2001: 5). McChesney sees Murdoch as being driven by the “incessant pursuit for profit that marks capitalism” (McChesney, 2001: 5).

Indeed, it has been argued by scholars that Murdoch’s media empire propagates a form of media imperialism. Thussu’s case study of Murdoch’s Star TV in India found that public opinion in India was concerned about Murdoch’s “invasion from the sky” (Thussu, 2007: 595). Murdoch, however, responded, “Indian culture is too strong. It can look after itself very well” (Thussu, 2007: 595). Yet Thussu’s argument is well-founded; the study found that Star’s news bulletins focus on crime, cricket and cinema, even broadcasting material from Fox News, Sky, and “Indianised” versions of Western reality TV, while failing to cover important domestic Indian issues, especially those affecting the poor (Thussu, 2007). This can be seen as a form of media imperialism as a powerful, dominant Western corporation striving for profit projects its own norms and values into the media of a non-
dominant nation. Further, Thussu argues that via the Western-influenced content of the broadcasts, Star “may in fact be propagating dominant neoliberal ideology and helping to legitimise a media marketplace in which global corporate clients can consolidate and expand, while the rural poor move further to the margins of the rapidly globalising and Americanising urban Indian middle classes” (Thussu, 2007: 609). McChesney agrees, that “sometimes the bias is explicit, and corporate overlords like Rupert Murdoch simply impose their neoliberal political positions on their underlings” (McChesney, 2001: 14).

These political biases suggested in Murdoch’s brands have not only been identified in Star, as Kyriakidou has identified political motives in Murdoch’s newspapers’ coverage of Brexit. “Rupert Murdoch’s media have been the ringleaders of a blatant and well-sustained anti-EU campaign through the years of his reign in the British media landscape, a hostility based on Murdoch’s inclination for low taxes and weak media regulation” (Kyriakidou, 2016: 1). Kyriakidou’s conviction is supported by a claim from journalist Anthony Hilton, who reported that “I once asked Rupert Murdoch why he was so opposed to the European Union. “That’s easy,” he replied. “When I go into Downing Street they do what I say; when I go to Brussels they take no notice”’” (Hilton, 2016). This statement implies that Murdoch opposes the EU due to the barriers it gives to his profit-reaching goals. This clear indication of Murdoch’s anti-EU stance demonstrates another reason as to why this study looks at Murdoch’s UK newspapers specifically, when analysing “empire talk” in British newspaper coverage during Brexit. The newspapers analysed in this study are: The Times, The Sunday Times and The Sun; and it is insightful to provide a brief overview of their histories to understand how their discourse has been shaped.

4.2 The Times

The Times was founded in 1785, and has been part of Murdoch’s News Corp. since 1981. Given its long history, it is useful to recognise how the paper historically discussed the former British empire. During the height of British rule in India, The Times possessed its own “Extraordinary Express” service with special agents and transportation networks, costing £10,000 per year (Potter, 2007: 628). The paper claimed to represent “the voice of the English nation” (Potter, 2007: 623); and it can be seen to represent the zeitgeist of the time through its framing of the Empire. For example, when the future king, the Prince of Wales, toured India in 1875, The Times was asked to accompany the tour and chronicle it (Kaul, 2016: 107). A quote from the paper illustrates its attitude towards empire: the paper stated that the Prince would be surrounded by “trusted and experienced counsellors … so that no
anxiety may be felt of the luxurious manners of the East having any baleful influence” (Kaul, 2016: 108). This quote implies an Orientalist attitude towards India, seeing it as corrupting and immoral. Another example by Potter substantiates a view of British superiority over India, as Potter argues that the news of the Indian Mutiny of 1857-8 was framed in a way in support of British rule, against native struggles for independence. The paper detailed “triumphal accounts of the recapture of Delhi” and “atrocity stories” of the Indians against the British, ultimately telling a “racialised narrative of native atrocity” (Potter, 2007: 629). Pratt highlights contemporary journalist Jones, from The People’s Paper, who substantiates Potter’s argument, alleging that the British in India were “inspired by bloodthirsty calls for revenge emanating from parliament and The Times” (Pratt, 2006: 98).

Indeed, it has been argued by scholars that The Times’ close relationship with the British government influenced the way it reported. Journalism historian Allan Nevins states that the paper has been in close contact with the British Prime Minister and government for a long time (Nevins, 1959). During the Empire, for example, the paper “received confidential information from the Foreign Office; and maintained close links with the ruling Conservative party” (Potter, 2014: 38). Potter also argues that Lord Salisbury used the paper as a tool of diplomacy (Potter, 2014). Since then, the political leanings of The Times have differed now and again from the ruling party, but generally the paper has retained a Conservative standpoint. Both The Times and The Sunday Times are claimed to have backed Margaret Thatcher; in a deal in 1981, Thatcher needed a boost from the press and so supported Murdoch’s bid for the two papers in a secret meeting between the two of them (Evans, 2015). The Times has also supported Eurosceptic candidates (Butler & Kavanagh, 1997).

4.3 The Sunday Times
The Sunday Times was originally published as The New Observer in 1821, changing its name a few years later. It historically had no relationship with The Times, but they have had common ownership since 1967. In 1981, The Sunday Times was taken over by Murdoch alongside The Times. There is little research about how the British Empire was discussed in the paper; as a Sunday paper, it naturally produced less coverage than The Times. As aforementioned, the paper was Thatcherite (Evans, 2015), and arguably backed Leave in the Brexit campaign (The Guardian, 2016).

4.4 The Sun
The Sun, originally a broadsheet, was first published in 1964. But, as a broadsheet, it was losing money – and so Murdoch took it over in 1969 (Moorhouse, 2011). The paper was founded after the British left its major colonies; however, nationalist and imperialist rhetoric has been detected in the paper’s coverage. In 2003, for example, The Sun was accused of racism due to the paper’s criticisms of the government’s immigration policy and its caricatures of “Mr Men”\(^3\) from ethnic minorities, which homogenised and mocked non-white people (Byrne, 2003). In 2015, the paper came under fire when columnist Katie Hopkins was denounced by the UN High Commission for Human Rights and accused of hate speech, after calling migrants to Britain “cockroaches” and “feral humans” (Gander, 2015; Stone, 2015). More recently, the paper expressed support for British ownership of Gibraltar, saying “hands off our rock” (Ponsford, 2017a).

Although a Labour supporter in its early years, the paper was a strong Thatcher supporter and has since generally supported the Conservatives (Thomas, 2005; Greenslade, 2003; Greenslade, 2009). The “long-term viciously anti-EU” paper has been outspokenly pro-Brexit (Seaton, 2016: 334), and officially endorsed the Leave campaign (Hughes, 2016). It was implicated in a scandal in 2016, when the front page claimed that the Queen supported Brexit (Stewart, 2016).

Briefly outlining the histories and political stances of these newspapers is useful in order to analyse them using critical discourse analysis, as context is critical to effective critical discourse analysis. For instance, Carvalho argues that this methodology aims to include institutional and sociocultural contexts in its analysis, in order to be able to fully evaluate the causes, meanings and effects of texts within the situation of their conception and impact (Carvalho, 2008). These three newspapers were originally chosen for analysis due to their joint ownership by Murdoch, as it was the as-yet-unexplored relationship between Murdoch’s media empire and imperialist discourse within his media brands that sparked the idea for this research. Yet each paper’s background proves insightful into where their discourse comes from, and why they may frame imperialism and Brexit in a particular manner; especially given their previously imperial and/or Conservative ideologies.

Finally, it is worth noting the circulation of each newspaper to indicate their relative influence. In December 2016, the average daily circulation of The Times was 446,164; and at

---

\(^3\) The original children’s cartoons by Roger Hargreaves featured characters who represented certain characteristics, such as Mr Forgetful, Mr Lazy and Mr Funny.
the same time, that of *The Sunday Times* was almost double, at 792,210 (Ponsford, 2017b). These two newspapers are the only UK national newspapers whose print sales have grown year on year: *The Times* growing by 9.18% – the best-performing print paper – and *The Sunday Times* growing by 3.84% (Ponsford, 2017b). By contrast, *The Sun*’s circulation has declined by 10.5% year on year in recent years, but it still retains an average of 1,611,464 copies sold per day and it is, in fact, the highest-circulating British daily newspaper (Ponsford, 2017b). Thus, it is worth recognising that over a million and a half readers per day are influenced by *The Sun*’s content, and around 1.2 million by *The Times* and *The Sunday Times* together. Thus, almost 3 million people read at least one of these three newspapers every day; by contrast, the average daily readership of the more left-wing newspaper *The Guardian* is a mere 161,091 (Ponsford, 2017b). In addition, *The Times* and *The Sunday Times* have a steady, if not increasing, readership; suggesting reader loyalty. Ultimately, it is fair to argue that the three newspapers analysed in this study have a notable influence on British readership.

### 4.5 Time frame

In general, the Brexit context has been chosen for the analysis of “empire talk” as, as previously indicated in the literature review, imperialism and nationalism have a companionable history. The “white past, multicultural present” paradigm reflects the view of a safe, homogeneous and traditional British past, tied to an imperial heritage, in contrast with an anxious multicultural present, and this concept has been convincingly applied to recent illustrations of British nationalism in the media (Black, 2016). It is for this reason that the context of Brexit is interesting for this study, as previous studies such as Balthazar’s (2017) have found that pro-Brexit voters were preoccupied with a version of history that prioritised the British empire, traditions, and identity associated with the nation. A nostalgia for the glorified imperial past has been identified in Britain in recent years (Black, 2016), and so it is worth questioning whether this nostalgia has become more prevalent in media discourse due to the outburst of Brexit and anxieties surrounding the pro-Leave narrative. Further, Seaton’s 2016 study recognised that during Brexit, the media often “othered” people who did not subscribe to a British identity. These studies indicate that a “white past, multicultural present” paradigm tied to imperialism and nationalism may be applicable to media discourse during Brexit.

Therefore, the time frame chosen for analysis is from January 1st, 2016 to August 1st, 2017. This time range has been chosen as it includes the weeks before the referendum was
announced on February 22nd, 2016; the months of political campaigning in the run-up to the referendum; the referendum itself on June 23rd, 2016; the aftermath of the result, both short-term and long-term; the invoking of Article 50 on March 29th, 2017 which formally triggered the process for Britain’s withdrawal from the EU; and the withdrawal process itself and associated rhetoric from March until August. August 1st is chosen as the end date of analysis as this is when the research for this paper began.

4.6 Method

The articles are sourced through LexisNexis. Editorials are chosen as the sample to be analysed as they demonstrate the “voice” of the newspaper; they are written by the senior editorial staff or publisher of the paper, or by a chosen guest. They therefore generally reflect the partisan stance of the paper and represent the paper’s ideology. Obviously, a clearer and more representative picture would emerge if all sections of the newspaper were analysed, but this would be too much content for this thesis.

A number of keywords have been chosen in order to identify “empire talk” within the newspapers’ editorials. These keywords are: empire, imperial, imperialism, imperialist, colonial, colonialism, and colonialist. The reasons for choosing these keywords is that they directly reference empire and imperialism, thus it is expected that they will identify talk directly concerning these subjects. “Colonial” and its derivatives also connote the activities of physical empires such as the former British Empire, so it is expected that it may likely highlight talk about the former Empire itself. Scholars such as Harvey (2003) suggest that much of the way empire is discussed nowadays in the West is more indirect, and following this argument it would be fruitful to search for words such as “intervene”, to locate more subtle imperialist discourse. However, this study looks only at discourse around the specific concept of empire and imperialism, not all discourse which could be seen as imperialistic.

These keywords are used to search for editorials within the given time frame containing these words. The editorials analysed in this study are only those which discuss “empire talk” referring to Britain and the EU institution. For example, an editorial discussing Russian or U.S. imperialism will not be analysed as it is not relevant to this study; however, if the article mentions the EU institution or British imperialism, it will be. This is because this study analyses “empire talk” during Brexit, and so newspapers discussing imperialism related to the EU institution or related to Britain necessarily reflect the papers’ attitudes towards the EU, Britain, nationalism and imperialism. Opinions of imperialism in other nations would be too much to analyse for this study, and do not relate to Britain, the EU, and Brexit as directly.
Once all the relevant editorials are collected, the keywords in them are analysed within the context of the article, using critical discourse analysis to examine the rhetoric, narrative and stance of the article with regards to “empire talk”.

4.7 Critical discourse analysis
The method used for analysis in this paper is critical discourse analysis (CDA). This is chosen because CDA provides insights into the relationship between language, grammar, power and ideology with the assumption that language both shapes and is shaped by society (Machin & Mayr, 2012). The idea that discourse both creates, and is created by, societal action is the first premise of CDA. Faireclough notes that the “critical” part of CDA implies that social practice and language use are tied to causes and effects that we may not be aware of under “normal” conditions (Faireclough, 1995). Further, Austin’s speech act theory posits that words not only say things but, in fact, do things; they are performative (Austin, 1962). This can be either explicit or implicit. Each speech act is formed of three parts: firstly, the locutionary act (the words spoken); secondly, the illocutionary act (the intention of the speaker); and lastly, the perlocutionary act (the effect of the words on the hearer) (Austin, 1962). This theory can be applied to words written in newspapers. Therefore, the words we use in society, as well as being shaped by society, contribute to societal practices and thus are crucially implicated in effecting societal responses and actions. The findings of this thesis thus have important implications as structural features of a language may cause us to think in certain ways, and even act in certain ways (Hoijer, 1954).

The second premise of CDA is that power relations are discursive. As van Dijk argues, CDA “studies the way that social power, abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context … Critical discourse analysts take explicit positions, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality” (van Dijk, 2001: 352). This argues that discourse is an integral part of the way social power and inequality operate. CDA therefore addresses social problems, and can be seen as a form of social action.

The idea of discursive power relations is implicated in the third premise of CDA: that discourse does ideological work, in the ways that power structures, societal goals and equality are portrayed and enacted through text. The Marxist view of CDA argues that language is ideological in that it causes us to think in ways that support the interests of powerful groups (Matheson, 2005). In fact, CDA studies have previously revealed that news does not overstep hegemonic boundaries, but rather legitimises the status quo in favour of
those in power; thus, it is argued that the press continues to be complicit in patriarchal gender ideologies, racism and nationalism (Van Dijk, 2009).

Language use is simultaneously constitutive of social identities (Fairclough, 1995), and structures of othering can be found in text. The concept of “representational strategies” allows us to “place people in the social world and highlight certain aspects of identity we wish to draw attention to or omit” (Machin & Mayr, 2012: 77). For example, van Dijk has shown how the media pits us against or alongside people via “ideological squaring” (van Dijk, 1998). Analysing representations of identity, whether oppositions are created between people, and whether the discourse supports the interests of powerful groups will be crucial in analysing the “empire talk” in these newspapers.

Finally, it is also important to analyse the context of the discourse; as Carvalho argues, context is critical to CDA (Carvalho, 2008). It has been established that discourse is shaped by, and shapes, society; and so this context must also be analysed. That is why the ideas and consequences of the Brexit referendum on public rhetoric are crucial to note. Similarly, the context of the article within the paper itself and within discourse is important; the concept of intertextuality means that all texts necessarily build upon previous discourse as clearly, discourse does not stem from nothing (Fairclough, 2005). It is reflexive and responsive. Thus, it is important to question where the discourse stems from, as this knowledge contains insights about what sort of discourses are seen as worthy and valued by the newspaper, and what sort of discourses are dismissed. Again, this ultimately suggests the ideology of the newspaper.

Therefore, it is expected that CDA will prove insightful into how these newspapers discuss “empire talk”, in terms of the ideologies suggested in the text. To some extent, it is expected that the newspapers will be somewhat complicit in imperialist rhetoric and power structures, following the Frankfurt school of thought. At the same time, it must be questioned why these papers agree or disagree with a certain discourse. For example, Matheson argues that everybody must use ideologically-loaded discourse if they want to progress in society; which suggests more insidious reasons for the use of discourse, and this too will be explored later (Matheson, 2005).

Ultimately, as Foucault argues, we should study texts as a discourse embedded in relations of power and identity; texts must be studied as part of the ongoing oppression and prejudice but also struggle to gain power by knowledge (Foucault, 1989).

CDA is interpretative and explanatory. With this in mind, some aspects to search for in a text when carrying out CDA include grammar features, rhetorical and literary figures,
and evidentialities. Examples include passive or active conjugation of verbs, emotive language and the choice of adjectives, analogies and metaphors, and statements of factuality such as “obviously”. In addition, it is important to identify words or phrasing indicating hidden relations of power, and who exercises this; who the ideal subject (audience) is for the text; and what is left unsaid as well as said. The analysis will make use of Gee’s 28 tools for CDA, which highlight questions to ask of your data (Gee, 2011). A few of the most relevant tools provided by Gee for this study include deixis (how words are tied to context, and make assumptions about the readers’ pre-existing knowledge); intonation; framing; what the speaker is trying to do with the words; identities building (which socially recognisable identities the speaker is trying to enact, or which identities they are encouraging the readers to take up); and politics building (how the discourse aims to define what is a social good and whether this should be distributed or withheld from others) (Gee, 2011). These tools are important as they are insightful about how the paper constructs a British identity, encourages or discourages certain political actions, and suggest the perspectives they encourage their viewers to take on imperialism in the context of Brexit.
5. Findings

The findings of the study are presented here by theme, collaborating the findings of all three newspapers. Generally, three broad themes were identified in the texts: firstly, a dismissal of the anti-imperialist argument; secondly, a demonstration of nostalgia for a British identity tied to imperialism; and lastly, a discussion of new forms of imperialism in which British neo-imperialism is portrayed as “good”, versus the “bad” imperialism of the EU. Much of the rhetoric within the texts cross over specific categories and can be seen to demonstrate arguments which fit into multiple themes. Each theme is comprised of sub-categories. Within these sub-categories, the most representative examples from the various newspapers will be presented, including the text and the analysis of the text, and then discussed further below.

5.1 Dismissing anti-imperialism

The first general theme identified within the rhetoric of texts from all three newspapers is that of dismissing the anti-imperialism argument. This is done in two ways: firstly, by mocking and deriding students who advocate for anti-imperialism; and secondly, by dismissing the impact, and especially the negative effects of, the former British Empire.

5.1.1 Against academia

Both The Times and The Sunday Times mock and deride students who advocate for anti-imperialism and decolonisation, often through the use of sarcasm. They present the students as childish and invalidate their arguments, even portraying the anti-imperialist argument as dangerous.

