

“It is time for the British people to have their say”

The Daily Mail and the Guardian on Brexit from 2013 to 2016

Tiina Pajakoski
Master’s Thesis
University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages and Communication Studies
English
November 2017

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kieli- ja viestintätieteiden laitos, historian ja etnologian laitos
Tekijä – Author Tiina Pajakoski	
Työn nimi – Title “It is time for the British people to have their say” The Daily Mail and the Guardian on Brexit from 2013 to 2016	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli, historia	Työn laji – Level Pro Gradu
Aika – Month and year Marraskuu 2017	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 108 + liite
Tiivistelmä – Abstract Yhdystyneiden kuningaskuntien kansanäänestys Euroopan Unionista lähtemiseksi kesäkuussa 2016 oli monella tavalla järisyttävä, jopa odottamaton, tapahtuma. Yleisenä oletuksena oli, että vuoden 1975 kansanäänestyksen tulos toistuisi ja Yhdystyneet kuningaskunnat pysyisivät edelleen Euroopan Unionin jäsenmaana maassa pitkään vallinneesta euroskeptisyydestä huolimatta.	
Tämän tutkielman tarkoitus on tarkastella, miten Brexitin keskustelluimmat teemat kuten maahanmuutto, talous ja identiteetti kehittyivät vuosina 2013-2016 lehdissä the Daily Mail ja the Guardian sekä miten nämä teemat vaikuttivat Brexitin kokonaiskuvaan lehdissä. Tarkastelun kohteenä on myös, miten nämä lehdet vaikuttivat lukijoihinsa, sillä tutkitusti britit eivät olleet kovinkaan tietoisia Euroopan Unionista, mutta saapuivat silti äänestämään yli 70% äänestäjän voimalla. Tutkielman aineisto koostuu lehtiartikkeleista (61 kpl). Metodeina toimivat kriittinen diskurssianalyysi ja sisältöanalyysi sanomalehtimedian tutkimuksessa.	
Tutkimuksen tuloksista selviää, että sanomalehtien narratiivit olivat täysin erilaisia: the Guardian tuki Britain Stronger in Europe- kampanjaa, kun taas the Daily Mail kannatti Vote Leave- kampanjaa. Tämä heijastui maahanmuuttovastaisuutena sekä britti-identiteetin korostamisena the Daily Mailissa ja the Guardianissa maahanmuuton tukemisena sekä Euroopan Unionin puolustamisena taloudellisesta näkökulmasta. Lehtien käyttämät taktiikat agendojensa puolustamiseen olivat kuitenkin suhteellisen yhteneväisiä. Lehtiartikkeleista kävi ilmi, että molemmat lehdet valikoivat painattamansa tekstit ja niissä esiintyvät tiedot tarkasti. Artikkeleissa vaikuttivat erityisesti lehtien tekemät lingvistiset ja sanastolliset valinnat. Näistä ovat esimerkkinä intertekstuaalisuus, jota käytettiin muun muassa yhdistääessa menneitä tapahtumia nykyisiin ja viittaamalla lehden ulkopuolisiin lähteisiin, sekä modaalisuus, jolla ilmaistiin tiedon varmuutta ja oikeellisuutta. Näillä valinnoilla oli tarkoituksena legitimoida lehtien edustamaa kantaa ja näin vaikuttaa lukijoiden mielipiteisiin.	
Asiasanat – Keywords Brexit, United Kingdom, European Union, immigration, economy, identity, newspapers, critical discourse analysis, content analysis, media analysis	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository JYX	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION	4
2 THE EU AND THE UK.....	7
2.1 The European Union.....	7
2.1.1 The historical background of the EU	7
2.1.2 The Lisbon Treaty and Article 50	14
2.1.3 Euroscepticism	16
2.2 The United Kingdom	18
2.2.1 Joining the EEC and the referendum of 1975	18
2.2.2 The situation develops, 1975-2016	20
2.2.3 The immediate post-Brexit Britain.....	24
2.3 Key issues raised during Brexit discussion and their backgrounds.....	25
3 DISCOURSE AND MEDIA	30
3.1 Discourse analysis	30
3.1.1 Language and discourse	30
3.1.2 Critical discourse analysis	31
3.2 Media discourse	33
3.3 Content analysis.....	36
4 AIMS, DATA AND METHOD	38
4.1 Research questions	38
4.2 The Daily Mail and the Guardian	39
4.2.1 Newspapers in the UK.....	39
4.2.2 The articles	41
5 THE DAILY MAIL AND THE GUARDIAN ON IMMIGRATION, ECONOMY AND IDENTITY	48
5.1 Immigration	48
5.2 Economy	59

5.3 Identity	73
6 DISCOURSE AND INFLUENCING THE AUDIENCE	86
6.1 David Cameron promises the referendum 23.01.2013	86
6.2 The referendum results 24.06.2016	94
7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	100
BIBLIOGRAPHY	107
Primary sources (all newspaper articles and their codes used in the data)	107
The Daily Mail (23.01.2013 – 13.07.2016)	107
The Guardian (23.01.2013 – 13.07.2016)	108
Secondary sources	110
APPENDIX: Article 50	113

1 INTRODUCTION

It was a shock to many when the referendum results came in 24 June 2016. The United Kingdom (the UK for short) was to leave the European Union (the EU) after their 43 years of membership. The voting was tight, and for many it was an unexpected twist that Brexit won. This could be observed from the media coverage of June 22nd, the day before the ballot, and from the immediate aftermath. Even Vote Leave was unprepared for the outcome. Before the referendum, the overall public tone expressed during the campaigns of Brexit and Bremain¹ was of how the latter was most certainly going to win. The event even had a precedent from 1975, when the United Kingdom decided to stay in the European Economic Community (the EEC) after only two years of membership under their belt. However, these results were not repeated. Now, the people, both in the UK and in the EU, British or EU citizens alike, are living with the consequences. Some are happy, some are definitely not. The past year has brought many controversies and problems to be solved in the exit negotiations, such as whether the EU citizens in Britain are welcome to live there any longer and if the British people in the EU are able to remain where they are as well. In this case, both sides have potentially much to win and to lose.