**Example 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>1 April 2016, The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Folly of Academe; Imperial College must stay imperial, a pint must be a pint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Even more grim is the targeting of Imperial College. First to go will be the college motto, Scientia imperii decus et tutamen, or “Knowledge is the adornment and protection of the Empire”. If the insurgents have their way empire will have to go, and perhaps even knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>“Folly”: childish, not to be taken seriously, unintelligent. “Pint”: about British tradition, values and identity, which academia is thus against. “Insurgents”: barbaric, reckless, violent, against majority, illegal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Empire will have to go, and perhaps even knowledge”: mocking the students as being ridiculous, unintelligent. The syntax and tone here is sarcastic.

Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>12 March 2016, The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Once Rhodes has fallen, your kitchen is next; You complacent bourgeois fool! Didn’t you realise how that room glorifies Kitchener, the poster boy for militarism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>#OXFORDSTREETFALL MUSTFALL Why is it called Oxford Street? It doesn’t go to Oxford any more. It’s just an imperialist reminder of an irrelevant old university that makes people who went to other universities feel bad. I suggest that we call it “The Other Lame Christmas Shopping Street”. (+ 2 other examples in the same manner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>“Your kitchen is next”: completely ridiculing the movement for being irrational, but also dismissing the significance of Rhodes’ statue. “imperialist reminder of an irrelevant old university”: sarcasm, mocking as Oxford university is internationally renowned, and not irrelevant, thus makes anti-imperialist argument seem as if it takes things out of proportion. Oxford Street: symbolism, about British identity, important British landmark. Two other examples are given alongside this one, which similarly mock the anti-imperialist movement and make it seem as if the movement targets irrelevant things. This excerpt doesn’t directly address the anti-imperialism argument but alludes to it through using sarcasm to mock other things that could be seen as anti-imperialist. In this way, the excerpt assumes that readers are aware of the anti-imperialist argument that has already been mocked in the newspaper in other editorials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>23 October 2016, <em>The Sunday Times</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Fascist canoeists are up the creek now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>More fun from the eminently rational world of academia, this time Canada – just so you don’t think we have a monopoly on these halfwits. Meet Misao Dean, professor of English at the University of Victoria. Misao is angry, very angry, about canoes. They are emblems of colonialism, imperialism and marginalisation. They were used to colonise Canada (which is why you now have a comfortable, highly paid job, Misao, rather than sitting in a tepee gnawing bark for supper).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Title is comic. “eminently rational”: sarcastic, academia as irrational and thus invalid arguments arise from it. Halfwits: explicitly rude and ableist, academia othered as completely unintelligent and irrational. “very, very angry, about canoes”: repetition and phrasing portrays Misao as childish. “emblems of colonialism, imperialism and marginalisation”: linked with canoes which are comical, makes these claims comical and satirical, dismissing their validity. The fact that this sentence stands alone also seems to mock imperialism, colonialism and marginalisation themselves. Mentioning Misao’s job: “good” aspects of colonisation, presenting it as saving the “savages” and civilising them (especially in relation to next clause). “tepee gnawing bark for supper”: “savage” trope, directly racist. Othering and white supremacist. Using Misao’s first name instead of naming them Dr or Professor Dean is very degrading, especially seeing as <em>The Times</em> has a formatting policy of calling people Mr or Mrs, followed by their surname.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>8 January 2017, <em>The Sunday Times</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Title | Pass me a bludgeon: zombie universities are cosseting students
--- | ---
Content | At last, after the usual overlong interregnum for celebrating that archaic festival of western colonialist triumphalism, Christmas, the academic year is back in full swing.
Analysis | “Zombie”: mindless, irrational, dangerous other. Christmas referred to as “archaic festival of western colonialist triumphalism”: exaggeration, sarcastic and sneering. Presents decolonial rhetoric as a joke, and against national traditions. Anti-imperialism against British values and identity. Also completely misunderstands decolonisation argument. Again, it doesn’t directly address the anti-imperialist argument but alludes to it, assuming that readers know that *The Times* has discussed this before

These excerpts present students who advocate for anti-imperialism as being childish, often through the use of sarcasm. Academia is described as “folly” (example 1): childlike play which is irrational; and it is argued that universities are “cosseting” or mollycoddling students (example 4), making the students who advocate for anti-imperialism seem childish. It is also the professors who are childish: one professor is “very, very angry, about canoes” (example 3), which sounds comical and is mocking and patronising the professor through the use of repetition and juxtaposition. Similarly, the texts also present students who advocate for anti-imperialism as being unintelligent. It is sarcastically suggested that “perhaps even knowledge” will have to leave university (example 1), which implies that students are not intelligent as they don’t acquire or respect knowledge. Students themselves are called “halfwits” (example 3), a rude and ableist word which directly suggests that students have limited knowledge and abilities. They study at “zombie” universities (example 4); using cultural tropes, as zombies are connotated with a lack of rational brain function. Through the presentation of the anti-imperialism movement as being childish and unintelligent, they dismiss the validity of the anti-imperialist argument, portraying it as comical and irrational. Sarcasm is prolific in all of the examples above, such as in example 1’s “perhaps even knowledge” statement as aforementioned, and the quip that Oxford is an “imperialist remainder of an irrelevant old university” (example 2), which is clearly sarcastic given that the university is internationally hailed as being one of the highest quality. The texts therefore play on cultural symbolism, juxtaposing important symbols of British heritage with academic
views on imperialism. The “eminently rational world of academia” in example 3 is also clearly sarcastic when paired with the text; as is the description of Christmas as a “festival of western colonialist triumph” (example 4).

The excerpts also present the anti-imperialist argument as dangerous, and as being against British values. Cultural meanings of zombies (example 4) and calling students “insurgents” (example 1) imply danger: being out of control, violent and “other” to a safe society. Anti-imperialism is thus the “other” against which British traditions and values such as pints (example 1), Oxford Street and Kitchener (example 2), and Christmas (example 4) are set.

5.1.2 Dismissing the impact of imperialism
Further, the texts also dismiss the negative impacts of imperialism, both of the former British Empire and of neo-imperialist actions more recently. They present imperialism as a game, and neglect to engage with the significance and impact of imperialism.

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>29 May 2017, The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>England’s lack of national pride is a problem; The Irish have a powerful, cheerful sense of identity, whereas celebrating Englishness is often seen as shameful or racist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Yet the French, Dutch, Spanish and Portuguese often behaved worse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Title neglects to look at different histories of England and Ireland, forgetting English role in imperialism. It suggests that the English should have national pride, as the lack of pride is a “problem”. Suggests this pride should be held despite any shame or racism, which dismisses the importance of the shame and racism. It even questions these claims of shame and racism, as firstly, it says English people should have national pride and secondly, Englishness is “seen as”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


shameful. “Seen as” is a qualifier which presents the shame/racism as an opinion, rather than a fact. “Behaved worse” makes empires seem like a playground game that is trivial and meaningless. Introducing these other countries with the word “yet” asks the question as to why England’s national pride is criticised when these countries are not, and alludes to a sense of unfairness.

**Example 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>20 January 2016, <em>The Times</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>It’s right to chisel away at Rhodes’ reputation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Rhodes shouldn’t fall. His statue commemorates an extraordinary if dubious individual and his contribution to Oxford. Sadly this imperial adventurer has also become caught up in a wider battle about free speech that cannot and must not be lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>The title and first clauses suggest that Rhodes wasn’t a national hero and that we must engage with the past, but “imperial adventurer” completely downplays the significance of his actions, presenting imperialism as a childish game through the cultural symbolism of adventurer as opposed to the word “imperialist”, for instance. Similarly, the words “dubious individual” under-emphasise any negative consequences Rhodes created. “Dubious” means suspicious and doubtful, and so this suggests that instead of being condemnable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
or intolerable, his racist and/or imperialist actions are merely doubtful to his “extraordinary” character. Describing Rhodes as being “caught up” in this battle negates any responsibility Rhodes has in imperialist actions; it is as if Rhodes accidentally became involved in this without responsibility. Finally, beginning the extract with the words “Rhodes shouldn't fall” immediately suggests to the reader that, despite what follows in the rest of the excerpt, the anti-imperialist argument is wrong.

### Example 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>4 April 2017, <em>The Times</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Howard’s Way; The former Conservative leader has debased the Brexit debate and insulted an ally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The use of military power to enforce trade really was a part of British imperial history, as with the ignoble opium wars with China in the mid-19th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>With the title and the first clause of the sentence, the article recognises that enforcement of trade via imperialism is a bad thing and that this shouldn’t happen again. However, the adjective “ignoble” to refer to the opium wars completely downplays the horrific violence inflicted on the Chinese people by the British.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Example 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>10 July 2016, <em>The Sunday Times</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Marigolds for remembrance as India finally mourns Somme dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>More than 1m Indian soldiers – including Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims – took part in the war, making up a third of British colonial forces, and 74,000 were killed ... Until now they have received little official recognition in India because of sensitivities about the colonial past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Recognises colonial troops in the war, factual and serious tone, and presents it as grave that so many were killed. But the “sensitivities” makes it seem trivial, delicate and floral, not such a harsh matter. Also, the editorial criticises that the troops’ deaths were not recognised in India (with title too), but attributes no responsibility to the British for employing them in war in the first place or of commemorating their deaths too. In terms of syntax, placing the clause “making up a third of British colonial forces” in the middle of a sentence (instead of dedicating a whole sentence to this) diminishes the importance of the fact that Britain relied so heavily on colonial forces or that Britain should take recognition of this too.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Example 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>20 July 2016, <em>The Sun</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Money matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Now the Nats tell us the vote to renew Trident – always a foregone conclusion – will lead to another pro-indy boost. But despite talk of the “imperialist” nature of the nuke decision, we’re not so sure this issue is the clincher that the SNP reckon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Quotation marks around “imperialist” dismisses and the claim; invalidates the importance, relevance, significance and truthfulness of the claim by questioning it. The “imperialist” claim is also referred to as merely “talk”, which indicates that the claim is an opinion instead of a fact. The paper directly refers to its own ideology by the use of the word “we’re”, which acknowledges <em>The Times</em>’ own opinion. This also automatically creates an identification of us versus them. The sentence follows, that <em>The Times</em> is not sure that the “imperialist” claim is the argument that conclusively settles the decision to renew Trident.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the excerpts, imperialism is described as if it is a game. This is demonstrated in the statement that other countries “behaved worse” than Britain in imperialism (example 1), and how Rhodes was an “imperial adventurer” (example 2). These phrases connote childish playground games through the imagery the words create, trivialising imperialism. Further, the texts downplay the significance of imperialism. Adjectives such as Rhodes being a “dubious individual” (example 2), and the opium wars in China being “gnoble” (example 3), dismiss the horrific violence and the long-lasting negative effects that these acts and people inflicted on other nations. Similarly, using the word “sensitivities” to describe the colonial past makes it seem trivial, delicate and even weak; when people are described as “sensitive”, it is often in a manner dismissing the validity of their being offended. Again, the quotation marks around the claim of the “imperialist” nature of the nuke decision (example 5) question the validity of
the claim, thereby taking away from the claim’s importance, relevance, significance and truthfulness.

In addition, the excerpts neglect to engage with the context and history of empire; for instance, example 1 compares England with Ireland in the argument for national pride, but does not reflect on why England’s national pride is tainted with imperialist history and Ireland’s is not. Where the examples do criticise British imperialism, they only engage on a surface level; for example, it is recognised that Rhodes’ reputation should be questioned due to imperialism (example 2), but then this is not connected to wider debates about whether statues of imperialist figures should still stand on a pedestal and be celebrated. Example 3 also acknowledges the enforced trade under empire, indirectly suggesting that this was a negative thing, but then evidently does not want to be too harsh in criticising British actions under empire, as suggested by its vague argument and the adjective of the “ignoble” opium wars. Further, example 4 notes that it is grave that so many colonial troops died in the war, and stresses that it is good that they are being remembered by India, but then neglects to reflect on why the troops were in the war, Britain’s colonial responsibility, and Britain’s remembrance of colonial troops.

5.2 Nostalgia for an imperial identity

The second general theme identified in the newspapers is the nostalgia for an imperial identity, in other words a longing for a past British identity that existed alongside empire. This broad theme is comprised of two sub-categories: firstly, the nostalgia and admiration for empire expressed in the newspapers; and secondly, the representation of British values, identity and arrogance that is implied in discussion about empire.

5.2.1 Nostalgia and admiration for empire

The following examples from all three newspapers arguably reflect an admiration and nostalgia for the former British empire, focusing solely on the British perspective towards empire and Britain’s own gains from it.

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>29 July 2016, The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Our Middle East carve-up is no cause for shame; the Balfour declaration and other milestones in our imperial history show how hard we tried to do the right thing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analysis

“Carving up” the Middle East isn’t a cause for shame, despite the imagery of the wording suggesting something messy and violent. “Milestones”: achievements, successes, and so suggest successes of imperialism. “we tried to do the right thing” makes imperialism about Britain’s good-willed intentions, while dismissing any negative effects. The use of “our” and “we” creates a collective identity around Britain that includes imperial actions.

### Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>21 May 2017, The Sunday Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>A return to ‘Safety First’ for the Tories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>In the 1930s Mr Baldwin could rely on empire markets to give us some shelter from the economic storm. That is a luxury we no longer have. Mrs May has her eye on rebuilding Commonwealth markets for Britain’s exporters but in the meantime has to negotiate our new relationship with the European Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>“rely”: stable, dependable, strong. Shelter from storm: cliche depicting romanticising imagery. “Luxury”: empire markets as luxury. “We no longer have”: expresses sadness/disappointment that Britain cannot rely on empire markets any more. Presents empire markets as beneficial to Britain, expresses disappointment that Britain no longer has them, and only looks at imperialism from point of economic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
benefits to Britain, neglecting any other perspective. Also worth noting that EU relationship is presented as a distraction from the real issues that benefit Britain, as May “has to” deal with Brexit, seen as an obligation and annoyance when contrasted with “rebuilding Commonwealth markets”, which has a positive tone when read in conjunction with the editorial’s yearning for empire markets.

**Example 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>22 April 2016, <em>The Sun</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>‘For U.S. it’s: Do as I say not as I do’; says Boris Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>It was a bust of Winston Churchill, the great British wartime leader … It was a fine goggle-eyed object, done by the brilliant sculptor Jacob Epstein, and it had been sitting there for almost ten years. But on day one of Obama’s administration it was returned, without ceremony, to the British Embassy in Washington. … Some said it was a symbol of the part-Kenyan President’s ancestral dislike of the British Empire, of which Churchill had been such a fervent defender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>At first seems to present the Empire rather neutrally, but on closer inspection Churchill is culturally coded as a positive icon symbolic of Britain’s strength and identity through the words “great”, “British wartime leader”, “fine goggle-eyed object”, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“brilliant sculptor”. When reading empire as tied to such a positively coded British icon, and Churchill as being imperialist in his “fervent” or strong defence of the Empire, imperialism is then connoted with positive British icons. Obama’s dislike of empire is dismissed, also suggested by the invalidity of his dislike: “some said” presents an anonymous opinion which is doubtful in contrast to Churchill, the great wartime hero. Worth noting that in other editorials in The Sun, the claim that Obama’s ancestors were negatively affected by imperialism is doubted. In terms of the syntax, the first few sentences create a story-like depiction glorifying the bust of Churchill. However, this nice story is interrupted with the word “but”, which signals a negative plot twist with Obama returning the bust.

Nostalgia and admiration for empire can be seen in how the excerpts place emphasis on achievements in imperialism; Britain’s good-will; disappointment in the lack of empire and the traditionalism and iconoclasm of empire for “great” Britain. Describing imperialism in terms of “milestones” (example 1), and in admiration for empire markets (example 2) suggests the emphasis of what is seen as “achievements” of empire, and the positive aspects of empire on the part of Britain. The excerpts indeed prioritise Britain’s good-willed intentions of empire over negative realities; Britain tried so hard “to do the right thing” (example 1), as if that makes up for any negative effects. The focus is on Britain, which can also be seen in the way example 2 focuses only on the British perspective and only discusses empire in terms of Britain’s economic gain. This example even suggests disappointment for a lack of empire now, as the “luxury” of empire markets has left, leaving Britain with no shelter for the economic storm, the romanticised cliche that Britain had previous to

---

imperialism. In addition, traditional British icons, although associated heavily with imperialism, are strongly coded positive: Churchill for example is described as “great”, a “British wartime leader”, whose statue is a “fine goggle-eyed object” by a “brilliant sculptor” (example 3). This description, and the dominant cultural perception of Churchill as the hero or saviour of Britain during the Second World War, certainly presents Churchill as someone to be admired. The fact that he is then described as a “fervent” defender of empire, with no further exploration of the meaning of empire, implies a dismissal of negative connotations of empire.

5.2.2 British values and identity

Positive representations of empire, a sole focus on Britain’s perspective, and traditional British icons tied to empire all suggest that British values, identity and even arrogance are implicated in how empire is discussed in these newspapers. The three examples below highlight the associations between empire and British identity.

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>18 April 2017, The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Let’s hope the new Smiley doesn’t betray us; The time is ripe for the return of Le Carre’s spy – as long as his creator sticks up for the West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>After empire, those who wished to serve their country no longer knew what it stood for. This is what Peter Guillam, hero of the new novel, described in Tinker Tailer Soldier Spy as the betrayal of a whole “notion of English calling” which, although “vague, understated and elusive”, was no less shatteringly felt by its loss. So far, so timely and excellent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Analysis         | “sticks up for the West” is evocative of anti-PC rhetoric, making the West look like the target of abuse and as the weak one in the current global discourse and climate, as it
needs someone to stick up for it. “those who wished to serve their country”: imagery evokes strong, good-willed, nationalist, heroic, good people. “No longer knew what it stood for”: British national identity is explicitly tied to empire. So like the Churchill example before, good people are tied to defense of empire. Anti-imperialism is a “betrayal” to the English nation, people and identity: a very strong and negative word that creates a good “us” versus a bad, untrustworthy “them”. “shatteringly felt by its loss”: imagery suggests English “calling”, aka identity and purpose, was violently and tragically destroyed by end of empire. “So far, so timely and excellent”: equating loss of empire and loss of identity in this book with the context in the UK, and validates this narrative as being applicable.

### Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>26 March 2016, <em>The Times</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Our immigrants need to read British fiction; Great writers more than anyone can convey a sense of nationhood and love of one’s country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Tragically, however, a way of thinking took hold several decades ago which identified British national identity as a form of cultural imperialism to be eroded and neutralised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>“our” immigrants, as if Britain owns them. Portrays them as dependents. “Great writers” are then British. “nationhood and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
love of one’s country”: nationalistic undertones while trying to create a hegemonic imagined national community, pro-Britain. “Tragically”: emotive, strong and evocative adverb which suggests cultural imperialism thesis is tragic, and victim is British culture. Last clause of excerpt recognises that British identity is connoted with imperialism and that this is apparently a negative thing, but dismisses the judgement against empire implied in this via its conviction that this is a shame. The opposition created between the title and the content with the use of the word “tragically” again signals an unwelcome plot twist.

Example 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>16 February 2017, <em>The Sun</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Egyptians built the Pyramids on beer … they did a top job; as Lloyd’s bans staff boozing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>It’s a British elbow-bending institution and at a time when around four pubs are closing every day, it’s our drinking duty to give something back to the cornerstone of British culture. Lest we forget, the brewing industry was once the engine room of the British empire and oiled the wheels of the industrial revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>“British elbow-bending institution”: imagery and adjective suggests drinking is important to sense of British identity and tradition. “duty to give something back to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the cornerstone of British culture”: give something back to implies that British culture has given a lot; is generous and a positive thing to which British people should be grateful. “cornerstone” of British culture: again, pubs associated with British culture, and noun cornerstone of an “institution” to which we owe something makes it seem like a good thing. Through this, the “brewing industry” has already been suggested as being a positive thing, and “industrial revolution” is an achievement for Britain; taught as positive in schools and Britain wouldn’t be so developed today without it. In combination with British empire, empire is coded similarly – about British achievements, progress, culture and identity. The word “our” again creates a sense of British communal identity which is, later in the content, inherently linked to imperial heritage.

| the cornerstone of British culture” | give something back to implies that British culture has given a lot; is generous and a positive thing to which British people should be grateful. “cornerstone” of British culture: again, pubs associated with British culture, and noun cornerstone of an “institution” to which we owe something makes it seem like a good thing. Through this, the “brewing industry” has already been suggested as being a positive thing, and “industrial revolution” is an achievement for Britain; taught as positive in schools and Britain wouldn’t be so developed today without it. In combination with British empire, empire is coded similarly – about British achievements, progress, culture and identity. The word “our” again creates a sense of British communal identity which is, later in the content, inherently linked to imperial heritage. |

These excerpts illustrate that British people, institutions and traditions coded as “good” are tied to the defense of empire. For example, “those who wished to serve their country” (example 1) uses imagery to evoke a sense of national pride, heroicism and strength, coding these people as good. Yet, these good people were “shattered”, an adjective suggesting tragic destroyment, after the end of empire as they no longer knew what their country’s calling, purpose and identity was. Things which are coded good and tied to empire also include the industrial revolution and the brewing industry, which are strongly coded as good things and achievements to be regarded with pride (example 3), vital to a sense of British identity. These good things are then compared equally to the British empire, as if they are comparable phenomena, which suggests that the empire is also perceived here as “good”.
A sense of British nationalism and national identity is also tied to empire. In example 2, it is recognised that “great” British writers, a sense of nationhood and love of one’s country are tied with being imperialist. Furthermore, the excerpt then suggests that this accusation of imperialism is a “tragic” shame. This firstly suggests that nationhood and empire are linked – the excerpt does not deny this – and secondly, expresses sadness that anti-imperialism, and a lack of empire, is destabilising traditional associations of British national identity. This leads on to the suggestion that a loss of empire is equated with a loss of identity. This is also seen by the loss of an “English calling” – a loss of purpose for and identity of the nation – or loss of what Britain “stood” for, due to the collapse of empire (example 1).

5.3 New empires: bad versus good
Moving on from the discussion of former empires, this study found that the newspapers constructed an oppositional discourse of current forms of empire, presenting British neo-imperialism as “good” in comparison to the “bad” empire of the EU.

5.3.1 British neo-imperialism
Neo-imperialism, as aforementioned, comprises new methods of imperialism that don’t necessarily focus on the physical colonisation or imposition of rule but rather on more subtle forms of dominance, such as making a non-dominant nation economically or culturally dependent on a dominant one, or exploiting its natural resources. These aspects may also have been part of former colonialism, but neo-colonialism is more insidious; often doing these things within the law and without drawing attention. British neo-imperialism in these newspapers is primarily portrayed as positive for Britain, while negative effects for the non-dominant country are ignored or neglected.

Example 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>5 March 2016, The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>We’re mad to turn our backs on vibrant Africa; Whitehall and the British political elite don’t think the continent matters any more, which is a colossal misjudgment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>This is the wrong moment to lose faith in Africa. Post-empire it’s the moment for Britain to reset the relationship. … I could bore you with figures for Africa’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
astonishing share of our planet’s mineral resources, but it’s not just what can be extracted: these are real and growing economies, real markets, real consumers. Take advantage.

Analysis

“vibrant Africa”: mentioning whole continent homogeneously and this “exotic” adjective is Orientalist. The “vibrancy” of Africa is for the British: the “us” that is created as “we’re”, referring to British people, is the first word of the title. This demonstrates entitlement. “don’t think the continent matters any more”: politicians don’t think it matters for British benefit any more.

“re-set the relationship”, directly in reference to empire, suggests creating empire 2.0; neo-imperialism. It also dismisses the impact of the past and treats Africa not as a continent of autonomous human beings but as an object; as human relationships cannot simply be “re-set” or remoulded.” “not just about what can be extracted”: “just” as a quantifier implies that it is partly about what can be extracted, thus about exploitation of African resources for British benefit. “these are real and growing economies … markets … consumers”: in relation to previous clause, talks about these in relation to what Britain can gain from them. Strongly advocates for neo-imperialism via economy, exporting to and from Africa. “Take advantage”: unequivocal
direct suggestion that Britain should exploit Africa. In any other context, “take advantage” means to exploit a situation or opportunity for one’s own benefit. “Africa’s share of our planet’s mineral resources” suggests a distinction between Africa and “our” planet. Also, the syntax around the phrase “but it’s not just about what can be extracted” suggests that, to a large part, it is about what Britain can extract from Africa.

Example 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>20 March 2017, The Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Britain must make sure that India is a friend; The empire left unhealed wounds but post-Brexit Britain will need markets and a free flow of Indian talent and goodwill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Post-Brexit, reaching out to the fast-growing economies of the world, we will need that goodwill, but we are currently doing too little to continue earning it. We are squandering our soft power. … More than any other country, India will matter to Britain in the coming years: as a market, an ally, an innovator, a source of talent and – despite everything – a friend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Analysis         | “unhealed wounds”: quite vague and dismissive of impact of actual atrocities, not taking accountability. Wounds as a metaphor evokes message that they can heal - does not not recognise death, for example. Still, recognising negative aspects of empire, which makes it even worse that the
article advocates for neo-imperialism. “post-Brexit Britain will need markets”: about exploiting Indian markets for British gain as focuses on Britain’s “need”. “goodwill”: India must have goodwill to its former oppressors so that Britain can get what it wants. Need them to be complicit. “our soft power”: recognises that Britain has power to manipulate/persuade countries into giving Britain what it wants. Dominant over others. “our” sets up identification of powerful British in contrast to India. India will matter to Britain because of what it can provide for Britain “market … ally … innovator … source of talent”; so still seen as less sovereign/powerful.”“despite everything – a friend”: recognises negatives of former empire but very vague, doesn’t accept accountability for British actions. Dismisses former empire by advocating for new one. “a friend”: doesn’t talk about India as if it is equal to Britain, quite patronising. The use of the word “we” again creates a collective identity around Britain, which is then tied to imperialism as it is suggested that Britain exploits former colonial resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>21 May 2017, The Sunday Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>A return to ‘Safety First’ for the Tories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>In the 1930s Mr Baldwin could rely on empire markets to give us some shelter from the economic storm. That is a luxury we no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
longer have. Mrs May has her eye on rebuilding Commonwealth markets for Britain’s exporters but in the meantime has to negotiate our new relationship with the European Union.

| Analysis | The entire excerpt won’t be analysed here, as it was already analysed in section 5.2.1, example 2. However, the admiration and nostalgia for empire suggested in the “luxury” of empire markets being a “shelter from the economic storm”, (as discussed previously), combined with “rebuilding Commonwealth markets for Britain’s exporters”, suggests that new Commonwealth markets are an attempt to imitate empire markets to ensure Britain’s safety from the “storm”. Commonwealth nations are previously colonised nations which are still somewhat under British control, and so these new markets suggest a neo-imperial dominance over these nations by exporting to them for Britain’s own gain. |

A direct support or advocation for British neo-imperialism is suggested in these excerpts. Example 1 mentions that post-empire, it is time to “reset the relationship” with Africa, going on to describe resources that Britain can extract from the continent as well as markets that can be beneficial to Britain. Together, this explicitly suggests the return to a colonial relationship imitating the past. Furthermore, it even argues that Britain can “take advantage” of the continent, words which conjure ideas of domination of a weaker subject and exploitation of an opportunity. Britain’s “soft power” (example 2) over other nations suggests that Britain has dominance over other nations; and it is warned that this power may be lost or “squandered”, implying that the power is something that should be kept. All of the excerpts
also set up a distinction between a powerful British “us” or “we”, who has soft power over places which could be beneficial to Britain.

More indirectly, the excerpts advocate for the exploitation of other nations, especially less dominant ones. The discussion of rebuilding Commonwealth markets in the same paragraph lamenting the loss of empire markets (example 3) suggests a striving for neo-imperialist economic policies by economically benefitting from nations previously colonised. Similarly, the excerpts highlight the markets, consumers, allies, innovators and sources of talent (examples 1 and 2) in Africa and India that could be useful to Britain; suggesting that Britain can use these phenomena for their own gain. This is rather patronising towards Africa and India, as their autonomy in deciding how to use their markets, etc., is not recognised. It is assumed that Britain can do whatever it wants with them.

This leads on to the fact that the excerpts solely focus on the British benefits that could be gained from economic policies which implicate imperialism. For instance, British politicians didn’t think that Africa “matter[ed] any more” until the usefulness of their resources, markets and consumers became evident (example 1); which clearly only focuses on the importance of how Britain can benefit from Africa. This can also be seen in example 2, which states that “post-Brexit Britain will need” markets, etc. The emphasis on what Britain needs from other nations only focuses on how Britain economically benefit from others. “India will matter to Britain” only for what it can provide to Britain, as if the country does not matter at all to Britain now despite being a former colony – and it is India that will need “goodwill”, not Britain.

Perhaps the most ironic aspect of these excerpts is that they acknowledge the former empire whilst suggesting an advocate for neo-imperialist policies. For instance, example 1 recognises that Africa is “post-empire” yet suggests that it’s time to “reset the relationship”. Given that the excerpt also suggests that Britain has no relationship with Africa any more as the continent doesn’t “matter” to Britain, it implies that the imperial relationship must thus be re-introduced. Similarly, example 2 advocates for Britain using India’s economic resources for its own gain, “despite everything” and despite the “unhealed wounds” of empire. These last quotations also both dismiss the impact of imperialism in India: they are vague, and neglect to detail and engage with the horrors committed on behalf of the British.

5.3.2 The EU empire
In opposition to Britain’s “good” neo-imperialism, the EU empire is presented as “bad”. The newspapers portray the EU’s empire as hegemonically monopolising the continent; restricting Britain’s freedom; and even in some cases, as inherently evil.

**Example 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>2 May 2016, <em>The Times</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Britain’s role has been to break up Europe; The English Channel has kept us apart from continental wrangling. Now we have a chance to engage more globally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>If it had been one sixth as wide, we would be unlikely to be having this referendum because we would have been repeatedly incorporated into European empires and would feel far more blurred in our nationality. … When a hegemon aspires to monopolise the continent, it is often Britain that proves hardest to harmonise, because of the Channel. The empire then cuts us off from trade, as Charlemagne, Innocent III, Charles V, Louis XIV, Bonaparte, the Kaiser and Hitler all did to various degrees and at various times. Yet it is often Britain that provides the resistance and causes the hegemon to fall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Title: visibly anti-EU. “incorporated into EU empires … far more blurred in our nationality”: suggests EU empire as hegemonic, monopolising and culture-destroying. “hegemon aspires to monopolise the continent”, and “the empire then cuts us off from trade”: EU as power-hungry, to the detriment of nations. Monopolisation seen as bad thing in free market capitalist society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This sentence is also ironic seeing as Britain once ruled a quarter of the world. “Hegemon” is a strong word, evoking dictatorial imagery in contrast to democracy and national sovereignty. “Hitler”: a person strongly culturally coded as evil is compared to the EU empire. “often Britain that provides the resistance and causes the hegemon to fall”: nationalistic sentiment as glorifies Britain as the fighter of oppression. Unintentional irony, as it is suggested here that Britain destroys oppressive empires.

**Example 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>28 February 2016, <em>The Sunday Times</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Ireland too must choose between EU diktats or freedom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>The EU’s imperial courts are determined to impose this army of regulations on member states and to undermine national sovereignty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>“diktats”: reminiscent of Orwell’s Newspeak; oppressive control over citizens. Short form of dictator, against democracy. Choose between this and “freedom”: EU and freedom mutually exclusive, freedom is the goal. So “imperial”, when applies to EU, is a bad thing; oppressive and undemocratic. “Army of regulations”: aggressive, forceful imagery. EU regulations often used as rhetoric by the Leave campaign during Brexit. Nationalism thus implied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“undermine national sovereignty”: against the nationalistic ideal.

Example 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; newspaper</th>
<th>25 January 2016, The Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>UK in or out, game is up for ailing EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Whichever way Britain votes, it is too late to prevent the decline and fall of this bureaucratic empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>EU is ailing, “bureaucratic” and imperialist. The Sun is strongly pro-Brexit, and unnecessary bureaucracy often mentioned by the Leave campaign. So in this sense, empire is a negative thing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, all three newspapers present the EU’s empire as a hegemonic force, imposing its rules on the continent. The EU is described as a “hegemon”, monopolising the continent (example 1) with its “army of regulations” (example 2). The strong imagery in these words suggest a dictatorial and aggressive militant power which is against democracy and national sovereignty. The forceful imposition, dominance and restriction of freedoms from the EU is suggested as inherently negative, as Britain must make the “hegemon” fall (example 1). This suggests that the EU must be destroyed as EU regulations undermine national sovereignty (example 2), thereby restricting Britain. The portrayal of the EU empire as being against British values and interests is strong in the text: it is presented as destroying Britain’s right to trade and to establish its own culture as it “monopolises” trade – which is seen as a bad thing under free market capitalism – and ends up “blurring” Brits’ sense of nationality, which is important to a sense of nationalism (example 1). It also undermines British national sovereignty (example 2), which is evocative of nationalist rhetoric which, as argued in the theoretical framework, emphasises the importance of national sovereignty. In some cases, the EU’s “empire” is presented as explicitly bad and even evil; for instance, the EU empire is compared to that of Hitler (example 1), a figure who is strongly coded in Britain as being an evil dictator. The “dictatorship” of the EU empire is also expressly a
negative thing in these excerpts, as dictatorship and “diktats” are juxtaposed with the goal of “freedom” (example 2).

Therefore, the findings have shown that the newspapers dismiss the anti-imperialist argument, and thus by dismissing the necessity to engage critically with Britain’s imperial history, they are complicit in the support of imperialism by refusing to take seriously the argument to dismantle lingering imperialism. The findings also show a dismissal of the negative aspects of the former empire itself. Furthermore, a nostalgia for imperialism is illustrated in the way that some aspects of the former empire are admired and the longing for a British identity, tied to imperialism, lingers. Finally, the findings suggest that the newspapers even express implicit support for, and advocate for, a renewal of imperial policies, while at the same time condemning any imperialism on the side of the EU.

Of course, there are exceptions to these rules; each newspaper contains editorials that oppose these opinions. However, it has been found that the number of exceptions to the rule are far fewer than the rule itself. Finally, it must be acknowledged that not every single newspaper is included in every single section of these findings because the most representative excerpts were chosen, which may have dismissed less representative excerpts from other newspapers. It may also be because some newspapers did not produce excerpts which fit into every category. This can be explained by the differing styles of each newspaper and the different focuses of the editorials, based on the intended tone, rhetoric and audience of each paper. In general, however, it must be acknowledged that there is, on average, fairly equal representation of all newspapers in these findings.
6. Discussion

6.1 British identity, nationalism and imperialism

The findings have shown that the representation of national identity in these newspapers implicates a nostalgia for a glorified imperialist past. It has been shown that people, institutions and traditions coded as good or even great, such as Churchill, soldiers, and even the brewing industry, are tied to the defence of empire. This corroborates MacKenzie’s argument that imperialism created a worldview which was at the core of British self-perceptions (MacKenzie, 1984); and arguably this worldview still is central to British self-perceptions, whilst also incorporating nostalgia. Indeed, in these findings, it is suggested that a loss of empire results in a loss of British identity, for example with soldiers no longer knowing what they stand for. It was suggested in the theoretical framework that nostalgia – the sentimental longing for an irrecoverable past – contained a sense of imperialism, with studies finding that British people yearned for an imperial past. It can be argued that in this study, such a sense of nostalgia for imperialism as identified previously by scholars is entwined within a sense of British identity.

Furthermore, this manifestation of national identity also links to nationalistic discourse. As previously explained, nationalism includes a sense of loyalty and devotion to a nation; a “national consciousness”; a national identity based on shared characteristics; and further, a feeling of superiority over other nations (Triandafyllidou, 1998). These aspects are arguably demonstrated in the findings, with the sense of national identity as described above as well as a sense of superiority over other nations which is implied in rhetoric admiring the former empire, advocating for neo-imperialism and focusing solely on British gains from imperialism. The incorporation of nationalism and imperialism within the newspapers’ discourse, tied to national identity, is reflective of Black’s conviction that, historically, British nationalism has been closely tied to an identification built on the nation’s economically and constitutionally hegemonic status (Black, 2016).

It is not surprising that Potter sees a strong connection between mass media and national identity (Potter, 2007), given that the manifestation of national identity articulated through these newspapers is reflective of studies such as Seaton’s and Balthazar’s (Seaton, 2016; Balthazar, 2017), which illustrate a very similar perception of a British national identity in the context of Brexit. Moreover, this conception of national identity within print demonstrates the sort of imagined community conceptualised by Anderson, whereby a nation’s citizens are united in conceiving for themselves a national identity and sense of
community or shared characteristics, despite having never met one another (Anderson, 1983). Indeed, it is arguable that it is this sense of national identity, built upon the rhetoric of nationalism and imperialism, that contributes to a sense of othering; clearly, there are those that subscribe to the British national identity, and “others” that do not.

6.2 Orientalism and othering
There are generally three “others” found in the sample: academia which articulates anti-imperialist discourse, former colonised nations, and the EU. Firstly, anti-imperialist discourse is constructed as the “other” through the ways that students who advocate for this discourse are othered. The findings have shown that students advocating for anti-imperialism and decolonisation are presented as childish, unintelligent, irrational and even dangerous. This portrayal both de-legitimises and invalidates the anti-imperialism argument by discrediting and othering the proponents of it, as well as dismissing the argument itself. Thus, anti-imperialist discourse is presented as the “other” through its articulation through academia. In opposition, it is implied that imperialism is therefore the “us”.