There has not been much time to study Brexit extensively and in-depth yet; the process is still in progress as of November 2017 as the article 50 was activated only on 29 March 2017. This makes it difficult to make conclusive deductions. Still, questions such as how Brexit came to pass and what influenced it have been examined in the current context. For example, Michael Kenny and Nick Pearce (2016) studied the concept of Anglosphere and the ideals it represented, suggesting that the differences between the European and the British identities played a part in Brexit. In addition, Sara Hobolt (2016) considered Euroscepticism and indicated in her article that British Leave voters were motivated by anti-immigration and anti-establishment feelings. Yet, although Brexit is still relatively unstudied, media's hand in shaping the world is not. Media texts are meant to influence the way people think; they are often framed to enhance arguers' rhetorical interests (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 93), whether merely one person or an institution. The contexts of the texts matter. Who wrote

¹ The name Brexit came from the words Britain and exit, and the side supported leaving the European Union; on the other hand, Bremain came from Britain and remain, and supported staying in the institution. The official referendum campaigns for Brexit and Bremain were called Vote Leave and Britain Stronger in Europe, respectively.

them? For what purpose? Was there something particular they wanted the audience to consider?

In Brexit's case, there has been a long history which needs to be considered too. Looking at the context, it matters that there was a precedent of 1975 in the referendum. This means that there were doubters of the EU since the beginning. It matters that, apart from Prime Minister Edward Heath and Tony Blair, there has not been a truly pro-EU leader in the United Kingdom. It matters that as the country with the most exceptions with its membership agreement, there might be others who thought that unfair and were reluctant to grant them more of the same. It matters that what the UK wanted went against what the EU was about. The context matters. News can portray a variety of things in a variety of ways, especially since media has the power to create their own narrative. They can reinforce ideas or weaken them, and they can construct and maintain truths and falsehoods. In addition, if their source material comes from a source people trust, then they have the power to shape even millions. Because of that, newspapers – particularly printed newspapers – are an interesting object of research. They are still widely read in Britain despite the growing presence of Internet and the ever-present television challenging them for audience's attention (Tunstall 1996: 223).

In order to examine Brexit, the United Kingdom's exit from the European Union, the present study turns its focus to newspapers to see how the issues that influenced the process were covered in them, both pre-Brexit and post-Brexit, to give a concise yet in-depth look into the referendum. The aim is also to see whether there might be themes to be uncovered in the newspaper media coverage. Three recurring themes emerged and were chosen for further study: immigration, economy and identity. This study investigates the newspaper coverage of these themes in the Daily Mail and the Guardian. These papers were chosen because they represent two ends of the news spectrum with the Guardian leaning towards left and the Daily Mail right. As it turned out, the Daily Mail was also pro-Brexit while the Guardian was pro-Bremain. In addition, the papers had different target audiences and styles of reporting.

The analysis focuses on articles published during the period starting from the former Prime Minister David Cameron's promise on holding the referendum to his consequent resignation as Britain Stronger in Europe lost and Theresa May's rise to become the new Prime Minister. In short, the studied time period is between 23 January 2013 and 13 July 2016. Because of the relatively scarce research literature on Brexit itself, another purpose of the present study is to fill this gap. In addition to analysing the coverage of the three main themes, the language used

in order to convey meanings and purpose for readers is studied. A detailed analysis of key texts from January 2013 and June 2016 illustrates the main linguistic features through which the papers represent their points of view and attempt to connect with their audience.

I begin the present study in Chapter 2 which introduces the relevant background on the European Union, the United Kingdom and the key issues and concepts that became centred on the Brexit phenomenon. The time period examined starts from the 1970s, and continues right up to the 2016 referendum. Chapter 3 situates this study in the field of discourse studies, particularly critical discourse analysis and content analysis with particular focus on media discourse. Chapter 4 introduces my research questions more in-depth as well as the data and the analytic procedures. Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 present the analysis and findings. First the themes of immigration, economy and identity are discussed through the newspaper articles, before moving into more detailed analysis of the key texts. The study concludes with a summary and discussion of the findings in Chapter 7. Potential further research is also discussed.

2 THE EU AND THE UK

In this chapter, the development of the European Union and the United Kingdom is discussed. The EU sub-chapter focuses on the main points of the Union's development through treaties and decisions, and the UK sub-chapter delves deeper into the nation's reactions and inner conflicts. The main treaties discussed are called the Treaty of Rome, which created the European Economic Community, and the Treaty of Maastricht, which brought to life the European Union; the rest of the treaties are amendments and revisions made to the main ones. The Treaty of Lisbon, which is the reformed treaty of the Treaty of Maastricht, is discussed in its own subchapter as it had a strong impact on Brexit with its article 50 and it is the treaty that was in force during the proceedings. The concept of Euroscepticism and its effects has been given its own subchapter as well.

2.1 The European Union

2.1.1 The historical background of the EU

After the Second World War, cooperation within Europe, particularly Western Europe and with West Germany, was seen as the antidote to the post-war chaos as well as a possible safety net against the threat from the Soviet Union (the USSR), particularly when the tension from what would become the Cold War started to intensify (Watts 2008: 5). The United States supported the idea of a united Europe as the precedent set by the Treaty of Versailles had given the continent and the Western world a bitter lesson. Financially, the US also offered the Marshall Aid to further help and separate the war-torn Europe from the threat they saw the USSR to be (Watts 2008: 12). The result of that was the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), which did not force states into giving up their national sovereignty. The French senior civil servant Jean Monnet saw this as a weakness but the solution was preferred by those who encouraged cooperation rather than integration at this stage (Staab 2013: 7; Watts 2008: 13). It was subsequently renamed the Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). In addition to the OEEC, in 1949, European states created the Council of Europe, which provided a framework of principles for the protection of human rights and key freedoms considered essential to a free and peaceful Europe (Staab 2013: 7).

In 1952, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) entered into force. At this stage, France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg joined the project

that would become the European Union we know of today. It was inspired by Monnet, and lasting peace was something strongly desired after the two disastrous wars. For Monnet, stability between France and Germany was the key to make that happen (Watts 2008: 6). Therefore, an idea of a higher authority with supranational² powers which would look after the interests of all who joined the coalition was presented by Robert Schuman, the French foreign minister of the time (Watts 2008: 15).³ The ECSC was not, however, meant to only focus on trade and materials; it was thought that a united Europe could be more than just a concept of politics and economics. It had more potential than the previous attempts, so, naturally, people wanted to expand on that.

One of the attempts at expanding on the potential were plans to create a unified defence and foreign policy alliance within the ECSC in the early 1950s, and to remilitarise West Germany. This was partly because of the post-war idealism of creating peace and partly because the wars in Asia, such as the Korean War, were seemingly creating a base for the Third World War before the world had even recovered from the previous ones (Staab 2013: 9). However, the idea of a European defence and foreign policy alliance did not take fire within the community because the European integration had not been given much of a chance to establish ground yet. Therefore, in 1955, West Germany instead joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), which had been established 1949 (Watts 2008: 17). Part of the idealism for a unified Europe was curbed down in the first half of the fifties to ensure more practical and achievable goals. It was not long after that the European Economic Community (EEC) replaced the ECSC. The EEC was founded in 1957 by the Treaty of Rome, which entered into force the following year. The treaty would last for decades as it would one day be replaced by the Maastricht Treaty on the European Union in 1993 (Staab 2013: 8-9).

The creation of the EEC was not completely a smooth one. While the member states of the ECSC had reached an understanding on the atomic industry in the early 1950s, old prejudices lingered. For instance, in France, there were still concerns over Germany. France had experienced heavy losses during the First and Second World Wars under Germany's assaults; therefore, it feared that by helping West Germany, France would be once again at a disadvantage both economically and militarily. Agreement was reached only after France was

² Power given to an authority that acts on behalf of all the countries involved; in this case, the European Union. Literally meaning 'above states'.

³ The notion was not meant to be altruistic as the main idea had been to protect France's interests first and foremost as it was assumed that France would gain access to the German Ruhr area's coal and steel reserves. It did not end up happening but the ECSC was established nonetheless.

given benefits on the common market that outweighed its misgivings. Thus, the Treaty of Rome was signed in 1957, and the EEC and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) established. Great things were expected to come of it as the European Common Market (ECM) was to be achieved through the realisation of the four economic freedoms outlined in the treaty: the free movement of goods, capital, services, and persons across borders and beyond national regulations (Staab 2013: 11). This was only strengthened by the post-war economic growth and the outlook on the European integration was mostly a positive one.

There was one significant obstacle concerning the idea though. France's President Charles de Gaulle believed supranationalism to be a danger to France's interests and opposed many attempts at improving and enlarging the integration in Europe (Watts 2008: 22). For example, the idea of the Common Market working on the basis of unanimity was refused by France in the mid-1960's, introducing national sovereignty as a blocking mechanism to act against the growing integration (Staab 2013: 12; Watts 2008: 23-24). This made it possible for a single member country to stop a proposal completely. Although unanimity was the norm in the EEC, some countries, such as France, thought a majority voting might undermine their national interests in case they were ever left in the minority (Staab 2013: 12), which led to this development.

The idea of a common currency was introduced during the Hague Summit in 1969 for further investigation. The idea became even more relevant after the dollar crisis of 1971⁴ since it was thought that economic and monetary cooperation could be a key to a more stable system. The notion was dismissed a couple of years later as it was not viable at the time, and the member states were merely asked to keep the values of their currencies within a narrow range of one another. The integration of Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom took precedence, and there were conflicting ideas about how to proceed with the European Monetary Union (EMU) project. Overall, the nations were more interested in their own economic prosperity than Europe's as a whole. This became evident during the economic recession in the beginning of the 1970s. As such, the 1970s were mostly a decade of inactivity that needed to be resolved. Another strain on progress toward integration was the accession of new members: Denmark, Ireland and the UK in 1973. This was because, for example, the UK's needs concerning e.g. agriculture did not coincide with the other existing member states, and there was controversy

⁴ The crisis was caused by the USA's President Nixon's new economic policy that, for example, temporarily imposed a tax surcharge to force the European countries to realign their currency values against the dollar.

on how to achieve the necessary balance of contributions (Staab 2013: 14-15). Later, during the 1980s, there was a disagreement between the UK and the EEC over the ‘budgetary imbalance’ which drew the attention from enlarging and improving the community (Watts 2008: 33).

Yet, despite the monetary, economic and political difficulties, the 1980s invigorated the integration of Europe, especially the EEC. The economy was challenged by the United States and Japan, so a change was necessary. The stagnation of a decade and a half had to be broken. The EEC expanded as Greece, Portugal and Spain sought access to the community and its stability. Difficulties were experienced since other member states like Italy and France were concerned that their trade would experience significant drops if the countries that shared their products would arrive in the same markets. Because of that, Spain and Portugal joined in 1986, five years after Greece’s acceptance in 1981. The fears were not founded, however, and the EEC grew in attractiveness. The first direct elections to the European Parliament were also held in 1979, and they gave much needed legitimacy to the system and attracted new people to develop the community, even if the parliament’s power was more limited then (Staab 2013: 16). In 1985, the EEC finally realised the Single Market which had been agreed to be done by the Treaty of Rome three decades before (Staab 2013: 17).

The Single European Act (SEA), signed in 1986, for example, realised the Single Market further than ever before, and finally officially introduced majority voting (Staab 2013: 18) which had been decades in the making. This breakthrough was achieved by the leader of the European bureaucracy, Commission President Jacques Delors, and he even dared to impose a six-year deadline to the project after which the member states who had not achieved the desired result would be fined. Delors also convinced the states to set up a European environmental policy, on the grounds that the effects of economic activity on nature were also supranational and thus everyone’s problem, and to cooperate within scientific research (Staab 2013: 17-18). The SEA also increased the role of the European Parliament and the overall cooperation within the EEC. The effects were very positive as the Act created one of the largest and wealthiest markets in the world and the EEC began to be seen as one with international clout (Staab 2013: 19).

The 1990s brought in changes too. The Soviet Union (USSR) had been on the fringe of Europe since before the EEC and its predecessors’ establishment but the USSR finally collapsed in the 1991 after being on the brink for years. The German unification, new

countries emerging from the USSR and communism's new role in Europe were just a few of the questions the EEC had to face. For instance, the security policies based on the Cold War had to be re-examined (Watts 2008: 39). In the light of everything, the Maastricht Treaty, or the Treaty of the European Union, was brought to life and entered into force in 1993 (Staab 2013: 21). The treaty contained, for example, revisions of European Monetary Union and the single currency; the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP); and cooperation within fields such as police, immigration, asylum and internal security matters (Staab 2013: 22).

The biggest change was the decision to merge national macroeconomic policies with EMU and to give it a definite date to be achieved. This meant that the interest rates could not be adjusted anymore according to changes in the economy by national central banks. A deadline was also given for creating the single currency that came to be known as the euro (Staab 2013: 22; Watts 2008: 41-43). There was also a desire for a powerful European central bank free from political interference on the German and French front at the same time, and concessions of funds were given to some of the poorer countries (Watts 2008: 41-43). According to Staab (2013: 22), the CFSP approach was thought ambitious too. Foreign and security policies were a big part of a nation's sovereignty, but it was also thought that a more unified European diplomatic front would be effective. Unanimity and intergovernmentalism⁵ were the keys to how both the CFSP and the cooperative actions were handled while the EMU decisions were made through supranationalism (*ibid*), the power to act on behalf of states. Watts (2008: 41) noted that these developments laid the foundations for more radical moves towards a federal-style union which would follow later in the decade even if at Britain's insistence the word 'federal' was not used in the Maastricht Treaty.