This is illustrated through the almost continual use of sarcasm or irony in all of the texts in *The Times* and *The Sunday Times* which concern students and the anti-imperialist movement. Irony is used to attack, discredit and belittle established opinions, and is done via the literal reading of a text expressing the opposite of what the writer actually means; for example the writer states “that was great”, when they really mean that it was bad (Burgers, Konijn & Steen, 2016). Through this, irony “acknowledges the disconfirmation” of what it is saying: it gives a negative evaluation of existing discourse (Burgers, Konijn & Steen, 2016). Applied to this study, the sarcasm and irony used when discussing the anti-imperialism argument thus invalidates the argument, suggesting that it is wrong. If anti-imperialism is wrong, then it is suggested that imperialism is right, which is a plausible interpretation given the ways that the newspapers express support for former and current British imperialism.

Secondly, former colonised nations are also othered through the construction of British neo-imperialism as “good”, presented solely from a British perspective. The findings have shown that the newspapers discuss economic policies towards India and Africa through imperialist sentiment, discussing these nations and continents only in terms of what Britain can extract from them and gain from them, without recognising any perspective of autonomy or opinion of the former colonised places themselves. This implies a view in which Britain is superior, as it is the one doing the exploiting and recognising its own benefits, whereas the opinions, identities and other aspects of the former colonised places are neglected. Further, it
is arguable that the portrayal of these places also incorporates a kind of orientalism like that discussed by Said (Said, 1978). For example, Africa is discussed not in terms of its nations but as a whole continent, reducing its diversity to a homogeneous state. Moreover, it is described in terms of its “vibrancy”, evoking colourfulness and liveliness. This homogeneity, combined with colourful language and a sole focus on British benefit which neglects the continent’s diversity and autonomy, can be argued to be orientalist as it rather patronises the continent and fetishizes it for Britain’s own benefit. It presents a dichotomy between “them”, the nations and areas with different cultures who can be exploited by Britain, and “us”, the superior nation who does the exploiting.

Lastly, this “good” neo-imperialism is contrasted against the “bad” empire of the EU, which is convincingly othered. It has been shown that every time the EU’s “empire” is mentioned in the newspapers, it is portrayed as a hegemonic force which undermines national sovereignty; is in opposition to British values and culture; is a dictatorship in opposition to the ideal of freedom and democracy; and is even associated with evil tropes. The findings thus substantiate Kyriakidou’s (2016) conviction that, during Brexit, the media portrayed the EU as the “other” of British politics. It is also interesting to note MacKenzie’s argument that, during the First World War, propaganda showed a struggle between a good, righteous empire (the British empire) against a bad, undeserved empire (the German Reich) (MacKenzie, 1984); and it could be plausibly argued that today, this us-vs.-them structure is mirrored onto the British and EU empires.

6.3 Misunderstanding anti-imperialism

Furthermore, as well as “othering” the anti-imperialism argument, the findings suggest that the newspapers in fact misunderstand the anti-imperialism argument. The anti-imperialist movement isn’t, for example, opposed to people celebrating Christmas, as *The Sunday Times* suggests. In other examples too, the newspapers demonstrate a misunderstanding. For example, *The Times* argues that “purging western thinkers to please students is wrong”. However, the anti-imperialism argument does not want to “purge” Western thinkers but to engage with them critically, instead of blindly celebrating figures who contributed to empire. This is not to “please” students, but to engage with history and the importance of its impact on today’s world. In another editorial which derides the anti-imperialism argument, *The Times*...

---

5 *The Sunday Times*, 8 January 2017 – see appendix 2

6 *The Times*, 10 January 2017 – see appendix 1
Times argues that “white western men or Christians can never be offended or hurt because they are themselves innately offensive and hurtful, while ‘powerless’ women or minorities can only ever be their victims”. Yet, this articulation misunderstands and misrepresents the anti-imperialist argument and political correctness. The paper fails to address the power structures behind acts like imperialism, racism and sexism; neglecting to realise that the anti-imperialist argument targets systems of oppression, not individuals.

These representative examples, among others, demonstrate that the editorials only engage with the anti-imperialism argument on a surface level, neglecting to explore the actual arguments of the anti-imperialist movement. This ends in a misunderstanding of who and what the causes and targets of the anti-imperialism movement are. Furthermore, this demonstrates that the editorials are not interested in engaging deeply with the anti-imperialism movement, but that they wish to invalidate the movement without considering its arguments seriously.

6.4 Imperialism as a good thing
As well as portraying British neo-imperialist economic policies as a positive, and expressing admiration and nostalgia for the former empire, the newspapers also express support for imperialism through the way that negative effects of the former empire are dismissed. It has been shown that empire is often presented as a game, and that the newspapers neglect to engage with the significance and impact of imperialism, especially from the perspective of the colonised nations. This ultimately results in the newspapers failing to acknowledge any negative aspects of empire, or when they do, glossing over them. This failure to recognise the negativity of empire, alongside the positive view of neo-imperialism and an admiration and nostalgia for the former empire, support De Chickera’s conviction that media reveals only “a very convenient – selective – view of history. All good. All celebration. No bad. No reflection” (in Black, 2016: 792).

6.5 White past, multicultural present
It is this lack of reflection and engagement with the past that arguably results in a view of the past as being safe, harmonious and white. Revisiting the concept of the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm, it is convincing that this is reflected in the findings of this study. As a reminder, the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm conceived by Littler

---

7 *The Times*, 21 February 2017 – see appendix 1
and Naidoo (2004) describes a perception of history characterised by nostalgia and lamentation for a homogeneously white and “traditional” past, constructed in the image of the nation; which is then contrasted with the “anxiety” of the present and its addition of non-white and non-homogeneous “others” to the society and nation state.

The “white past” part of this concept can be seen in these findings, in the way that the findings demonstrate an admiration and sense of nostalgia towards the former British empire. The empire is portrayed as traditional and safe through the way it is connected to national icons or “heroes” as well as secure markets; it is connected to the nation and national identity; and it implicates a sense of pride in Britain through its comparison to other national achievements. When compared to the present, the newspapers also demonstrate the “multicultural present” aspect of the paradigm, in the way that they express anxieties of the present. The status of Britain’s national sovereignty is seen as being under attack by the EU; British pride, identity and culture is threatened by the anti-imperialist student movement; and secure markets are sought due to Brexit and the economic situation, suggested by the advocation of conquering markets in former colonised states. Thus, the findings partially substantiate Black’s argument that understandings of Britain were once based on an imperialist status, but are now defined by anxieties due to the EU and post-imperialism (Black, 2016). However, they are not fully identical to Black’s argument, as the findings arguably still do present understandings of, and the identity of, Britain through an imperialist frame; yet acknowledge that this frame is under threat.

Further, the “white past” is seen as being attacked and dismissed by the present; in the way that students who advocate for anti-imperialism are portrayed as attacking national icons (such as revered statues), heritage and traditions (such as Christmas). This evokes Hewitt’s argument of a “white backlash”, which he defines as a perceived “unfairness” to white people (Hewitt, 2005). Similarly, Skey’s recognition of a sense of loss due to other groups who enter the nation and threaten established identities and traditions links to this, and is demonstrated in the findings in the same way (in Black, 2016: 787). Hewitt also argues that this “white backlash” occurs with the backdrop of decreasing national sovereignty and “threats” of immigration (Hewitt, 2005; Rhodes, 2010), which can also be seen in the findings within the anxieties of the present, especially around Brexit and the EU’s role.

6.6 Exceptions to the rule

Of course, there are exceptions to the general themes found in the newspapers. Generally, it was found that most editorials advocated for neo-imperialist economic policies and expressed
admiration and nostalgia for empire. However, there were a handful of editorials which disagreed with the dominant discourse. Some editorials, for example, mocked and warned against imperialist nostalgia, for example by stressing that the nation should follow “a democratic present rather than an imperial past”, or called Empire 2.0 a “dangerous post-Brexit fantasy”.\(^8\) Mocking imperialist nostalgia was also apparent in a few examples which argued against Brexit, opposing the dominant narrative. These examples recognised that imperial nostalgia, linked to nationalism within Brexit, existed. However, they then proceeded to mock this, or argue that it was “delusional”.\(^9\) Finally, some editorials also went against the dominant narrative attacking students and the anti-imperialism argument, and in fact defended students, arguing that students should critically engage with the past.\(^10\)

Yet, most of the editorials which were exceptions to the rule only went so far in diverting from the dominant narrative – for example, defending students’ arguments but then still arguing that statues should never be taken down; or arguing against “Empire 2.0” but then stating that this phrase, which criticises the advocation of neo-imperialism, is “unkind”.\(^11\) Therefore, few editorials completely opposed the dominant discourse, and through agreeing with some aspects of those editorials which fit the general themes, the exceptions (at least partially) justify the dominant perspective.

### 6.7 Hegemony

So far, the findings have established that the newspapers construct a nostalgia for empire; they present imperialism as the “us” against the “others” of anti-imperialism, former imperial colonies, and the EU; they represent positives of the former empire and of neo-imperialism whilst dismissing the negatives; and finally they portray the traditional “white past” as safe and traditional, under the threat of a “multicultural present”. Underlying this discourse is a sense of nationalism, implicated in the search and protection for and of a British national identity, markets, and a role in the world. With this established, it is worth questioning why “empire talk” in these newspapers is constructed in this way, keeping the Brexit context in mind. This can be explored via the discourse of hegemony.

Gramsci’s hegemony theory purports that the media “do not construct representations on their own but instead belong to the mechanisms that maintain the existing hegemony, i.e.
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\(^8\) *The Times*, 1 January 2016; *The Times*, 25 March 2017 – see appendix 1

\(^9\) *The Times*, 28 November 2016 – see appendix 1

\(^10\) *The Times*, 20 January 2016; *The Sunday Times*, 2 April 2017 – see appendix 1

\(^11\) *The Times*, 20 January 2016; *The Times*, 25 March 2017 – see appendix 1
institutions that participate in the economy, culture, public opinion and social mobilisation” and thus “intellectually, morally and politically manage society” (Navarro, 2010: 97). In other words, media discourse feeds into and stems from power structures which enable the status quo, through which those in power secure their positions. This is why McChesney argues that journalism is “controlled by those who benefit from existing inequality and the preservation of the status quo” (McChesney, 2001: 13). In this study, it is arguable that The Times and the other newspapers owned by Murdoch express imperialist and nationalist rhetoric, and support for Brexit, as this discourse enables both the newspapers and Murdoch to secure their power. The newspapers support the State in its policies, especially policies which ensure Britain’s status as superior, legitimising its imperial interventions to secure the economic safety and global status of the nation, which the newspapers also benefit from.

Firstly, it is worth noting The Times’ historical connections with State; the editors have historically been in close contact with each Prime Minister of the time (Nevins, 1959), and during the British empire, the paper “received confidential information with the Foreign Office” and was closely linked to the ruling party (Potter, 2004: 38). This suggests reasons why the newspaper may have an interest in supporting the governmental policies of the time. In addition, Murdoch also has an interest in the way imperialism is articulated in his newspapers. As well as maintaining and expanding his worldwide media outlets – which have been accused of media imperialism – Murdoch has also stated himself that his reason for being against the EU is because, “When I go into Downing Street they do what I say; when I go to Brussels they take no notice” (Hilton, 2016). This suggests that close links with the British government are favourable to Murdoch, and that the EU is not; thus, it is not so surprising that his newspapers support the government’s neo-imperial economic policies and ongoing Brexit procedure.

It may be argued that presenting imperialism in a positive light is also financially beneficial for Murdoch and his newspapers. Previously, during the former British empire, MacKenzie found that many non-governmental organisations realised that they could make profit out of promoting imperial patriotism (MacKenzie, 1984). Potter agrees, that “commercially minded newspaper proprietors … seemingly had something to gain from the promotion of popular enthusiasm for imperial expansion” (Potter, 2014: 45). The vested interest in supporting governmental policies and imperialism for profit is explained by Schiller, who sees media as governed by the “same market imperatives that govern the overall system’s production of goods and services” (Schiller, 1976: 6). Therefore, the media also embodies “the ideological features of the world capitalist economy” (Schiller, 1976: 6),
an economy which relies on market dominance and exploitation of the global South. This fact is also demonstrated in the newspaper excerpts, as it is made clear that Britain relies on exploiting former colonial markets. Moreover, McChesney argues that media is generally politically conservative, as “media giants are significant beneficiaries of the current social structure around the world, and any upheaval in property or social relations – particularly to the extent that it reduces the power of business – is not in their interest” (McChesney, 2001: 14).

The global economic system also underlies the way we see nation-states, according to hegemony theory. The findings of this study have shown that the newspapers contain nationalistic rhetoric which is tied to imperialism. This also works within a hegemonic system, as the nation-state is crucial to free-market capitalism, as McChesney (2001) argues. Generally, much of capitalist activity works within national borders, and the nation is crucial in representing national economic interests (McChesney, 2001). It has previously been mentioned that media are likely to support dominant ideologies as supporting the status quo is more beneficial to the media. In this case it can be argued that the newspapers in this study, perhaps even unconsciously, express nationalist rhetoric which supports the hegemonic economic system – which in turn supports the media.

Further, the anxieties created by maintaining the nation’s status in the global economic system can be linked to the concept of “white past, multicultural present”. Poole argues that recent shifts in the “global power equation” have led to “anxieties and attempts by ‘the West’ to maintain its hegemony”; and that “this has been necessary for ‘the West’ in order to reassert its power over an economically rich area and, in doing so, defend its supreme Western identity” (Poole, 2002: 17). This implies that the anxieties of the present are linked to the insecurity of hegemony, which is contrasted with the past. For Western power to now be reasserted, it implies that it was already asserted previously. This argument can be seen in the newspaper excerpts, as the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm is often related “anxieties” such as the EU and the anti-imperialism argument. The excerpts then suggest that Britain was better off in the “white past” of imperialism and a “supreme Western identity”.

In addition, it has been argued that the nationalist rhetoric within the newspaper excerpts, which is arguably also imbued in the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm, represents people who do not subscribe to the nationalist rhetoric or a national British identity built on imperialist legacies and icons as the “other”. This was demonstrated, for example, in the presentation of the EU and of students and their anti-imperialist rhetoric as the “other” of
what Britain stands for. With these newspapers supporting and advocating for British neo-imperialist economic policies, it is not surprising that anti-imperialism is constructed as the “other” in a system that supports the hegemony of the British. In addition, the anti-imperialism argument advocated by students was also recognised as the “other” in the newspapers. Schrecker argues that, in the U.S. context, academia is seen as a haven for “radicals who want to destroy the free enterprise system”, and so business leaders must “destroy the credibility” of the academy in order to ensure the safety of the capitalist system (Schrecker, 2010: 79). Therefore, in this case for example, if newspapers wish to support British economic exploits in terms of benefitting from former colonial markets in a free market system, then academia which condemns the use of these markets cannot also be supported; they are mutually exclusive.

It is worth mentioning at this stage that it may be the case that the newspapers analysed in this study do not consciously subscribe to this argument of hegemony, and are not actively othering students for this purpose. Yet, as aforementioned, critical discourse analysis is interpretative, and it has been argued that supporting the status quo means indirectly supporting the hegemonic global systems at work. Ultimately, the impact of media constantly criticising academia and the anti-imperialism argument is still crucial in upholding hegemonic constructs. As Wilson argues, the “crusade” against these sorts of arguments “has silenced the deeper questions about quality and equality that our colleges and universities must face” (Wilson, 1995: 2) and:

By criticising anyone who dares to discuss race, class, and gender, by attacking all multiculturalism as political indoctrination, by misrepresenting the facts about the PC controversy, and by failing to consider the arguments of the other side, the conservatives and the media distorted what might have been (and what still can be) a productive debate about our universities (Wilson, 1995: 3).

Wilson’s argument is quite applicable to this study; the findings have shown that the newspapers criticise anti-imperialism arguments or anti-racism arguments which criticise imperial history. The newspapers also misunderstand the anti-imperialism arguments and fail to consider them as they are immediately dismissed without being taken seriously. In this study, it is not apparent that the newspapers “attack” multiculturalism, and so this is where the findings diverge from Wilson. However, by maintaining the status quo and failing to engage with debates about the representation of the past – and its links to the present – the
media is complicit in the maintenance of imperialist and hegemonic systems of power which prioritise Western global dominance. Therefore, questioning why the newspapers represent “empire talk” in a certain way is necessary in order to understand the systems underlying “empire talk”, and to understand how the media benefits from expressing certain representations and not others.
Conclusion

The aim of this thesis was to explore the relationship between media and imperialism, the role that nationalism plays within this, and ultimately how imperialism is discussed in Murdoch’s British newspapers during Brexit. After analysing editorials using critical discourse analysis, it was found that, generally, the newspapers dismissed the anti-imperialism argument by invalidating and criticising the proponents of the argument – students and academia – and by dismissing negative effects and wider impacts of British imperialism on colonised nations. The newspapers also expressed a nostalgia for an imperial identity, through suggesting a longing for a glorified imperial past and by linking British values and identity inherently to empire. Finally, the newspapers portrayed a glorified British imperialism in opposition to the EU, by representing British neo-imperialistic economic policies as a positive thing whilst damning the EU’s “empire” as a bad, even evil, structure.

These findings are convincing as they support the theories and arguments outlined in the theoretical framework. Firstly, nationalistic rhetoric in these newspapers implicates imperialist sentiment and the editorials generally express an admiration for the former empire and support for neo-imperial policies. This continues the trend of studies which have linked media with imperialism.

Secondly, the “white past, multicultural present” paradigm is applicable to these findings (Littler & Naidoo, 2004), as the former empire is glorified as a safe sphere with a secure national identity; whilst the present is beset by worries over threats to Britain’s imperial sovereignty by the anti-imperialist argument and by the EU’s empire. This also reflects the “white backlash” concept (Hewitt, 2005), as an imperialist British national sovereignty, identity and heritage is seen as being under attack, and so the newspapers retort by dismissing and criticising these threats. Finally, the discussion of hegemony has questioned why the newspapers discuss empire in this way. It has been suggested that the newspapers work within greater power structures which favour imperialist rhetoric in order to maintain a status quo in which capitalist and Western governmental demands rely upon manifestations of imperialism and nationalism.

The findings of this thesis have important implications. As aforementioned, discourse does things as well as says things; it acts through language (Austin, 1962). Kaul argues that the press shapes empire and empire shapes the press (Kaul, 2006). If this is the case, then the “empire talk” in these newspapers plays a role in shaping British manifestations of imperialism. It has been demonstrated that the newspapers express admiration for the former
empire, and support or advocate for neo-imperialist economic policies, and if this discourse indeed shapes empire then it suggests a support for British neo-imperialism.

These implications are vital to note during Brexit. Due to its exit from the EU, Britain is searching for new trade deals and relationships with nations, and a new identity and role in the world. If media discourse impacts on how empire is shaped, then awareness and caution must be taken in terms of the role that current imperialistic rhetoric within the media plays during this process.

As well as having implications for institutions and structures, the findings also have implications for individuals in the general public. Temple argues that all opinions should be free to be expressed in the public sphere and that readers can make up their own minds (Temple, 2010). However, this is a neoliberal view which neglects to take into consideration the power structures and psychology at work behind framing. Following the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, structural features of a language cause us to think in certain ways (Hoijer, 1954); thus, the use of sarcasm and certain syntax structures which deride the anti-imperialism movement are likely to set much of the readership against the anti-imperialism movement also – and by the same token, in favour of historical and current forms of imperialism. Again, this is especially significant during the Brexit context as, to a certain extent, the discourse in these newspapers is likely to shape readers’ views about national identity, the British empire, and “others” such as the EU and the anti-imperialist movement. This may then have impacted on how people voted in the referendum, and how they perceive and treat non-white and/or non-British people in Britain.

Moreover, Potter argued that structural and rhetorical devices which expressed imperialist sentiment have resulted in limiting the public sphere to an “imperial public sphere” (Potter, 2007: 638). This concept may be seen in the findings as the site of deliberation both in the newspapers themselves and created by the newspapers is shaped towards a certain nostalgic view of imperialism. Indeed, the application of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and Kaul’s conviction that the press shapes empire and empire shapes the press both, substantiate Potter’s argument. This imperial public sphere has negative consequences for productive deliberation. As previously highlighted, Wilson argues that the media’s criticism and distortion of the discussion about race, class, gender and political correctness results in a failure to engage in productive debate (Wilson, 1995).

Furthermore, this imperial public sphere, the dismissal of the anti-imperialist movement, and the nostalgic and generally positive view of the former empire and neo-imperialism in the newspapers impact upon which discourses are recognised in the
newspapers, and which are not. The anti-imperialist movement is not recognised as a valid and legitimate discourse as it is constantly dismissed and not taken seriously. In newspapers which frame imperialism in a nostalgic and positive way and which dismiss critiques of empire, those who disagree are not given a platform as their validity is constantly questioned. Thus, people who have been negatively impacted by and/or disagree with empire cannot speak in this newspaper. As well as having concerning implications for journalistic values of objectivity, this is also significant for the Brexit context, as it encourages similar perspectives and public discourse which exclude unfavourable opinions.

That being said, it must be recognised that this thesis has limitations. Firstly, the thesis neglects to look at the individual writers of the editorials; which would provide more thorough analysis, as each journalist has differing viewpoints despite contributing to the same newspaper. In addition, the keywords used to search for relevant editorials are very explicitly related to imperialism, and so they neglect to identify more insidious forms of “empire talk”. Indirect words implying a sense of imperialism, for example descriptions of Britain “interfering” in other nations, have been identified by scholars including Harvey (Harvey, 2003). Furthermore, when discussing how the editorials frame current or future relations with former colonial nations from a neo-imperial perspective, the analysis does not take into account the governmental or economic policies which are being discussed themselves, and so it is difficult to fully analyse the descriptions of them without being aware of their actual content and workings. Again, it is worth mentioning that these editorials are analysed via critical discourse analysis, which is an interpretative methodology. Thus, the conclusions drawn are based on interpretations by the researcher, founded on methods of critical discourse analysis as explained by other scholars (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 2001; Carvalho, 2008; Gee, 2011). Finally, this thesis briefly touches on the role of hegemony in accounting for newspaper coverage of “empire talk”, yet this theory is not discussed in depth, or in terms of how it has been critiqued or applied to other newspapers.

Future research could build from this thesis, for instance by looking at non-direct examples of “empire talk” as suggested above. This thesis looked only at editorials, and so it would also be worth looking at “empire talk” in the news sections and even in culture and feature sections. This is especially necessary when we consider that media imperialism often operates through a cultural imperialism lens, by imposing Western culture onto other cultures: for instance in Murdoch’s Star TV (Thussu, 2007). It would also be interesting to compare more left-wing British newspapers, such as The Guardian and the online-only Independent, with the newspapers discussed in this thesis in terms of their representation of
“empire talk”. Then the ideologies of each paper would perhaps become more starkly demonstrated. Finally, future research could analyse the role of hegemony more thoroughly in how it relates to these newspapers specifically, to assess to what extent it accounts for the manifestations of “empire talk” in these newspapers.

In terms of existing research, there has been little to no scholarly interest into imperialist rhetoric in the contemporary media. This thesis addresses this lacuna, contributing to the existing body of research by demonstrating that researching the manifestations of imperialist rhetoric produces notable and significant results. These findings add to previous literature by applying concepts from media studies but also from sociology and from history, finding that these concepts are relevant and fruitful for research in this field. The thesis therefore suggests that an interdisciplinary perspective is useful when conducting studies of the media. Remembering the conception of this thesis, the research was sparked by curiosity as to whether accusations of media imperialism bear any significance upon imperialist rhetoric within the media itself. After this study, it can be noted that Murdoch, who has been accused of media imperialism, owns newspapers which reflect imperialist rhetoric. This thesis therefore addresses the ways that ideologies can be manifested within journalism, and highlights critical discourse analysis as a useful tool for uncovering them. Moreover, within a context of an ongoing Brexit procedure, the findings of this thesis are highly relevant to understanding imperialistic implications within the nationalism of the pro-Leave campaign, and in the ways in which the government has addressed this situation. Ultimately, this thesis has shown that the results of analysing “empire talk” are highly significant both to the study of media and to today’s socio-political context.
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Appendix 1: *The Times* research

“Empire”

- January 1, 2016:

Title: Our honours are entirely without merit; Britain must replace its Ruritanian prizégiving ceremony for grown-ups mocking with something we can all be proud of

Content: I have no objection to honouring the nation's best as long as the awards obey the principles of merit and express a democratic present rather than an imperial past. Empire and democracy mutually exclusive; empire as dictatorial and backwards then. The titles are obsolete now that there is no British Empire to have an Order of. so suggesting that in some ways our traditions are stuck in the past and that this is somewhat silly

- January 2, 2016:

Title: Read Rudyard Kipling instead of pulling down statues makes it seem violent, ignorant and without reason; Arguments about Britain’s colonial legacy should be about remembering history, not destroying reminders of it has misinterpreted the argument for taking down statues then – belong in museums, not to be celebrated. It’s not about destroying it. So they haven’t really listened to the students

Content: Awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1907 elite-focused journalism, substantiating his reputation, Kipling also had a gift for controversy, largely because, as a result of his apprenticeship in India, he became a strong advocate for the British Empire. A Gladstonian liberal as a teenager, he came to admire the dedication of the soldiers, engineers and administrators who, as he saw it, were bringing health, justice and stability to the Raj. no critique, just presenting Kipling’s view almost as fact

This enthusiasm, amounting to obsession, for the empire, led him to befriend Rhodes.

So far as I know, no one has suggested banning Kipling. mocks the idea of banning him and so mocks the dismantling of Rhodes’ statue, presenting it as not rational But in the past he has endured long periods of disapproval and often censorship (now beginning to shift), when commentators, spurred on by George Orwell in a famous essay in 1942, felt it easier to condemn Kipling for his conservative and often dubious politics than to acknowledge his literary brilliance.

However the RMF lobby ? is onto something. Like Kipling in those stories, we do need to interrogate our past; the histories of slavery and the Raj are being rewritten. so passing up responsibility; saying it’s being dealt with so that’s ok We just shouldn’t destroy the evidence. again, misunderstanding the students’ argument

- January 27, 2016

Title: We need to hear from the middle class; Those who once forged the empire, invented the Tunnock’s teacake and joined the golf club funny comparisons: all quintessentially British and two of them enjoyable and fun. ‘forged the empire’ sounds like an accolade have now tilted left

Content: Scotland's middle class was once all-powerful. so now it’s weak It forged the empire, built the industrial revolution, this is hailed as one of the greatest things in history, so comparing empire to it gives empire positive, strong, proud connotations invented the Tunnock's teacake jokey but a good thing and taught its children to get
But then something happened. Instead of embracing capitalism and opting to make more money it tilted leftwards, voted Labour and professed a marked enthusiasm for social justice and the working class. It still does. By switching its support to the SNP, it endorses a party that aims to redistribute wealth, raise taxes and extend the power of the state. Is this bad or good? Can’t really tell from the tone but I think bad – raising taxes has negative connotations, as does extending the power of the state. So basically saying that the Scottish middle class were better before?

- February 12, 2016:

Title: Tories are peddling piffle to glue us to the EU; if we want political freedom the only way is Out. An independent UK will not end up isolated

Content: In Britain, EU membership was pushed by a political class that, after 1945, was demoralised by Britain’s near-bankruptcy and its loss of empire and role in the world. It saw the EU as both a protector and, if not joined, potential threat. So reason for joining the EU due to loss of empire. EU a negative thing.

- March 5, 2016:

Title: We’re mad to turn our backs on vibrant Africa

Content: This is the wrong moment to lose faith in Africa. Post-empire, it’s the moment for Britain to re-set the relationship. Yet not only do I lack confidence we’ve got our Africa policy right, I doubt we even have one. We’ve kept open posts on the continent so the lights are on; but is anybody in Westminster at home? Focus is missing because the people at the top in Whitehall and in politics don’t really think sub-Saharan Africa matters.

I could bore you with figures for Africa’s astonishing share of our planet’s mineral resources, but it’s not just what can be extracted. It is though, because it’s about Britain exploiting Africa for its own gain here: these are real and growing economies, real markets, real consumers.

Take advantage. This is explicitly exploitative! Definitely imperial.

Perhaps, after empire, we did need to step back. Perhaps we did? Wow. Perhaps the pause has been necessary both for ourselves, sounds like someone’s desperate to be oppressed, but ok and for Africa, to reflect on the good and the ill we brought, even mentioning that we brought good is imperialist, and ill downplays the horrors we committed. But that’s over. Empire is over now so we can start again? What Africa has now is promise, energy and possibility. For us this is no time to turn away.

- March 21, 2016:
Title: Britain leads the world in saving our blue planet

We lead – power. saving – we are heroic, selfless. “our” planet: whose? Britain’s?; A quiet revolution is going on to protect hundreds of unique species in the waters surrounding UK overseas territories.

Content: Britain may no longer have an empire, but it still rules a heck of a lot of waves. Presented as a positive thing (ruling waves) – and then compared with empire, still a positive/hailing our power and success. One of the manifesto commitments of the Conservative party in the last election was to create a “blue belt” of marine protected zones around the 14 overseas territories that still belong to this country. We are doing good then, we have territory and we are protecting it better than anyone else can. It has started fulfilling the promise and is already protecting more of the sea than any other nation.

- April 1, 2016:

Title: Folly

Not serious, unimportant, childish, a joke of Academe; Imperial College must stay imperial disassociation, a pint must be a pint about British values and identity.

Content: Even more grim is the targeting of Imperial College. First to go will be the college motto, Scientia imperii decus et tutamen, or “Knowledge is the adornment and protection of the Empire”. If the insurgents barbaric, ruining things, reckless, not knowledgeable or articulate have their way, empire will have to go, and perhaps even knowledge. Joking but mocking the students as being ridiculous.

Imperial measures will have to follow Imperial College. Will we be required not like being told what to do to enter whose? Clearly not the students’ pub, no longer named the Royal Oak or King William, why? and ask not for an imperial pint but 568.2 millilitres of bitter? What does this matter? About British identity?

- April 16, 2016:

Title: You who?

Us vs. them can’t brainwash presenting Remainers as brainwashed, not rational every Brexiteer granny small, old, fragile – we should be helping them; It’s patronising and outrageous that Remain campaigners think the elderly should simply obey their young overlords. Remainers as arrogant then.

Content: Wise old age we should respect this is now trumped by the prescience of youth. The young talk of open borders: the old wonder how nations will collect tax, old people as rational, knowledgeable, practical whereas young as idealistic and impractical, whimsical. The old know that before empires fall, they overexpand. Not sure what this means. Empires as EU? EU empire always presented as a bad thing. They hear young people hail as progressive an accountable bureaucracy that makes British fishermen chuck their catch in landfill against British values, unethical, sad and suppresses wages even presents it as anti-working class, then and they laugh. Yet old Brexiteers must have come to such views not through experience but because they are narrow-minded, maybe gaga. From my Janus-headed middle age, the old look stubborn, the young seem shallow fools. Neither has a monopoly on truth.

- April 22, 2016:

Title: By staying in the EU we can help dismantle it

Amid the scare stories put about by both sides, there may be one good reason for voting Remain.
Content: In the long run, the EU is probably doomed, just as the British Empire looked doomed in 1945, comparing EU to empire – empire as flawed then which raises a further thought. No other country in the world has more historical experience of dismantling a crumbling political institution empire as weak and crumbling, but not inherently negative then from within, relatively painlessly, for us than the UK.

- May 2, 2016:

Title: Britain’s role has been to break up Europe; The English Channel has kept us apart from continental wrangling. Now we have a chance to engage more globally

Content: If the Strait of Dover had been six times wider, we would never have joined the Common Market, because we would have had an even more distinct culture. If it had been one sixth as wide, we would be unlikely to be having this referendum because we would have been repeatedly incorporated into European empires and would feel far more blurred in our nationality; EU empires as bad, hegemonic, monopolising, culture-destroying

When a hegemon aspires to monopolise the continent, EU is this it is often Britain that proves hardest to harmonise, because of the Channel. The empire then cuts us off from trade, no discussion of the British empire as having done this to other countries as Charlemagne, Innocent III, Charles V, Louis XIV, Bonaparte, the Kaiser and Hitler comparing the EU to Hitler, wow all did to various degrees and at various times. Yet it is often Britain that provides the resistance and causes the hegemon to fall, we destroy oppressive empires then? Ironic

- June 3, 2016:

Title: Once I bought into the EU dream, like the American dream, which we all know is deceiving

Now I’m voting Out

Content: Back in the mid-1990s, I was the president of the UK branch of the Young European Federalists, justifies the alternative opinion by saying that they used to believe otherwise To my mind, those who didn't want to fully immerse Britain into a United States of Europe were backwardlooking, small-minded nationalists still suffering from a post-imperial hangover, joking, empire not serious, but connotations as a bad thing for people who think this way even several decades after our empire had disappeared. this as incorrect then, as has changed mind since then. Demonstrating that this is what Remainers think, but that they are wrong

- June 15, 2016:

Title: Let’s face it, the EU rescued us from failure; Would Britain risk joining if it wasn’t a member? No chance. That doesn’t change the fact we’ve had a 40-year success story

Content: Britain was, not to put too fine a point on it, failing. It was being overtaken economically by Germany and overpowered by France. The end of Empire was coming this was a failure for Britain, so whilst it was at a high point it was a success then and the Commonwealth seemed unlikely to provide a secure source of either economic or diplomatic power. The Americans, crucial to our defence and international clout, were clear that their primary interest in any kind of special relationship was our ability to act as a bridge with other European countries. EU necessary as we “failed” with our own empire
• July 26, 2016:

Title: Like independence, Brexit is not a cure-all; The emotional impulse to leave the European Union is a response to Britain's perceived international irrelevance so Britain feels a need to feel important

Content: And there is a paradox too: Britain's belated entry into the European Community was itself a response to the fading embers of Empire. Fading embers is quite romanticised; Empire was a fire then, warm and strong but also destructive. History made the old map obsolete; something new was needed. But Britain, and especially England, was never a wholehearted participant in the new arrangements. The pooling of sovereignty - in exchange for more vigorous economic growth - always stuck in many a craw. Britain put up with the EU but never loved it.

Europe was a kind of comfortable trap. Good enough, perhaps, for lesser countries but Britain, and especially England, is not a lesser country. England/Britain identity. Power complex, superiority. So suggesting Brexiteers are misguided, egoistic and longing for imperial past. For the more highfalutin Brexiteer, this was all you needed to know.

• October 1, 2016:

Title: Army lion who boosted morale with his roar promotes this man as credible, strong, even heroic; Allan Mallinson looks at General Lord Dannatt, author of a new book that analyses changes in British soldiering

Content: The demands of empire were great, too, though post-1945 these were of decolonisation and the defeat of communist or ultra-nationalist insurgencies. For the first time in her history, therefore, Britain accepted conscription - "National Service" - in peacetime.

General Lord Dannatt recounts these campaigns, in truth presents this as the truth the "melancholy, long, withdrawing roar powerfullness, reminiscent of a wounded lion or something" from empire, withdrawing from empire was sad then with authority and pace - with the insights of one who has served widely and commanded on operations at many levels.

• October 14, 2016:

Title: Brexiteers don’t want a brick wall at our border; Ignore the distortions of the Remainers manipulating the facts aka lying – June 23 was a vote for democratic hailed as the best thing control, not for a blanket ban on migration

Content: The brute fact that seventeen and a half million people reflected on the record of the EU, considered the costs of our membership and concluded that it was better to leave a dysfunctional, anti-democratic compared to post-Brexit democracy, growth-strangling, job-destroying, market-rigging, hopeshredding empire EU empire always bad of failed dreams and make power accountable once more seems impossible to accept.

• March 20, 2017:

Title: Britain must make sure that India is a friend; The empire left unhealed wounds not really accountability but post-Brexit Britain will need markets imperialism again then! Exploitation for capitalism and a free flow of Indian talent and goodwill the subject. They must have goodwill so that Britain can get what it wants
And it was we British who impoverished it. So argues Inglorious Empire, a remarkable new book by the Indian MP Shashi Tharoor, a former candidate for secretary general of the United Nations who is being touted as a potential leader of the Congress Party.

It left me wondering why Indians are generally so well disposed towards their former imperial mistress downplaying the events; making it seem sexy and naughty and tempting. Post-Brexit, reaching out to the fast-growing economies of the world, we us vs them will need that goodwill so we need them to be complicit basically, but we are currently doing too little to continue earning it. We are squandering our soft power admitting that we want to use soft power/soft imperialism.

The critics of empire at home, from Adam Smith to John Ruskin, were right that empire was a predatory racket. clever as it distances this new imperialism from old imperialism

After 1947, despite having a language rich in Indian words, from shampoo to hullabaloo, from juggernaut to jamboree, Britain all but forgot about India, turned its back on empire, downplaying decolonisation rewrote its story as that of a plucky underdog standing up to the Nazi bully, and eventually reached out to Europe instead. Brexit could be another turning point. More than almost any other country, India will matter to Britain in the coming years: as a market, an ally, an innovator, a source of talent things that are useful to Britain's capital and - despite everything what is everything? Doesn’t detail - a friend.