Ratifying the Maastricht Treaty proved difficult, however, and it was criticised as obscure and complex (Watts 2008: 43). There were positive examples, such as Ireland, which accepted the treaty with overwhelming support. However, some countries, such as Denmark, even rejected it via a referendum, or it turned out to be a political disaster when a referendum was not held, as was the case with the UK. There was also France where the results were 50.5 percent in favour to 49.5 percent against, creating a very narrow win. This was a big surprise since France had been a key member in deepening the European integration (Watts 2008: 45). Only an opt-out from the single European currency and a watered-down version of the treaty for Denmark and the UK placed the ratification train back on track (Staab 2013: 21). Even in

⁵ Intergovernmentalism focuses on the importance of member states in making decisions and regulations; cooperation between nations for mutual advantage is preferred over integration.

Germany there had been a last minute attempt at challenging the treaty by claiming it fundamentally altered the nation's constitution. In the end, the attempt failed (Watts 2008: 45).

As a result of all these troubles with ratifying the treaty, the notion of European solidarity was gone. In addition, the Maastricht Treaty made it possible for member states to reject policies that were not in line with their own national political agendas which made the decision-making and progress more difficult to achieve (Staab 2013: 23). The public also reacted negatively to the pace of changes, which meant that the European Union had to start ironing out details and shortcomings instead of just introducing new concepts all the time (Staab 2013: 23). The member states had to tread carefully unless they wanted the public to turn against them, and to avoid giving the Eurosceptics more fuel to their engines. It was time to slow down, and regroup.

A few years passed before the next treaty, called the Treaty of Amsterdam, entered into force in April 1999. The issues addressed were economic globalisation and its impact on jobs, the fight against terrorism, international crime and drug trafficking, ecological problems, and threats to public health (Staab 2013: 23). The atmosphere was more give and take rather than just accommodating some specific states (Watts 2008: 52). The Schengen Agreement, the gradual abolishment of border checks between the countries part of the treaty, was integrated into the Treaty of Amsterdam as it had previously been bilateral, and this change strengthened the free movement of people (Staab 2013: 23). The concept of European citizenship was also clarified, including the freedom of movement, the rights of the people, and the employment details. There were some opt-outs granted again to countries such as Ireland and the UK, for example on external border control because of their problems with terrorism and since, as islands, the countries' borders were naturally different from those of Continental Europe (Watts 2008: 53).

Many things were not on the agenda or were not agreed on during the Treaty of Amsterdam even if the treaty as a whole gave the EU a new direction to move towards, in particular the issue of EU citizenship. The failure to address these problems was amended in the Treaty of Nice which entered into force in 2003, although it is debatable if the treaty was successful, considering what needed to be accomplished with it and was not. One of the reasons might have been that the larger countries were unwilling to surrender their dominant position within the EU (Jones 2007: 20). Changes were, however, necessary as new countries were going to

join the European Union again. In 1995, Austria, Finland and Sweden joined the EU, which made it fifteen strong.

Before the three nations were accepted, the European Council had compiled criteria for the countries wanting to join the Union, which particularly concerned the Eastern European nations. The criteria were called the Copenhagen Criteria, and they declared that applicants had to be fully democratic, have a functioning market economy and be willing to adopt the *acquis communautaire*⁶ (Watts 2008: 50; Jones 2007: 21-22). Naturally, it was still necessary for the nations to seek approval from their own citizens before joining. Also, in 2004 there were going to be twelve new countries⁷ joining the Union, bringing the number up to twenty-seven. Institutional reforms were needed as the last major one had been the 1979 decision about direct elections of the European Parliament and because, as it was, the EU could not handle the potential growth (Staab 2013: 25; Jones 2007: 19).

The main parts of the Treaty of Nice in 2003 were the new limits on the number of the members of the European Parliament and EU commissioners, 732 and 27 respectively; the new voting formula for the Council of Ministers, the intergovernmental body for approving legislation; and the addressing of democratic shortcomings and undemocratic practices (Staab 2013: 25-27). For example, the EU adopted a clear procedure for how to deal with member states that departed from the democratic track, although expelling from the Union was not added to it. One additional thing was addressed prior to the summit too: The Charter on Fundamental Rights. It had been drafted by experts, and it addressed the civil, economic, political and social rights of the EU citizens (Staab 2013: 26).

The Charter was mostly favoured by the member states as it protected their rights around the Union. Nonetheless, the UK refused the Charter and, therefore, it was not included in the treaty. There were other details too that made people claim the treaty was a disappointment, such as the failure to address the budget and the financially wasteful agricultural policy which poorly prepared the EU for expansion (Staab 2013: 26-27). It created doubt about whether the Nice Summit was preparing the EU for the eventual enlargement sufficiently. The decision to postpone these issues was made so that in the next meeting there could be representatives from the nations joining the EU to take part in the decision-making. However, this did not

⁶ Meaning the accumulated body of the EU law, policies and obligations from the past Treaties.

⁷ The countries in question were Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Slovenia, Malta and Cyprus; in addition, Bulgaria and Romania joined the EU in 2007, as did Croatia in 2013.

make the Treaty of Nice any more successful in the eyes of the European public. Another thing causing outrage, in e.g. London and Berlin, was that the summit arrangements had been appalling. This was seen as a diplomatic failure by France, the host country. According to Staab, President Jacques Chirac's behaviour was regarded as arrogant and forceful, and not up to the EU's standards, like the rest of the meeting.

2.1.2 The Lisbon Treaty and Article 50

The Lisbon Treaty of 2007 is the updated version of the Maastricht Treaty of 1993, the European Union's foundation agreement. It entered into force on 1 December 2009. The treaty covers a similar base to the Maastricht Treaty, but with the EU's expansion it became necessary to reform it. An understanding had been reached that the EU would not be able to work with the upcoming members on board unless the decision-making was made more efficient and the organisation freed of too many 'federal' symbols. Prior to the treaty, another version of it had been rejected in 2004 by the French and the Dutch, which shook the whole Union for the two had been integral members since the ECSC's establishment (Watts 2008: 57; Troitino 2013: 223). The ratification process could have gone on without them but it was decided to begin the negotiations anew instead. With a German EU Presidency, the Merkel administration urged the member states to consider the treaty again (Watts 2008: 57).