- March 25, 2017:

Title: Club of Rome referring to Roman empire which ultimately fell; As they celebrate its 60th birthday, the EU’s leaders must urgently address how to overhaul outdated and failing institutions. If they fail, voters will punish them

Content: The union, mimicking empires of the past, it’s a bad thing when EU does it has become a victim of imperial overstretch.

- March 25, 2017:

Title: Empire 2.0 is a dangerous post-Brexit fantasy; Visit Australia and you’ll understand how far it has moved away from the motherland and how little a trade deal matters

Content: Australia always spooks me. It's so English - and it so isn't. Maybe that's what has foxed the poor fools imperialists in Britain now struggling to convince themselves that after we leave the European Union we can slot straight back into the days of Empire and pick up where we left off.

"Empire 2.0" was an unkind way so they should be kind about imperialist ideas? for civil servants to sneer at the idea, but when you listen to the kind of Tory backbencher who insists on conversion into Fahrenheit and still favours the double-breasted suit, and to a whole nest of commentators in the pro-Brexit media, you really do get the impression of a cadre for whom Imperial Airways, Pathé News and the old white Commonwealth feels like only yesterday. takes the mick out of imperialists, presents them as old and backwards and out-of-touch with today’s reality

It wasn't only yesterday. It was three generations ago. And it wasn't the common market that put paid to our post-imperial family of nations; it was Britain's slow relative decline, our dominions' advance still presenting them as backwards and not
acknowledging the necessity to move beyond imperialism from moral grounds, and then the Second World War.

• April 1, 2017:

Title: It’s time to deploy Princess Anne in a Union Jack dress joking, like the Spice Girls, ridiculous

Content:

The royal family is being drafted in to a European charm offensive. The Queen will do the charm, Prince Philip will do the rest. Forget negotiating strategies and non-tariff barriers, apparently the thing that is going to secure Britain a better red, white and blue Brexit deal with the EU is a battalion of royals fanning out across the Continent to point at things and ask, "Have you come far?" in two dozen languages. mocks the superiority complex of Britain

Ever enthusiastic, Prince Edward already has a tattoo promoting Empire 2.0, with the 2 and 0 on either buttock completely mocking the idea of Empire 2.0. To demonstrate our new ambition for exports recognises the capitalistic value, the farther-flung countries will be sold tea chests of Duchess of York commemorative plates, which Fergie has had in a lock-up since 1986.

At no point are the royals allowed to express a view on Brexit, even through interpretive dad-dancing. Instead they must just amble around in front of half-bored crowds like the papier-mâché dummies in It’s a Royal Knockout.

It would be silly to suggest this onslaught alone will make any great difference to the EU negotiations. But if things take a turn for the worst and no deal is looking worse than a bad deal, we always have one last trump card to force the Europeans into submission: Prince Andrew.

• April 18, 2017:

Title: Let’s hope the new Smiley doesn’t betray us; The time is ripe for the return of Le Carre’s spy – as long as his creator sticks up for the West sounds like someone’s desperate to be oppressed, but ok; evocative of anti-PC rhetoric

Content: The great theme is betrayal, not just personal or national but existential. Bill Haydon, the traitor who betrays his country, is seen as having been himself betrayed by the loss of his country's very sense of identity.

After empire, those who wished to serve their country strong, good-willed, nationalist, heroic no longer knew what it stood for about British national identity – tied to empire. This is what Peter Guillam, hero of the new novel, described in Tinker Tailor Soldier Spy as the betrayal of a whole "notion of English calling" which, although "vague, understated and elusive", was no less shatteringly felt by its loss.

So far, so timely and excellent. equating loss of empire and loss of identity in this book with the context in the UK

There are also obvious parallels with today's fraught arguments over national identity and inchoate enemies.

• May 29, 2017:
Title: England’s lack of national pride is a problem; The Irish have a powerful, cheerful sense of identity, whereas celebrating Englishness is often seen as shameful or racist. Neglects to look at the history behind it, just compares the two; suggesting that we should be proud despite of shame or racism or even that these claims are not correct.

Content: The left-liberal cadre dismissive, mocking has prissily mocking, suggests that it’s not strong discarded the distinctive Englishness of its roots: say that you like morris dancing, that change-ringing is an art or Kipling underrated, traditional British culture and they us vs. them irrationally juvenile, not adult or intelligent assume that you’re on the fascist fringe.

It is not because the Irish are fewer - Americans manage more open pride than we do. You may say it is shame about our bygone definitely presented as over, and not criticised empire, so our identity is innately connected to empire! yet the French, Dutch, Spanish and Portuguese often behaved worse like kids in a playground, not real and are not crippled British are the ones hurt, ones to be sorry for with awkwardness. No: this deficit of proud identity is an English disease strong word: negative. So we should have a proud identity, and it matters. For if you’re sure of who you are and can celebrate it, you’re more likely to welcome outsiders with a cheerful, unsuspicous: “This is how we rock, we’re like this - tell us about you?” completely neglects to look at other side of things or reflect on history.

If you’re sure of who you are, you can welcome outsiders

“Imperial”

- January 20, 2016:

Title: It’s right to chisel away at Rhodes’ reputation; Memorials to controversial figures should never be torn down, but students are right to want their flaws highlighted confusing argument, contradicting itself

Content: Rhodes shouldn’t fall. His statue commemorates an extraordinary if dubious individual and his contribution to Oxford. Sadly so it would have been better to not interrogate relics of imperialism, then – to not engage with this history this imperial adventurer completely downplays significance of this; presents it like a childish game has also become caught up in a wider battle about free speech that cannot and must not be lost so need to talk about free speech, but shouldn’t be too disruptive. But it is right, just as it has been at Mount Vernon, to ensure, with signs and exhibitions, that his memorial is seen in context, as part of a life in which he did much harm recognises his harmful effects then at least. And perfectly reasonable for students to urge this course upon the university. standing up for students!

- March 26, 2016:

Title: Despite the noise, Scots don’t want to go; British superiority, also us vs. them The referendum debate polarised opinion but contrary to what we’re told, many came away more British than not

Content: The old dog of Britishness British bulldog, iconic but seems strong and likeable, soft and harmless, we should protect it (everybody likes old dogs) has more life left in her than we’ve been led to think. Stemming from Linda Colley’s 1992 book Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1827, the notion has taken hold writer doesn’t agree with it that British identity is bankrupt. Since that identity was built in the common Protestant struggle against Catholic dominance in the 16th and 17th centuries, and then in the shared enterprise innovative, entrepreneur, business of the British Empire,
acknowledges that the identity was built with the empire it follows (so the theory goes writer obviously disagrees with this) that post-Christian and post-imperial Britons no longer have anything to bind them together.

But whatever the chattering classes mocks them; bourgeoisie, seem lazy as just chattering; chatter is not important have been telling themselves convincing themselves of; so not true, the empirical data doesn't back it. On the contrary, British identity in Scotland has been consistently bullish strong, rising steadily over the past 15 years.

- April 30, 2016:

Title: Looming Schism; The stain of antisemitism may not kill off Labour’s hopes in London’s mayoral election, but it will demand a statesmanship the party conspicuously lacks Corbyn as weak; Labour as weak

Content: That takes the problem Corbyn is a problem back to where it begins, with the Labour leader. Mr Corbyn has spent his whole political life in leftwing fringe groups seems like not “real politics”; activism whose animating belief is that colonial and imperial power is the villain in the world. writer dismisses this as a legitimate belief (also makes it sound like a Disney movie) They do not regard the liberal democracies hails these as examples to be emulated but as sources of danger and hypocrisy. As long as this view was confined to the margins it could be dismissed. Unfortunately so it should have been confined to the margins and dismissed it now runs through the leader of the opposition.

- July 29, 2016:

Title: Our Middle East carve-up is no cause for shame so “carving up” the Middle East isn’t a bad thing; The Balfour declaration and other milestones achievements, successful in our imperial history show how hard we tried to do the right thing so that makes it all fine? Impact over intent. The entitlement

- August 22, 2016:

Title: We’re guilty of island arrogance on languages; It’s ironic that the young voted to Remain but, to judge by their A-level choices, only want to converse with the world in English anti-students again, invalidating their political conviction. Ironic that they’re presenting Remainers as arrogant/thinking of themselves as superior. Recognising that Leavers are also arrogant, but at least their politics are consistent!

Content: It is hard not to connect British linguistic reluctance with our endemic national weakness native to Britain: island arrogance and a half-conscious memory of the days when we were an imperial force. imperialism still in the minds of people then/imperialistic complex It creates a pleasing but dangerous conviction so recognises that it is not correct that our islands are the natural centre of the world, and that we speak a uniquely rich and wonderful tongue which absorbed the best of all others to make something special (there's a scintilla of truth in that Agrees that English is the best language, but no call to be smug). The result is a vague feeling that English is the natural default language, the "normal" one. So if the world wants to speak with us, it will do so in English. We gloss over the fact that the practical truth of this is due to the global dominance of America deflecting responsibility.

- November 8, 2016:

Title: Lady Scotland must get a grip or quit Commonwealth job
Britain’s role as a world power has diminished since its imperial heyday defined as greatest success. The Commonwealth of Nations, founded on the principle of equality between Britain and the six dominions, would have become an anachronism if it had not reformed over the years. The creation of the Commonwealth Secretariat in 1965 symbolised a post-colonial order.

- November 28, 2016:

Title: We are no longer special in America’s eyes; President Trump will increasingly be looking to Russia as our post-Brexit influence wanes

Content: This is not to deny the depth of British yearning for distinctive and exclusive bonds yearning for being special, powerful, part of the same post-imperial think they mean neo-imperial? Because they recognise that it is not “post” hubris excessive pride/self-confidence that drove the leaders of the Brexit campaign connects Brexit to imperialism. But it is delusional, and delusions are inherently dangerous. imperialistic mindset as delusional and dangerous

- February 1, 2017:

Title: Punching above our weight is just what Britain needs arrogant, as if we can play a big role in the world

Content: So the moral of the story is clear: we British must get real, forswear our lingering imperial pretensions assertions and affectations; recognises that they still exist, stop playing poodle to the US, and leave the world's policing to the UN.

Britain should continue to punch above its weight. Even at the height of our imperial power we seldom fought alone and often paid others to do our fighting for us. can’t tell if this is portrayed as positive or negative?! Positive considering next sentence Among Wellington's troops at Waterloo, Britons were a minority. In 1999 Mr Blair- most unpoodle-like so glorifying Blair for not being pushed by US but rather pushing US - skilfully manoeuvred positive a reluctant President Clinton into putting American military muscle behind intervention in Kosovo compared with previous sentence about others doing our fighting for us – seems like it hails it as a good thing.

By all means let's have post-imperial modesty modesty recognises greatness/achievements but let's refuse post-imperial sulking. sulking as childish Just because we can’t be No 1 any more doesn't mean that we're nothing. arrogant; might not be No 1 but we can be No 2 then

- March 2, 2017:

Title: Closed Minds; A leftwards bias at universities is destroying ironic considering destructive legacy of imperialism the purpose of a liberal operative word education

Content: Speakers are barred for criticising Islam and statues that honour we should respect imperial leaders leading figures from Britain’s imperial age are deemed offensive. this is wrong according to the writer – so shouldn’t engage with past or criticise imperialism or anti-Islam rhetoric

- March 28, 2017:

Title: May and Sturgeon touting mince as caviar; Leaders have their work cut out presenting Brexit or independence as palatable and digestible
There has been, I confess, something hackle-raising about Theresa May's quasi-regal progress through the United Kingdom in the days before the formal triggering of Article 50 tomorrow. It carries a whiff of some imperial tour of far-distant provinces whose people are expected to be awed and grateful subjects of power expected to be grateful; mocks this as not being realistic, same as imperialism for this rare glimpse of real prime ministerial power. In a better-ordered world, the prime minister coming to Scotland would not count as "news".

- March 29, 2017:

Title: Britain’s Rubicon; Negotiators on all sides in the Brexit process that starts today must put short-termism aside and think of the future generations that will judge them

Content: Britain’s debate on whether to join what was then the EC spanned more than a decade. It was dominated by the country's search for a post-imperial role, EU as solution to end of empire and by French fears of a Britain tied so closely to the United States. British Euroscepticism was already well developed. Empire – EU – Brexit tied together, chronologically and almost inevitable The argument that such an old democracy had no business surrendering an ounce of sovereignty to Brussels found willing adherents in both main parties.

- April 4, 2017:

Title: Howard’s Way; The former Conservative leader has debased the Brexit debate and insulted an ally

Content: Britain has exercised sovereignty over Gibraltar since being granted it under the treaty of Utrecht in 1713, but its continued title is not some imperial hangover. Almost all Gibraltarians (almost 99 per cent in a referendum in 2002) reject the notion of shared sovereignty, so Gibraltar happy with British rule then let alone of ceding this British overseas territory to Spain.

The use of military power to enforce trade really was a part of British imperial history recognises this, as with the ignoble downplaying! opium wars with China in the mid-19th century. It is tempting to laugh as if this can’t be possible again; recognises that it is ridiculous to imagine doing the same nowadays at a politician who imagines that trade disputes can be enforced that way now. But Lord Howard's assertions are not funny it is serious; recognises that people genuinely think like this. They have been widely cited in Europe and they damage Britain's interests Britain portrayed as imperialist in Europe – not good for reputation.

- April 4, 2017:

Title: We’re confused who this refers to more like the English than ever before; It is precisely because we are so similar to our neighbours that so many demand independence

Content: Sometimes it is tempting to think we must be living through a real-life version of an Ealing comedy hailed as best traditional British comedy. In certain quarters, Brexit appears to be a question of restoring imperial measurements mocking Brexit then, purchasing a new yacht for the royal family, recolouring our passports blue and even, if only in jest, going to war with Spain to protect Britain's ownership of Gibraltar. As Tony Hancock later asked, did Magna Carta die in vain joking but presenting Brexit as against
human rights? And for this? Quite possibly. Still, all these post-Brexit entertainments not serious, ridiculous and unthinkable even brought to mind the classic Ealing comedy Passport to Pimlico

- June 10, 2017:

Title: The SNP has been too smug to learn from the English

Content: All of this has been overseen by a leadership with delusions of imperial grandeur not real, never going to happen, arrogant and invincibility. Scots noticed the arrogance and incompetence connoted with imperialism, and pushed the SNP down to 37 per cent of the vote compared with 50 per cent in 2015.

- July 25, 2017:

Title: We don’t need the cult of Diana revived again; Emotional incontinence that followed the princess’s death has now become almost compulsory

Content: As the embodiment of the nation, however, the monarchy reflects back to the public attributes with which they identify and can admire. King George VI reflected stoicism in the Blitz. Queen Victoria reflected imperial power and family strength.

If the monarchy now reflects dysfunctional neediness and narcissistic emotionalism, will the nation really think itself well satisfied?

- July 25, 2017:

Title: It’s still Europe that could rip the Tories apart; The ideological splits over Brexit are so profound that senior figures in the party talk of ‘poison’ and a ‘biblical curse’

Content: Now the Brexit row is about far more than the future of the single market, the free movement of people or the European Court of Justice. It is a battle to define progress and patriotism. The Brexiteers claim to champion outward-looking modernity, but a senior pro-European minister insists that their vision of "global Britain" is a myth. "This row is about the future versus the past - the Brexiteers somehow think we are going to go sailing off into some glorious imperial world quotes this, obviously equating Brexiteers with arrogant imperialists, but this is not The Times’ quote themselves; they remain neutral without realising that in the modern age we are interdependent," he says. "If we try to cancel exit we destroy ourselves; if we go ahead with it we destroy the country. People voted for a fantasy."

“Imperialist”

- March 12, 2016:

Title: Once Rhodes has fallen, your kitchen is next completely mocking students and political correctness; You complacent bourgeois fool! Didn’t you realise how that room glorifies Kitchener, the poster boy for militarism?

Content: #OXFORDSTREETMUSTFALL Why is it called Oxford Street? It doesn’t go to Oxford any more. It’s just an imperialist reminder of an irrelevant old university dismissing the anti-imperialism movement, so dismissing imperialism itself that makes people who went to other universities feel bad. I suggest that we call it "The Other Lame Christmas Shopping Street".
#YourKitchenMustFall Have you forgotten the miseries of the First World War when millions of innocent young men were sacrificed for an imperialist game? Again, by being sarcastic about this it completely dismisses the impact of imperialism after signing up directly because of the recruitment campaign of that mustachioed poster boy for militarism, Field Marshal Horatio Herbert KITCHENER?

#OZYMANDIASMUSTFALLEVENMORE I met a traveller from an antique land who said two vast and trunkless legs of stone stand in the desert. Now, I don't know what this bloke whose legs they were did, or who he was. But if he had a statue put up to him in the olden days then chances are he was a wrong 'un mocking and also presenting students as irrational, ignorant, whimsical, childish and I applaud whichever forward thinking group of activists it was who knocked him down. But why are the legs still there? Why the shattered visage? Why the pedestal with the imperialist legend directly mocking imperialism? I want it all gone, all of it. It's lone and level sands we want around here, and nothing else at all.

- March 26, 2016:

Title: Despite the noise, Scots don’t want to go; The referendum debate polarised opinion but contrary to what we’re told, many came away more British than not

Content: Clearly, some Scottish nationalists completely repudiate Britain and all her neo-liberal, aristocratic, imperialist, war-mongering works sarcasm (being sarcastic at the idea of empire dismisses its significance). They aspire to nothing less than a fully sovereign Scottish state that stands to the UK as Ireland and Denmark now do. Nevertheless, the latest data show that the number of these left-wing separatists paints them sort of as extremists/radicals grew by only 3 per cent over the referendum period, and even now account for little more than a quarter of Scots dismisses them from being legitimate/democratic/relevant.

- May 3, 2016:

Title: Labour is sneering at ‘the wrong kind of voter’; Rather than seek power through ‘big tent’ politics, the left is driven by an ideological purity that is electoral suicide

Content: Mr Corbyn may not be antisemitic himself but a strain of the hard left is. Driven by an anti-western, anticapitalist world view, which lumps Israel in with America as imperialist oppressors equating this with antisemitism, also makes them seem ignorant/not nuanced, not intelligent, these hardliners confuse they are not intelligent hostility to the Jewish state with hatred of Jews. Different factions have competing priorities: the tensions between Mr Corbyn and John McDonnell stem from the fact that the Labour leader is part of the anti-imperialist brigade brigade diminishes their significance and seriousness, dismissive, whose focus has historically been foreign policy, whereas the shadow chancellor's focus is anti-capitalist class war. What unites the camps, though, is the sense that equality is not fought for universally - it is bestowed upon noble cases by the high priests of the left. The political caste system this creates is every bit as divisive as Bullingdon Club snobbery on the right. Favouring the "right kind of victims" is as elitist as promoting those who went to the "right kind of school". There is even a virtue-signalling vocabulary on the left that echoes Nancy Mitford's separation of "U" and "Non-U": instead of "loo" versus "toilet" it's "Zionist" instead of "Israeli" or "cis" rather than "gay man" completely incorrect. The arrogance and moral superiority that's ironic coming from the right are astounding. completely anti-PC and anti-Left.
July 19, 2016:

Title: Trump fans are fired by the spirit of Brexit; Many who wanted to leave the EU were also keen to break a failed political establishment

Content: A nation is formed from cultural attributes: history, language, religion, law, institutions. Western elites not the general population; elitism always seen in opposition to the interests of the population, so anti-imperialism portrayed as this too, however, have decided that anti-democratic, sounds irrational their own national attributes are exclusive and imperialist, leading to nationalism, xenophobia and war.

Legitimacy is deemed to rest instead in transnational institutions, relationships and laws.

Multiculturalism thus became sacrosanct. Immigration couldn't be opposed. Putting the nation's interests first became seen as an act of global selfishness.

October 18, 2016:

Title: Superstition has no place in the modern world; From rural Africa to the Islamic east, western science is under threat and must be defended

Content: The campaign to “decolonise” quotation marks invalidates its seriousness and importance. Sarcastic, mocking. Again, by dismissing anti-imperialism, dismisses imperialism itself academia, which started at the University of Cape Town and then spread to Oxford, where students protested last year against a statue of the Victorian imperialist Cecil Rhodes, has now landed squarely on the head of Isaac Newton

January 10, 2017:

Title: Purging western thinkers to please students misunderstood gravity of argument – it’s not just to please students, it’s to engage with history and its role in today’s world is wrong

Content: Just as with the statue of the objectionable recognises that the people have imperialist histories but downplays the gravity imperialist Cecil Rhodes at Oriel College, Oxford, and just as with the plaque commemorating the vastly unpleasant Belgian king Leopold II that was shamefully taken down shouldn't be removed. Students should have shame last month by Queen Mary University London, these objects of hatred are better left to stand as cultural irritants downplaying than suppressed as unmentionables. Let them be TS Eliot’s symbols perfected in death, and all manner of thing might just be well.

June 7, 2017:

Title: Imagine a Britain with Corbyn in charge; Voters planning to back Labour because they believe the Tories will win anyway should think about what might follow

Content: You won't be able to understand what a Corbyn government might do unless you realise the team around Mr Corbyn are not merely the usual left of the Labour Party. These are people who have sent messages of solidarity to North Korea, saluted the IRA dead and bigged up Chavez's Venezuela portrays far left as dangerous and against Britain’s safety and interest They are allied to far-left groups. They are committed to a nonaligned foreign policy, regarding western liberalism as nothing special and our alliances as disastrous. They have opposed all terror laws, believing the right answer is
to understand the root causes, which lie in our own imperialist adventures. equates being anti-imperialist with being soft on terrorism

“Imperialism”

- March 22, 2016:

Title: Our immigrants “our”, like we own them. Portrays them as children, dependents, our property

need to read British fiction; Great writers more than anyone can convey a sense of nationhood and love of one’s country

Content: Tragically cultural imperialism thesis is tragic, sad, grave, destructive. Real victim here is British culture (not ones we colonise), however, a way of thinking took hold several decades ago which identified British national identity as a form of cultural imperialism to be eroded and neutralised. As the principal carriers of this culture, English literature and British history were singled out for attack by educationists.

- May 9, 2016:

Title: Undermining the BBC makes us look like idiots; Though the corporation has its problems, one-nation Conservatives should appreciate its value

Content: If this doesn’t sway fellow Conservatives, what about the patriotic case? Last year the UK was named the world's top nation for "soft power" proud of this, like an accolade. How much of this is down to the BBC? Some rail against its "cultural imperialism" again, quotation marks dismisses legitimacy of the term and of the claim, dismissing that it can be real, but I am all for it directly pro-cultural imperialism if it means the voice of British reasonableness and humour speaks to places that are repressed, seeping into the living rooms of those under jack-booted rule. doesn’t reflect on cultural relativity or give agency to those affected, assumes superiority

- February 21, 2017:

Title: Political correctness kick-started populism; For decades, left-wing ideologies silenced dissenters left wing and PC as oppressive – but now there is a welcome backlash paints Conservatives/right as the heroic rebels for the people!

Content: Those PC rules against this derive from secular ideologies such as anti-capitalism, anti-imperialism, feminism, multiculturalism, moral relativism and environmentalism find this really funny that they chose these concepts to be lumped together as bad. All these and more are based on the idea that the white, male-dominated, Judeo-Christian West is the embodiment of oppressive global power - the political source of original sin.

So white western men or Christians can never be offended or hurt because they are themselves innately offensive and hurtful, while "powerless" women or minorities can only ever be their victims completely misunderstands argument. In other words, such victim groups are given a free pass for their own questionable behaviour misunderstanding.

“Colonial”

- March 5, 2016:

Title: We’re mad to turn our backs on vibrant Africa Africanism/Orientalism; Whitehall and the British political elite don’t think the continent matters any more, which is a colossal MISJUDGMENT
Content: Here in the UK two tremendous misconceptions about sub-Saharan Africa thrive. The first is an essentially left-wing myth biased, untrue, the second essentially rightwing. First, that everybody there hates us as their cruel former colonial masters dismisses this as being valid as it stems from “left-wing myth”. Sounds sarcastic. Second, that now we’ve quit our colonies the whole place is a hell-hole: dangerous, dirty and chaotic.

- December 9, 2016:

Title: Turner prize pseudos based on post-colonial theory deserve the brush-off; By rejecting art that represents man or nature, our cultural commissars have created nothing more than a smug clique

Content: They judge their own work not by reference to any set of commonly understood traditional aesthetic criteria, like grace, beauty, harmony or proportion but by using the language of "critical theory". Critical theory is not art criticism as traditionally understood, and practised, by great writers from John Ruskin to Anita Brookner. It is the product of academics such as Theodor Adorno and Walter Benjamin, Roland Barthes and Louis Althusser, Gayatri Spivak and HélÈne Cixous, who have seen their role as critics not as forming aesthetic judgments but developing a critique of society overall. Their ways of viewing culture, developed into ideologies such as post-colonial theory or queer theory, were designed to subvert the political orthodoxies of liberal democracy and celebrate the rebellious and the transgressive.

So when you tour the Turner prize exhibition at the Tate you are invited to make sense of the arrangements of household rubbish or boots with bits of lichen stuck to them by reading the £6.99 guide mocking, portraying it as untalented, not real art, invalidating it, also presenting it as elitist – so by extension, these theories are which explains that you are witnessing the destabilisation of our "existing object-ordered hierarchies" with a "visibly masturbatory feedback loop" which leaves the artist "pasting my own language on to a reflective surface and getting off on the complimentary glow of false exchange".

Tone is always so smug

- January 2, 2017:

Title: Shakespeare study turns into a comedy of errors; Just like Freud, modern academics clearly don’t let the facts get in the way of a good theory

Content: When I was working on the 2012 British Museum exhibition Shakespeare: Staging the World, Dora Thornton, the curator, asked me to investigate the often-told story of how Hamlet was performed by a group of sailors on board a ship called the Red Dragon off the coast of Sierra Leone in 1607. It is, understandably, a narrative beloved of post-colonial literary scholars who are clearly wrong; believing fake or fabricated stories, according to this writer. The trouble was, an archival investigation revealed that the whole story was a 19th-century fabrication. There was something rather satisfying about putting that one there are clearly “others”. “that one” makes it seem like a childish story/lie to bed.

- January 20, 2017:

Title: Britain must seize chance for more trade with Africa

Content: English is now the official language in 19 countries including the giants and, despite the colonial past recognises that it would be valid for Brits not to be given a special welcome; hints at atrocities on our part, Brits tend to be given a special welcome.
The **opportunities for Britain in Africa are immense**, but then still suggesting we make profit out of a continent we previously colonised

- March 16, 2017:

Title: We must free our children from their chains; Growing up without challenges or risk is infantilising and damaging the next generation

Content: In America, as one sociologist has observed, four-year-old girls tying laces are applauded. At the same age in colonial times accolades this time, hails it as an achievement and something to be proud of compared to now they would have been adding to the household income by knitting stockings and mittens and doing intricate embroidery; by six they would have been spinning wool. In England Edward IV was just 18 and already an experienced military commander when he won two significant battles and declared himself king.

Many of us grew up with much more independence than is expected now. I started babysitting my siblings at six, which made me feel gratifyingly grown-up. At nine we were left to run free all day in the country, on bicycles or ponies, building dens, quarrelling, getting lost, making friends. At 13 and 11, living temporarily in the Kalahari desert, my sister and I were allowed to go riding all day on half-wild horses, following sand paths.

- March 30, 2017:

Title: To teach or not to teach Shakespeare’s plays?; A proposal to drop the Bard from South Africa’s curriculum forces us to ask whether anyone speaks for all humanity

Content: What **worries me most is the association of Shakespeare with colonisation**. This makes a decision on whether to drop him from the curriculum a political one, as if education isn’t political? So why are we not reading South African writers in British schools? and an issue to be exploited. Hypocritical Africa has its own populism too: “It’s all the fault of the colonisers, get rid of them and all facets of them and our lives will be far, far better.” dismisses the impact of colonisation This is the Mugabe schtick par excellence - when your war veterans get restive throw them a white-owned farm; if your education system is creaking, create a fuss about the colonial curriculum, just because there are other problems, it doesn’t mean that colonialism isn’t one too. Again, never delves into deeper context It’s the old chauvinist hypocritical bait and switch.

Look over there at the symbols of oppression and never mind the corruption and bad politics right under your nose.

I don’t claim the universality of Shakespeare because I am a white Englishman. I accept it not least because black South Africans tell me it is so.

I don’t demand out of injured national pride that he should be taught everywhere, but his proposed exclusion is horribly symbolic of today. It seems to me that an indignant insistence at every turn on what is separate and different about us, at the expense of what we have in common, is becoming the scourge of our times.

“**Colonialist**”

- January 23, 2016:

Title: Feminists are betraying their Muslim sisters; Cameron’s right: women who can’t speak English are kept voiceless in the family and society – and the left turns a blind eye
But never mind. "In the Muslim homes I have visited it was clear the women were extremely busy cooking and caring for many family members," wrote feminist Madeleine Bunting in The Guardian, deriding the PM for noting that 60 per cent of Muslim women are economically inactive. He was guilty of a colonialist "white man saving brown women trope". dismissive and painting him actually as being in the right/correct colonialist trope as being in the right/correct.

"Colonialism"

- September 19, 2016:

Title: It’s not a crime to explore other ways of life; We must fight the idea of ‘cultural appropriation’ quote marks delegitimising, from sombrero bans to arguing the word yoga is ‘stolen’ from India

Content: Well, we may laugh, shrug on a salwar kameez and let our children build tepees. Or we may reasonably accept that it is irritating to be treated as a novelty or joke (my Scottish father abhorred “tartanry” and Harry Lauder). But the ferocity of the response feels like a deeper attack on an imaginative empathy that is at the heart of fiction and drama: what Shriver calls "trying on other people's hats, stepping into their shoes". To condemn it as colonialism is dangerous colonialism claims are dangerous, because then we can't try other cultures? Again, incorrect, given the nervousness of modern commercial publishers?. Let the idea take root and we are all the poorer.
Appendix 2: The Sunday Times research

“Empire”

➢ January 3, 2016:

Title: The time is ripe for Sturgeon to bring in an alternative to the UK’s ludicrous and tainted honours system

Content: It would be no less crass than the present arrangement, would stop the unseemly horse-trading in the stuccoed offices of Whitehall and would bestow a veneer of democracy on a system mired in hereditary and the cold ashes of dead empire.

Analysis: “mired in” the “cold ashes of dead empire”: anti-empire. Going with this system is “ludicrous and tainted” and “crass”. Also suggests that it’s anti-democratic – so empire as anti-democratic?

➢ March 27, 2016:

Title: This is a time to reflect and then to move forward

Description: about Ireland gaining independence; 100-year anniversary of 1916

Content: There are many, often conflicting, interpretations of what happened at Easter 1916. Innocent, uninvolved people, mostly the poor, died without being given any say about their fate. Sixteen courageous men, who asserted their country’s independence, were executed by firing squad. Lives and livelihoods were destroyed without any electoral mandate. Yet something was awakened in the imagination of the people. The first significant fissure occurred in the powerful British Empire. A new, independent country came into existence.

Analysis: “powerful British Empire” presented sort of neutrally really, although it led to the death of “innocent, uninvolved people” and executed “sixteen courageous men”. “destroyed” “lives and livelihoods” without any electoral mandate. So ambiguous and unclear: presented neutrally but associated with despotic and destructive things. Contrasted with the “new, independent country”. Title: reflect and move forward makes it seem like we need to explore the past – the Empire – more thoughtfully and move forward aka move beyond it, it’s over.

➢ July 3, 2016:

Title: A united Europe kept the peace – now lessons of the Somme are lost

Content:

Quotes pro-independence Scottish Secretariat group pamphlet 1947 about Scotland’s war losses: "In a war in which human life was squandered so prodigally, and which brought so much suffering in its train to every part of the British empire, it would be wrong to draw invidious comparisons between troops of different nationalities."
“The European Union only exists because our continent our here being Europe: solidarity with Europe demonstrated a horrific tendency to descend into war down countless generations. After the mass slaughters of the 20th century, the dream of Europe's countries and economies coming together to build peace and prosperity has been realised in full. EU as positive, dream-like, utopia-like contrasted to horrific scenario beforehand

Yet whenever the EU's very real contribution to lasting peace pro-EU was mentioned in the referendum campaign, the "leave" side sneered: ironic seeing as this is the tone the Times uses elsewhere and vast numbers of people clearly didn't care.” Against Brexiteers

“The referendum was an opportunity for this generation to keep faith with a project that has delivered peace, and show that our acts of remembrance have depth and substance. "Lest we forget". The UK just did.” Historical amnesia

➢ July 31, 2016:

Title: Beeb can’t get no satisfaction

Content: On this weekend 50 years ago England was celebrating victory in the World Cup. Yes, in those days the words "England" and "victory" did not look out of place in the same sentence. national identity, anxieties, decline

The BBC's News at Ten marked the anniversary last Friday by reporting that the defeat of West Germany had brought cheer to a nation wreathed in gloom and unsettled by the retreat of Empire. Decline of empire as negative effect on nation’s attitude. Collective identity of nation, nationalism – but then goes on to suggest this wasn’t accurate

Is that really how it was? The BBC might have been wringing its collective hands as yet another part of the Empire, Guyana, won its independence in 1966 but the rest of the country was too busy having a good time to notice. So paints BBC as sad at decline of empire, but rest of nation as not bothered

Swinging London was becoming the world capital of cool. Was Twiggy, named as "the face of 1966", depressed about the retreat of Empire? Were the Who and the Rolling Stones anxious about Britain's place in the modern world? Real culture not bothered about empire or nation-state’s role If so, they hid it very well. As the saying goes, if you can remember the 1960s, you weren’t there. If the BBC can’t remember 1966, it must have been having a rare old time.

➢ October 30, 2016:

Title: For the displaced Chagos islanders, it’s time to right a colonial wrong colonialism as wrong

Content: Reading the sorry tale, anyone would be forgiven for thinking that it happened in Britain's colonial past, when we were slow to quite forgiving, not explicit or telling of the atrocities accept the equal worth or even the common humanity of recognises racism/superiority our fellow men and women. In fact, its origins go back to the sunset romanticised of the British Empire, only half a century ago, and the ramifications of what happened are very relevant to the world of today.
February 26, 2017:

Title: These foolish things; ESTABLISHED 1822

Content: “After objecting to a statue of Cecil Rhodes at Oxford and an African bronze cockerel at Cambridge, students have found a new symbol of oppressive imperialist hegemony - beef stew. mocking, dismissing importance of imperialist legacy, and students are the only ones identifying it – dismissing of students. The catering staff at Pembroke College, Cambridge, have been criticised for referring to a dish of beef and mango as Jamaican stew.”

“Should we boycott Earl Grey tea because it celebrates an aristocratic member of the feudal class or drink up because it was named after the prime minister who abolished slavery in the British Empire? There is danger everywhere.” sarcastic

April 2, 2017:

Title: Harry and Meghan mustn’t shack up. Not because it’s sinful; it’s just tedious

Description: longer piece about many things – one bit defending students

Content: At Bristol University students are demanding that a racist racism perhaps more tangible and credible as an issue building on campus be renamed. They say the Wills Memorial Building is an "offensive" threat to "inclusivity and diversity" because the 19th-century businessman it honours, Henry Overton Wills, made his money through slavery. Except for the micro-fact that Wills was born in 1828, five years before slavery was outlawed in the British Empire, they have every right to be cross. I'm glad they are up in arms. defending students when it comes to their fights against racism and slavery

What is absurd is not that students are angry about something - that is their job. not very legitimate or relevant, then? It's that suddenly we've started paying attention. weird that the media is paying attention to students’ anger now, as it is historical

May 21, 2017:

Title: A return to ‘Safety First’ for the Tories

Content: In the 1930s Mr Baldwin could rely on empire markets to give us some shelter from the economic storm. rely: stable, dependable, strong, helpful, also co-operation. shelter from storm: romanticising and dismissing of any nastiness on part of those markets. That is a luxury empire markets as luxury we no longer have. Mrs May has her eye on rebuilding Commonwealth markets for Britain’s exporters no critique of this here, but portrayed as helpful, similar to how empire markets were. Rebuilding: nice, usually. but in the meantime has to negotiate our our: us vs. them new relationship with the European Union. this is an inconvenience That process, as our interview with the Brexit secretary David Davis makes clear sort of collaborative, is likely to start with rows about the size of the UK divorce bill. rows: smirking, not serious. Divorce bill: jokey, not serious

“Imperial”
• February 28, 2016:

Title: Ireland too must choose between EU diktats

diktats: like Orwellian Communist language, very much “them” not us, not democratic or freedom EU and freedom mutually exclusive

Content: The EU's imperial when it applies to EU is a bad thing courts are determined to impose this army of regulations aggressive and forceful on member states and to undermine national sovereignty. nationalism and pride

• June 5, 2016:

Title: If we vote “remain”

Content: "If we vote 'remain'," warns Tory MP Chris Heaton-Harris, "Brussels bureaucrats have plans to force the Imperial War Museum to change its name - to the Metric War Museum." Note to "leave" campaigners: this was a joke. mocking Brexiteers for being too gullible (like believing promises made)

• June 12, 2016:

Title: Lucky Brits

us, national identity, and lucky to be able to vote have chance to say goodbye, not au revoir means until the next time. So language very much contrasted, us vs. them, and also lucky that this is a definite leave

Content: But since the EU is a pseudo-democracy them contrasted against us. Not democratic that is actually ruled by a Strausskahnovite them, foreign nomenklatura lofty, no such existential challenge to their imperial edicts imperial in EU a bad thing would ever be allowed.