The new treaty was meant to cover things that did not pass the last time, and, essentially, it was the same paper but with a different name (Troitino 2013: 223). The main reforms of the agreement were the following. First, the unanimous decision-making was almost abolished by making it impossible for a single member to veto an initiative supported by the rest. Consensus was still key but in theory it was now possible to force a state to accept further integration against its wishes. Second, the co-decision system was expanded. Third, posts were created for a permanent President of the European Council and a High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy. Fourth, the Charter of Fundamental Rights was included, although the UK, Poland and the Czech Republic were excluded from it. Fifth, legal personality was included to strengthen negotiations and relations. Sixth, a department for Justice and Home Affairs was created to increase the scope of the court system but the UK secured the ability to opt out of police cooperation and to opt in to legislation relating to judicial issues. And, lastly, the clause for withdrawal from the Union, Article 50, was introduced for the first time (Troitino 2013: 224-225).

Because of the differing attitudes to the previously failed treaty and the member states' contrasting ideas of how things should proceed – whether the Union should move towards the United States of Europe or stay as a looser union of nations with minimal responsibility for its other members and everything in between – it could be seen as a triumph for Merkel that the Lisbon Treaty reached consensus and was ratified. For example, the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries have been wary of Brussels interference in state matters since the EU decision-making can at times seem remote from the matters that affect them (Watts 2008: 246). The treaty increased the European Union's power but it was found lacking in terms of integration by some members (Troitino 2013: 226).

Article 50⁸ consists of the agreement on how a member state may voluntarily withdraw from the EU. It states that when the decision has been made, the member state shall inform the European Council of its intention of leaving. Agreements are made according to guidelines and the management of the relationship between the leaving state and the EU. The Treaties that tie the state to the EU also cease to apply after a certain time period and they have to be negotiated anew between the leaving state and all those states that still remain within the EU as well as with the EU too. Rejoining the Union is possible, but the state must apply again just as any other nation. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Theresa May, invoked the article 50 on 30 March 2017, nine months after the referendum results were official, and the nation has started the process of withdrawal. It will last two years, and will end on 30 March 2019, regardless of whether there have been new agreements between the UK and the EU.

As of November 2017, the negotiations between the United Kingdom and the European Union have begun but are without significant progress. Neither side have shown to be too willing to concede on major points. The May administration has expressed, for example, unwillingness to pay a so-called 'divorce bill', meaning their share of costs, such as pensions and the EU's unpaid debts, agreed upon in previous agreements, after the UK leaves the EU in March 2019. The European Union has also been decidedly uncompromising, possibly to show a united front and the consequences of leaving the Union to the world. Other points to be resolved include the EU and the UK citizens' rights and the status of the Northern Irish border. Because of the stagnating negotiations, the concept of 'hard' Brexit – a good deal or no deal – has become under question in the public discussion, as has the competence of May's

⁸ See Appendix.

administration, which has been using ‘hard’ Brexit as their guideline in the current negotiations.

2.1.3 Euroscepticism

Political institutions always have their doubters, and the European Union is no different, as seen by the recent rise of Eurosceptical media coverage, and far-right and even far-left movements. Euroscepticism literally means criticism of the European Union, although the term also has been used to describe opposition to and rejection of the EU. Historically, it has always existed. Even during the Cold War, when the EU’s predecessors were thought of as being able to provide a counterpoint against the threat of the Soviets (Watts 2008), there were sceptics of their usefulness. However, especially after the USSR fell, the doubts about further integration increased, which could be seen from the trouble the EEC had with trying to ratify the Maastricht Treaty and the amendments to it (Staab 2013; Watts 2008). Lately the concerns have focused around immigration and the ever-growing number of the member states, the economic situation and globalization, as the public discussions of the past few years have shown. Those with an attachment to their national identities, whether ordinary people, politicians or even institutions, are also more likely to feel threatened by the integration to a union of multiple different nations that may have different values from theirs.

Similar problems can be found with immigration all around Europe. The free movement of labour, coinciding with crises happening outside the EU borders such as in Syria and in Africa, have created tensions all around. As some countries are more fortunate and richer than others, they are viewed as a gateway for a better life. A more stable area, Europe naturally attracts refugees leaving their less fortunate homeland, as the sudden increase in the Syrian refugees in 2016 suggests. Thus, in Europe, the majority and the culture of the majority can be seen as being threatened. The news media provides a good outlet for those wanting their voices to be heard, even going as far as being accused of fearmongering. One such example comes from the French town of Calais from 2013, where the town’s major claimed that the town was becoming increasingly lawless because of immigration (DM261013/2).

In addition, since the Lisbon Treaty also mostly erased unanimity in EU decision-making, there is a fear that the EU will, at some point, threaten the national security of member states by trying to become more federal than a union of independent states (Watts 2008: 41). According to Grenade (2016: 513), many citizens within the EU have also lost trust in the

state and supranational institutions as protectors of their security and promoters of their welfare. This is because, despite the existing rules of democracy, they can still be sometimes neglected or manipulated from their basic purposes. At the very least, this is how things can be perceived by media and citizens, as evidenced by the data of the present study (DM150416/1; DM220616/2; G220616/3; G220616/4). While ‘democratic’ supranational institutions sustain regionalism⁹, they often bring to the fore questions of accountability, representation, legitimacy and sovereignty (Grenade 2016: 513), which were some of the issues raised during Brexit. This could be seen from the Daily Mail accusing the EU of having questionable accountability (DM150416/1; DM220616/2). Under the circumstances as they are, far-right movements are flourishing.

If the United Kingdom’s Brexit referendum ballot results are taken into account, one can see that the younger and internationally-inclined people voted in favour of Bremain while the older generation voted for Brexit (Electoral Commission 2016; Hobolt 2016). In addition, the populations of Northern Ireland, Scotland and the people in relatively prosperous as well as international regions such as London supported Britain Stronger in Europe while those from the poorer areas and smaller municipalities were opting for Brexit (Electoral Commission 2016). Another significant divisive factor was that highly-educated people tended to be more in favour of staying in the EU, regardless of age. The idea of nationality may not have been the only thing the voters considered, but it was a part of it. For instance, Hobolt (2016: 1270) found in her study that those who felt that the EU had undermined the distinct identity of Britain were much more likely to vote to leave, whereas the view that the EU had made Britain more prosperous had a similarly sizeable effect in the opposite direction.