• June 26, 2016:

Title: With that X in the box we

collective us, national identity just voted to bring back our democracy the be-all and end-all

Content: He it was [Juncker] who said in 2005 - when Valéry Giscard d'Estaing's imperial European imperial EU a bad thing constitution began to run into the buffers of hostile plebiscites - "If it's a yes we will say, 'On we go', and if it's a no we will say, 'We will continue.'" EU as ignoring any complaints or opposition

“Imperialist”

• April 17, 2016

Title: PM Boris Johnson is too high a price to pay for Ukexit

anti Boris, not condemning Brexit itself but condemning consequences

Content: For Churchill is a wonderful example of what political charisma and a fluent pen can achieve. In his case, they concealed a mountain range of corruption, dishonesty, fraudulence, warmongering, greed and imperialist racism. this as a bad thing, compared with other things. anti-Churchill: who was a hero of the nation He provides the textbook
case of how a villain and rogue, whose career is bedight with infamy and betrayal, can get away with murder - and in Churchill's case, the metaphor is not remotely figurative.

Johnson knows all this. The London mayor knows what qualities are required to conceal such an unworthy and contemptible personality. anti-Boris. Warns of dangers Indeed, he has some of them, especially charisma.

“Imperialism”

- July 10, 2016:

Title: Chilcot’s Blair and the Provos’ Adams are moral twins

Content: With all his buffoonish posturing, being “politically correct”, Leftist, or an activist, then, is buffoonish posturing Adams strikes a note that is common in Irish life. This is the weird sense of moral entitlement moral entitlement is being an activist, Leftist, or politically correct? Ironic that allows people to denounce America for racism in not intervening in Rwanda, to excoriate its cowardice in not sending forces into Syria to overthrow Bashar al-Assad, and to castigate its imperialism for invading Iraq. this example doesn’t really fit with other examples It's an endless "heads I win tails you lose" argument that gives vast amounts of moral satisfaction to the chatterati sarcastic, all talk no substance, as if it is fashionable of Galway arts festivals and summer schools. arts festivals and summer schools deemed as Leftist/politically correct/activisty rubbish then? Summer schools – links to academia

- October 23, 2016:

Title: Fascist canoeists are up the creek now jokey title

Content: More fun from the eminently rational world of academia fun, so academia not legit or serious and therefore not relevant. Eminently rational here is sarcastic. Us and them with academia, this time Canada - just so you don't think we us vs them and also trying to make its claim more valid? have a monopoly on these halfwits explicit: academia as stupid, othered. Meet Misao Dean, professor of English at the University of Victoria. Misao is angry, very angry, about canoes painting the professor like a child, or someone with a mental illness. They are emblems of colonialism, imperialism and marginalisation. mocking these claims, dismissing them. But this sentence is stand-alone, so the writer mocks imperialist rhetoric in itself They were used to colonise Canada (which is why you now have a comfortable, highly paid job, Misao, like the railways: colonisation explicitly equated as being a good thing rather than sitting in a tepee gnawing bark for supper savage trope, othering, white supremacist ). Furthermore, the people who use canoes today are "almost completely white", she nameless, disrespectful insists. presents this as if it is not relevant, and reverse racist. Mocking cultural appropriation discourse

Ban fascist canoes NOW. sarcastic

- April 9, 2017:

Title: A late education; ESTABLISHED 1822
Content: Many will be shocked to hear that scientists now believe students should stay in bed and not get up for lectures until at least 11am. The main shock is that science thinks this advice is necessary. So mocking scientists too Isn't getting up late what students do? Students are lazy What has changed is that these young people need rest more than ever. Modern university life is so demanding. Sarcastic On top of lectures and the odd essay crisis, dismissing students’ workloads there are offensive statues to be identified and condemned as relics of imperialism. Sarcastic, dismissing importance of continuing legacy of imperialism (historical amnesia?) Pronouns must be rigorously policed to ensure that the use of "he" or "she" does not obstruct a gender-fluid environment. Students must be on constant alert, too, for examples of cultural appropriation such as Mexican hats, French dressing or takeaway curry. Mocking cultural imperialism and appropriation (need to tie cultural appropriation to imperialism) Rhetoric No wonder they need a rest. As Shakespeare said, sleep knits up the ravell’d sleeve of care. Yes, how typical that students can’t even take a nap without the intervention of a dead, white male. Mocking the fact that students are against the patriarchal white supremacist society and canon – so not seeing these things as a problem. Also Shakespeare: important historical British icon, about collective culture, which students therefore are not a part of

➢ April 16, 2017:

Title: Are students beginning to tire […]

Content: Are students beginning to tire of the constant struggle to cast off the shackles of imperialism? So dismissing any form of action to get rid of imperialism – dismissing that it is still there. Sarcastic, melodramatic A petition to rename Bristol University’s Wills Memorial Building, because Henry Overton Wills profited from the slave trade, has drawn 664 supporters over the past month. But a counterpetition was launched last week on www.change.org, demanding that the name be kept. It already has 747 signatures.

“Colonial”

➢ February 28, 2016:

Title: Staying in Europe is the unionists’ best bet – so why take a gamble?

Content: Much of what British people perceive as European liberalism is more correctly libertarianism, especially in Denmark and the Netherlands, where politics can swing rapidly to the right. Most of the Europeans who despise unionists not clear who they mean here for being backward post-colonial Jesus-freaks live in London caricatures post-colonialists as metropolitan, backwards, and born-again Christian? OR portrays Europeans as seeing unionist Brits as being post-colonial Christians? , and there is no unionist option for getting away from them.

➢ July 10, 2016:

Title: Marigolds for remembrance as India finally mourns Somme dead
More than 1m Indian soldiers - including Hindus, Sikhs and Muslims - took part in the war, making up a third of British colonial forces, and 74,000 were killed. recognises colonial troops in war, factual and serious tone, grave that so many were killed

Until now they have received little official recognition in India because of sensitivities about the colonial past sensitivities makes it seem trivial, delicate, floral. so the death of the troops weren’t recognised in India, but what about their recognition in the UK? No words on “our” responsibilities so still presenting them as foreigners, with Britain having no responsibility

That is set to change thanks to a group of Indian officers who have drawn up plans for an annual remembrance day that will be marked with buttonholes of marigolds rather than poppies.

"For a long time these soldiers have been ignored and forgotten by the rest of the world and even in India because they were seen as part of the colonial past," so dismissed by colonisers, and colonised also don’t want to remember that time said retired Squadron Leader Rana Chhina, 56, now the secretary of historical research at the USI. "Now there has been an acceptance of that part of history and a willingness to engage with it."

no talk of Britain remembering that colonial past, only about India remembering it

October 2, 2016:

We need more of George’s defiance

Content: This is perhaps not the place to go into the troubling experiences of First Nations people. Although they fared somewhat better under their British colonial masters so British colonisers were more humane? than Native Americans did in the US, as if the Native American repression in the U.S. isn’t attributed to Britain the wounds are still raw. A truth and reconciliation commission reported only last year on the barbaric conditions in residential schools, where children were snatched from their homes, forcibly educated as Christians and killed in droves by preventable diseases. so horrible things happened at hands of British No amount of "raven dances" and painting of totem poles by William and Kate can brush over this past. firstly, cultural appropriation. Secondly, points a denial of looking at the past, a tendency to forget the past (historical amnesia) but a need to do just this

These encounters Kate and Wills, quite rightly, are now frowned upon very trivial: frowned upon, not found shocking or engaged with meaningfully, but it was only a few years ago that William and Kate were carried off the plane on a throne made of palm trees when they landed at Tuvalu.

It wasn't a good look. colonialism isn’t fashionable anymore The more the modern monarchy goes on jaunts such as these, the more obvious it is that they, too, are a creaking part of the heritage industry. Monarchy as fragile, old-fashioned, stuck in the past (but at the same time refusing to engage with the past) As our colonial might has faded, all that's left for our young royals is costumes and ceremonies. Monarchy as imperialist and superficial Before George reaches the throne, we may have had enough of them.
“Colonialist”

➤ January 10, 2016:

Title: Not every offending remark counts as a criminal offence dismisses offense and political correctness

Content: “But the gold star infantilising, sarcastic, patronising goes to the South African student Ntokozo Qwabe, who won a prestigious and lucrative Rhodes scholarship so he should be thankful for the scholarship based on imperialism to Oxford and is now campaigning to have Cecil Rhodes, the colonialist founder of Rhodesia, no balanced news showing horrors of this colonialism, presented as a neutral if not positive fact denounced and his statue toppled. To think he’d been standing there all these years, radiating offence at hundreds of students sarcastic who benefited from the scholarship in his name, students are lucky and not grateful and nobody realised they were being routinely insulted sarcastic, joking until now. so they are dumb too”

Quotes Liam McNally saying: "The courts need to be very careful not to criminalise speech which, however contemptible, is no more than offensive. It is not the task of the criminal law to censor offensive utterances."

The Sunday Times replies: “No, we’ll leave that to the liberals.” anti-liberal, paints them as politically correct rubbish which is dismissed by the court: important institution (compared with academia)

➤ January 8, 2017

Title: Pass me a bludgeon: zombie universities dead, mindless academia are cosseting mollycoddling students

Content: “At last, after the usual overlong interregnum for celebrating that archaic festival of western colonialist triumphalism, Christmas, the academic year is back in full swing.” sarcastic, sneering. Anti-colonialist rhetoric is a joke then. Also about national identity

“Well students are being shepherded, with exquisite gentleness, into a fantasy world where their views are never challenged; where they are denied the vital human right joke because students talk about human rights to be upset, appalled or offended.” talking about political correctness
Appendix 3: The Sun research

“Empire”

- January 25, 2016:

Title: UK in or out, game is up for ailing EU

Content: Whichever way Britain votes, it is too late to prevent the decline and fall of this bureaucratic empire, like The Times, EU empire always a bad thing (EU = ailing, bureaucratic; The Sun famously pro-Brexit)

- April 22, 2016:

Title: ‘For U.S. it’s: Do as I say not as I do.’; Says Boris Johnson

Content: SOMETHING mysterious happened when Barack Obama entered the Oval Office in 2009.

Something vanished from that room and no one could quite explain why.

It was a bust of Winston Churchill, the great British wartime leader. Churchill = great; connotations as national hero; references to nationalism with wartime leader; so if Churchill is great, Obama is wrong

It was a fine goggle-eyed object, done by the brilliant sculptor Jacob Epstein, and it had been sitting there for almost ten years. tradition

But on day one of Obama's administration it was returned, without ceremony, to the British Embassy in Washington. No-one was sure whether the President had himself been involved in the decision.

Some said it was a snub to Britain. Some said it was a symbol of the part-Kenyan President's ancestral dislike of the British Empire, of which Churchill had been such a fervent defender. Churchill previously coded as great, fine, traditional, British, and now imperialist – ties together as positive adjectives. Obama taking it down connoted as a bad thing, and his dislike of the British Empire then also dismissed

- April 23, 2016:

Title: What racism?

Content: THE Left love to screech "racist" at anyone they disagree with. anti-Leftism. Leftism tied to anti-racism, anti-imperialism: and The Sun against this David Cameron on Wednesday. Now Boris Johnson. In yesterday's Sun, he repeated the speculation that President Obama, being part-Kenyan, had an "ancestral dislike of the British Empire".

Is it untrue? Mr Obama's father was Kenyan. Years ago, the future President was shocked to learn how his Kenyan grandfather was allegedly doubting tortured by British soldiers around 1949.

His step-gran Sarah Onyango, who told him about it, not a credible source was later quoted saying: "My grandson has never believed the British do anything for a common good, rather than their selfish interests." presents Onyango as being racist (especially clear when read next sentence: juxtaposition)

Yet Boris is branded racist for suggesting that Mr Obama's ancestry may have influenced his thinking dismisses racism - and not on Britain, but on our former empire, as if empire talk is even less credible as being racist than talk against Britain
This is typical of Labour’s **infantile** approach to public debate, ceaselessly point-scoring and playing to a gallery of **virtue-signalling** political correctness! **Twitter morons**.

- **May 24, 2016:**

  Title: 41 years ago cleaner Edith said we ought to quit Europe... she’s still right; Ex MP on 1975 Brexit Poll

  Content: OUR cleaner was called Edith, a name that is rarer now, and the year was 1975. I was 15 and Britain was set to vote whether to remain in or leave the Common Market. My parents were for Remain. Edith was for Leave on the grounds that she was British and the Common Market meant that Britain was losing its independence. My love was for my parents but my sympathies were with Edith. It was an insight into a certain idea of being British, of our national character being bound up with self-government.

  Forty years have come and gone but in some ways very little has changed. The Common Market has grown into the European Union.

  The consequence is poverty, unemployment, human misery and the rise of demagogues, in a frightening echo of the 1930s.

  But were the EU stronger - if that political, monetary and economic union were in place - we wouldn't want to be bound by it anyway.

  It wouldn't suit the free-trading, internationalist country that we are, both European and global.

  So the decision in this referendum is easy for me. But what is easy is not always simple. I have never been able to see "ever-closer union" as a wickedness in itself - as some Eurosceptics do - or the EU as an evil empire, actually against the predominant view of EU’s empire as a negative thing. **exception to the rule**

- **February 16, 2017:**

  Title: Egyptians built the Pyramids on beer... they did a top job; As Lloyd’s bans staff boozing... By the thinking drinkers

  Content: It's a **British elbow-bending institution** and at a time when around four pubs are closing every day, it's our drinking duty to give something back to the **cornerstone of British culture**. pub culture a good thing, about British identity and culture Lest we forget, the brewing industry was once the engine room of the British empire and oiled the wheels of the industrial revolution. industrial revolution and brewing industry a good thing, so empire also coded positive here. About British achievements, history, progress, modernity, culture and identity Back then, sweaty, sooty-faced workers would slake their rasping thirst with pints of mild and bitter after a hard day of back-breaking manual work.

  But now we don't make stuff like we used to, more people work in marketing than manufacturing and the heat of the furnace has been replaced by "hot desking".
As such, we simply don't go to the pub as much. But we should. Not only because Britain is making some of the best beer in the world right now, but also research by Oxford University ironic considering anti-academy stance of Times has shown that regular visits to the pub make people happier.

- April 18, 2017:

Title: Brexeters must pay for their mistakes

Content: Prime Minister Theresa May has finally shot her nation in the foot anti-Brexit, surprising – but perhaps not, as written by Irish person about Irishness after pulling the trigger on Article 50, and some of the crew of Rule Britannia are jumping overboard as a result.

As Taoiseach Enda Kenny told Donald Trump, St Patrick himself was an immigrant. pro-immigration
So we simply must not turn our backs on any refugees from the former empire suggests that British/Irish have a responsibility to care for fellow refugees due to imperial history to our east, now left all at sea due its madcap Brexit idea.

But we must also ensure we don’t allow our unique Irishness to be watered down by the new people coming into our country from the UK - which is why the new Irish should have to pass a number of tests. but still pro-nation, nationalism, patriotism, dubious of multiculturalism

“Imperial”

- August 31, 2016:

Title: The Sun says Why weight?

Content: MANY Brits, of all ages, still struggle with grams and kilos. Yet for 16 years it has been illegal under EU rules to sell meat, fruit and veg in imperial measures.

We can reverse that madness thanks to the Brexit vote - and should do without delay. While we’re at it, let’s phase our old blue passports back in too.

There’s not an ounce of common sense in doing anything else.

- August 31, 2016:

Title: Weigh to go!; MP back return of imperial measures

Content: The fanatics and bureaucrats - who are often the same thing - wanted to persecute shopkeepers just for using imperial measurements their customers understood.

Whatever the EU might have wanted, imperial measurements are still very much part of everyday life and I don't hear anybody talking about the length of a cricket pitch as anything other than 22 yards.

We have a complete culture of traditional thinking on the subject of imperial measurements and yet metric was just imposed on us.
There will still be grams and kilograms. But there are many people who wish to return to traditional imperial measurements and there is no reason on Earth why they should not be allowed to do so, alongside metric. The Americans, with whom we trade quite happily, have in many respects similar imperial measurement systems to ours - which is a help. But no one would suggest that because we still use the Pound and drive on the left that we are incapable of dealing with Europe.

“Imperialist”

- July 20, 2016:

Title: Money matters

Content: Now the Nats tell us the vote to renew Trident - always a foregone conclusion - will lead to another pro-indy boost. But despite talk of the "imperialist" quotation marks, dismisses claim, mocking, dismisses importance/relevance/significance/truthfulness nature of the nuke decision, we're not so sure this issue is the clincher that the SNP reckon.

Even though 58 of 59 Scottish MPs voted against a new generation of Trident subs, public opinion appears to be split down the middle.

“Imperialism”

- October 13, 2016:

Title: Why don’t lefties care about this suffering? presenting “lefties” as hypocritical, inconsistent, picking and choosing, thus invalidates their arguments

Content: Meanwhile IS is on the rampage in Iraq and Syria, jihadists are spreading terror around the world and Europe is at risk of unravelling amid a refugee crisis. Yet when British soldiers were being blown up in Iraq in 2004, Stop The War backed "the legitimacy of the struggle of Iraqis, by whatever means they find necessary".

And when 130 Parisians were massacred by terrorists last November, the group published an article saying that the city "reaps the whirlwind of Western support for extremist violence" in the Middle East. Savages torturing entire nations Senior figures of Stop the War, who The Sun already criticised harshly in the previous few sentences as being terrorist-sympathisers have backed Putin's seizure of Crimea, supported Russian hostility over Georgia, defended Soviet tyrant Joseph Stalin and praised Syrian President Bashar Assad for "resisting imperialism", so they praised Assad for "resisting imperialism". Assad coded as being barbaric leader responsible for war and destruction of Syria, so praise for him against Western values. Again quotation marks, as if imperialism is not a legitimate issue for Syria

“Colonial”

- March 19, 2016:

Title: Tax demands; Sun The Says

Content: THE phrase "no taxation without representation" is a cornerstone of democracy. You pay tax, but you have a voice in Parliament via your MP.
When early colonial settlers were denied it, they fought a revolution and established their own country, America. colonial settlers did a heroic thing: were denied democracy, so revolted and established their own country. Positive

Yet more than 250 years later that principle is denied us by the EU. ironic as EU bad empire, undemocratic, but colonial settlers in America good empire then - democratic

“Colonialism”
0 hits

“Colonialist”
0 hits