However, one can find divisions similar to the UK’s across Europe as the public discussion has shown. As Watts (2008) and Staab (2013) have suggested through their research, some of the member states may feel slighted and left behind where the integration has not been as successful or meaningful as expected. The populist parties of those countries are particularly keen on joining the Eurosceptic front as they pride themselves as the voices of the underdogs. This can be seen by the electoral successes of parties such as Front National in France, the Party for Freedom in the Netherlands and The True Finns in Finland, even if the latter two have now faced a drop in supporters in the General Elections of 2017 (Economist 2017; Finnish General Elections results of 2017).

⁹ Regionalism expresses identity, purpose and interests of a collective. It is often combined with the creation and implementation of institutions which represent the geographical region.

2.2 The United Kingdom

2.2.1 Joining the EEC and the referendum of 1975

While the United Kingdom had been working together with the OEEC and the Council of Europe, the nation decided not to join the ECSC when it was established. One of the reasons was that in 1945 the UK had decided to nationalise its coal and steel sector (Staab 2013: 8; Jones 2007: 12), which meant that cooperation with the future ECSC countries was not possible on a short notice. However, another reason was that Britain saw itself as one of the leading nations in the world and somewhat apart from Continental Europe. It had a long history as a colonial power and had, at one point, controlled a larger part of the world than any other country; one of the controlled areas being most of the east coast of what now is called the United States of America. Therefore, Britain saw itself as a bridge between the US and Continental Europe. This decision, in turn, would later define the relationship between the UK and the EU and its predecessors.

The UK did not wish to see a trade split in Europe, however, and the UK was instrumental in forming the EFTA (European Free Trade Area) in 1960 (Watts 2008: 20). The EFTA was an alternative to the EEC but also had the potential to work alongside it. For the UK, a clear benefit would have been to be able to import Commonwealth goods without duties on them. However, the association was seen as undermining the EEC which led them to deny any agreements at that point in time. There were now two rival bodies there, the Inner Six and the Outer Seven¹⁰, but with the European Common Market establishing ground, it was clear that EFTA was not coming on top from the two (*ibid.*). Britain, for example, did not benefit a whole lot from it since the other member states' economies were smaller than its (Jones 2007: 14-15).

The United Kingdom tried to establish a more global power but with poor success as the ties to the US and particularly the Commonwealth were becoming strained. The economic situation was also worse for the nation than for its continental counterparts, and there was the desire to be able to affect world affairs more, all of which then led the nation to turn its eyes to the EEC (Staab 2013: 33; Watts 2008: 25). In 1963, the United Kingdom sought to join the EEC but was denied. The nation tried again in 1967 but was refused membership again. Both

¹⁰ The Inner Six was composed by the EEC countries while the Outer Seven was formed by Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

applications were vetoed by France's President de Gaulle. He believed that the UK's interests were mainly rooted in trade and market access and that the nation was too much of an Atlanticist¹¹ with no interest to commit to the EEC's other policies, most notably agriculture, as it held little role in the UK's own economy, very unlike the other member states, in particular France (Staab 2013: 33; Watts 2008: 25; Jones 2007: 15). As it was, he did not believe that the UK had the best interests of the EEC and its member states on its mind. However, on the third try, the application was accepted as de Gaulle's successor, George Pompidou, did not share the same strict doubts, and the United Kingdom became a part of the European Economic Community on the 1 January 1973, alongside Denmark and Ireland. The British Prime Minister of the time was Edward Heath whose only mission had been to get in rather than solve the problems it would cause; he had found the economic and political benefits too great to be ignored (Staab 2013: 15; Watts 2008: 26).

There were some obstacles to confront, though, and one of them was the EEC's policy on agriculture. Agriculture had been a big part of the EEC agenda and one of the major focuses of the budget, which did not coincide with the UK's needs. Therefore, the EEC had to find something of equal value for the financial contributions they gained from the United Kingdom since farming subsidies were not something Britain needed. The compensation came in the form of a new regional policy aimed at developing poorer areas, but it did not satisfy the anti-European politicians in the UK, and provided much ammunition against the EEC (Staab 2013: 16). The British public was also sceptical of joining the EEC as it found the Commonwealth and the close relations with America more appealing. As de Gaulle had described, trade had been a major part of why the UK wanted in and that was also how Prime Minister Heath managed to convince his ruling Conservative Party to apply again (Staab 2013: 33). The UK had been falling behind Continental Europe and that was unacceptable to British people. The United Kingdom was not the only one to get something out of the joining either; the EEC found the UK's close relations with the United States very appealing, even if there were some lingering suspicions as well.

When Britain joined the EEC, there was no widespread enthusiasm detected amongst its people even if there was hope for the UK to gain back power it had lost in the recent years (Watts 2008: 267). After power had seemingly gone to Continental Europe, it made sense to follow in the other nations' footsteps and influence the Community from the inside.

¹¹ Atlanticism means supporting policies, politics and cooperation between Western Europe and the United States.

Therefore, the possibility to reach for the world stage again as well as to gain access to more trade made joining seem necessary. However, in 1975, a referendum was held in order to find out whether the UK should remain in the EEC or not. As such, the referendum of 2016 did have a precedent.

The reason the national referendum of 1975 was held was that the Labour Party, which came back to power in the 1974 election, thought the Heath Government had not got the best deal and, in fact, there had never been a mandate to enter the EEC (Jones 2007: 16). Thus, the terms were renegotiated and the referendum was held in June 1975. According to Jones, however, the vote had less to do with the EEC than with keeping the Labour Party in office. The referendum turned to favour staying in the EEC with a turnout of 64,5%, of which 67,2% voted in favour of remaining (UK Parliament 2016). The Brits thought that, clearly, it was better to work with the other nations than try to strike it out on their own since the alternatives did not look very promising (Watts 2008: 267). Yet, naturally, they wished for that cooperation to happen on their terms rather than anyone else's.

2.2.2 The situation develops, 1975-2016

From 1975, the British opinion of the EEC and later the EU varied. In 1979, Margaret Thatcher became the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. She saw the merits that belonging to the European market would bring to the UK, for instance in the form of a larger number of potential consumers that lived outside the UK. She found the free market to be an opportunity that was too good pass, even if she was keen on privatising the economy in the UK (Staab 2013: 17). In other words, she was interested in using Europe to advance Britain's agenda but was against the EEC influencing Britain in turn and was something called an Atlanticist, preferring a relationship with the USA over the EEC (Watts 2008: 269). Her criticism of European institutions and proposals was caused by her thoughts that they might have undermined the UK's national sovereignty. Thatcher was often displeased by the community, and her policies and confrontational style were not well-received by the other members either (Staab 2013: 17).

Thatcher was also sceptical of the Brussels bureaucracy and thought that "willing and active cooperation between independent and sovereign states is the best way to build a European community" instead of the growing European integration, as demonstrated by her speech at the College of Europe in Bruges in 1988 (Staab 2013: 20). In addition, she found it

unacceptable that, despite economic difficulties, the UK was making net contributions akin to Germany's to the EEC without getting as many benefits from it. Compared to the 74 percent of the EEC budget spent on farming, only 4 percent was spent on the Regional Fund. The purpose of the fund was to give grants to areas of low income, chronic unemployment or declining population which would have helped the UK (Watts 2008: 32), and did. She even demanded monetary compensation from the community, but her behaviour caused her and her country to be almost alienated from the others (Jones 2007: 174). Finally, in 1984 after a toil of five years, she got a deal in which Britain would receive a permanent rebate worth 66 percent of the difference between what it paid into the Community and the amount it got back. However, this came with the price of almost being a pariah in the midst of the rest (Watts 2008: 33).

Thatcher was replaced as Prime Minister by John Major in 1990 but the political situation did not get easier under him. When the time came for ratifying the Maastricht Treaty, he ended up not holding a referendum for it. The parliamentary act of approval proved difficult to arrange and caused the Conservative Party to have major disagreements over the issue. A sense of discontent with all things European was growing inside the party. When enlarging the European Community came to a question, there were people in favour of widening before deepening of the EEC. This was because a common market with a touch of intergovernmentalism seemed the best way to go; however, this was in clear conflict with what the founders of the EEC had in mind (Watts 2008: 39). It was also noted by the Conservative Party that power was slowly moving away from individual governments to Brussels. In light of these observations, Major negotiated an opt-out for the single European currency as well as for the social charter that established certain workers' rights throughout Europe (Staab 2013: 21; Jones 2007: 174).

These were seen as a triumph for British people for their national interests were protected (Watts 2008: 44), at least by parts of the Tory Party. Another celebrated thing in Britain had been the EU's failure to achieve approval for majority voting on major foreign policy's issues, as it gave the UK a theoretical right to act on what they wanted without considering the other states. Some of the other nations, despite being disappointed with the UK for slowing down the progress, were of a mind that it would catch up with the rest in commitments eventually (*ibid.*). A looser version of the Union was what some British political elite – particularly the conservatives – thought most welcome, and with the USSR's fall some thought a deeper union was now even unnecessary. With new countries emerging

from the USSR's shadow, the UK was also welcoming them into their midst for they could prove an important piece in the fight against the dominant Franco-German axis (Watts 2008: 49). The UK was also interested in letting countries such as Austria, Finland and Sweden join the EU, for they were wealthy and potentially could ease the financial strain the membership was creating for British people (Watts 2008: 50).

However, the situation changed some during the 1997 General Elections when the Tories lost to Labour. According to Watts (2008: 52), the topic of the European Union became a deciding factor on the results since it would provoke a response from the Eurosceptics of the Conservative Party, as well as the tabloid press, that turned the public opinion against them. Tony Blair became Prime Minister and under him one of the British government's priorities was the re-establishment of the UK's position in Europe. For example, the previously dismissed Social Chapter and the extensions of majority voting were accepted by his government to bring Britain to the same stand as the rest of the members and, thus, the UK's relations with the EU improved.

By doing all this, Blair wished for Britain to play a constructive role in Europe and reclaim its historical stand and global power, this time from within the Union (Watts 2008: 52). The new government essentially realised the EU's faults but also knew there were merits in being part of the Union even if, or because, it argued against decentralisation (Watts 2008: 270). Blair had similar ideas to his predecessors on how they should proceed as they all preferred a looser alliance over a federal union. Essentially, Blair's Labour preferred intergovernmentalism to deeper integration. Some of the European leaders found Blair less pro-European than he wished to convey since he seemingly preferred Washington over Brussels, the USA over Europe, during the early 2000's crises (Watts 2008: 271).

In 2003, the Charter on Fundamental Rights, which was introduced prior to the summit in Nice, was rejected by Blair. In addition, the European Court of Justice was not allowed to base its rulings on the Charter (Staab 2013: 26). Blair also welcomed the new nations into the European Union as allies for the cause of a looser Union. He was building Britain as the 'bridge' between the USA and Europe, to create a space for the UK as an integral part of the EU and its international relations (Watts 2008: 272). This was to make sure Britain did not have to choose between the two and could maintain its position and relations with both powers. Yet, Europe and the USA could not agree over the Iraq crisis in the early 2000s. This meant that Blair's support of the USA on the matter showed its preference as well as proved

de Gaulle's argument of Britain being more Atlanticist than European, according to Watts (2008: 272). Britain was not alone in its support of the USA, with some of the upcoming members sympathising with the cause, but the damage had been done. In addition, while Blair was making space for Britain in Europe, the European Union was not gaining more support inside the British borders (Watts 2008: 273).

The portrayal of Europe has been less than positive by the British media, particularly the tabloid newspapers, and *Eurobarometer*¹² suggested that the public thought the portrayal held a grain of truth (Jones 2007: 147-149). One of the reasons for that might be the result of the already mentioned anti-European UK governments. The surveys conducted in 2002 and 2004 indicated that the EU membership was conceived as both positive and a negative while between a third and a half of the British public held no opinion for it or against. The numbers, however, fluctuated year by year (Jones 2007: 150-151). Yet, it was worrying to see the unawareness of the public, indicated by the surveys, for what it meant for the UK to belong to the EU.

As in every country, Britain has its pressure groups too, both pro- and anti-European, but the latter are more numerous and active than the former (Jones 2007: 151). They also seem to have more connections to the MPs and even members of the House of Lords, as Jones (*ibid.*) notes. One of the most notable anti-groups was the Campaign for an Independent Britain, formed in 1976 under a different name, whose statements evolved later to advocating Britain's withdrawal from the EU. On the pro-EU side, there is the European Movement, founded in 1948 to prevent further European wars (Jones 154-155), which was once chaired by Sir Winston Churchill. The British branch of the movement was formed a year later in 1949. Both of these groups are cross-party and have supporters from all sides.

The Labour Party was in power until 2010 when the Tories won the General Election. In 2013, the Prime Minister, David Cameron, promised that if his Conservative Party won the next parliamentary elections, he would hold a referendum on whether the UK should remain in the EU by 2017 at the latest (DM230113; G230113/1). The party won the majority in the General Election of May 2015, and so Cameron had to keep his promise. Before doing that, he set out to negotiate more concessions for Britain in the EU. The process took some time, but on 20 February 2016 the deal was finalized and agreed upon by the member states. The deal included a change in the treaty so that the further integration of the EU would not bind

¹² European Commission's series of public opinion surveys, held since 1973.

the UK to it, the UK would be able to protect the interests of the City of London and British businesses better than before, and, in addition, the UK would have the power to limit EU migrants' in-work benefits (Jensen and Snaith 2016). The settlement, however, was not popular with the British people as seen by the public discussion, and the Daily Mail even blamed Cameron for being deluded (DM030216/1). Yet, although the deal was not considered all that successful, the government had confidence that those voting for staying in the EU would remain victorious (G030216/1).

All the major parties in the Parliament were in favour of remaining in the EU, including the major opposition party, Labour (Hobolt 2016: 1261). According to Hobolt (*ibid.*), the Remain side was supported internationally, as well as domestically, by major businesses and trade unions. Despite the support and the fact that most of the government was in favour of staying in the European Union, the division was there. For instance, Boris Johnson, who was the former mayor of London and a member of the Conservative Party, was openly on Brexit's side, and he was one of the key figures in Vote Leave. On 15 April 2016, the referendum campaigns of Bremain and Brexit kicked off. The campaigns climaxed on June 24th in Brexit's win of the referendum with a turnout of 72,2%. The voting was tight. Brexit won with 51,9% over Bremain's 48,1%. In total, 46,500,001 votes were accepted. While Scotland and Northern Ireland voted overwhelmingly for staying, England and Wales mostly voted for leaving, even if there were also some significant regional variations (Electoral Commission 2016).

2.2.3 The immediate post-Brexit Britain

The immediate post-Brexit Britain was a divided nation, and remains one a year after the results were announced. As seen by the ballot percentages, the difference was only 3,8%. The situation became even more tumultuous when the Prime Minister, David Cameron, resigned as he refused to lead the United Kingdom into Brexit. Cameron had campaigned for Bremain and had been on the pro-EU side, although with his criticism of the EU in the previous years, even during the campaign, did not make him into an ardent EU supporter. He had even tried to get the deal from EU to entice the British people into voting for staying instead of leaving. As such, when the results came out, he immediately resigned on June 24th.

In the aftermath, there was now a need to find a new Prime Minister, and the leader of the Conservative Party, to finish what Cameron had unwittingly started. A few people took up the

challenge and started reaching for the position. It was expected of Boris Johnson, a central figure of Vote Leave and the former mayor of London, to rise as one of the candidates, but he was ousted by another Leave campaigner, Justice Secretary Michael Gove (Stewart 2016). The Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change Andrea Leadsom, the Home Secretary Theresa May, the former Secretary of State for Defence Liam Fox and the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions Stephen Crabb also rose from the Tories as the other candidates for the position.

May won the first ballot on July 5th by a significant factor. She received support from 165 lawmakers while Leadsom gained 66 votes and Gove was backed by just 48 MPs (Francis 2016). Crabb and Fox, who had gained the least votes, expressed their support for May. The second ballot was held on July 7th, and May won that too with her 199 votes to Leadsom's 84 and Gove's 46, eliminating Gove from the race (Francis 2016). On July 11th, Leadsom withdrew from the competition and May won the bid by default (Francis 2016) although she quite certainly would have won it anyway. On July 13th, David Cameron officially resigned as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, and his replacement, Theresa May, was appointed to the position by the Queen Elizabeth II at the Buckingham Palace.

2.3 Key issues raised during Brexit discussion and their backgrounds

One of the issues raised by the British public was strongly related to their identity. Essentially, it was questioned if the Brits were part of Europe and the EU or not. This was tied to Britain's long history. The British Empire was still very extensive in the early post-Second World War world. After the war, Britain was regarded as a victor and a major power since it had been part of the Allies. It also had a powerful network in the Commonwealth and strong ties with other leading nations in the world, and the UK could trust its place in the world. It did not need to tie itself to the continent, or at least it seemingly did not, as Watts' (2008) discussion showed. In the public discussion, it sometimes even seemed as if the UK was seen as a nation without true ties to Europe at all (Freeden 2017: 1).

However, the UK's stance in the quickly globalising world was weakening during the Cold War, and they needed to find a solution to the problem. The EEC was seen as a last resort of a sort to improve the situation (Watts 2008; Staab 2013). Still, as was stated in Chapter 2.2.1, the nation and its people were refused twice by Charles de Gaulle before the nation was admitted to the Community. This was a blow to the country's pride. As became apparent in

the public discussion, the British identity as people of a great global power had not lessened, and it was still alive in the minds of the Eurosceptics and others. Britain still had, and has, a lot of impact around the world. However, that impact is not on the same grand scale as it once was. This was since others, such as Russia and China, have caught up with the UK in terms of economic, military and overall political power. Nevertheless, the Commonwealth and the historical ties to the former British Empire were thought of fondly, as suggested by the growing Anglospheric way of thinking (Kenny and Pearce 2016).

According to Kenny and Pearce (2016), the support for the concept of the Anglosphere, which included countries like the UK, US, Australia, Canada and New Zealand lay with their common history, language and political culture. For the EU sceptics, this seemed like an ideal circle of co-operation, as they did not see Britain as part of Europe culturally (Kenny and Pearce 2016: 304). Brexit would present an opportunity to reconnect with people and nations that had more in common with Britain than the Europeans. Anglosphere had returned as a central part of the EU doubters' agenda in the 1980s and had grown stronger ever since in the conservative circles (Kenny and Pearce 2016: 305). What seemed to support this claim was that the USA was seen as a more preferred ally for the Brits than the EU was. This, in turn, was shown by the support the Blair government offered to the US during the crises of early 2000s despite the EU wanting to take a different role (Watts 2008). Kenny and Pearce (2016: 306) called the concept's power ideological instead of geopolitical, as it referred to the nostalgia to see Britain as a single global power again, and not just as a part of an integrated region.

This brought up another point which is power, or better yet, the lack of it. It happened that Britain did not gain influence over the EEC after its admittance. The UK was a big part of winning the Second World War, but it almost seemed as if it was now a little too late to gain a better standing. Certainly, had the nation participated from the beginning, it would quite probably still be an important part of the decision-making in the EU. In addition, it would have been able to shape the Union more towards intergovernmentalism than integration. Yet, although the UK was not the only one opposing the integration process and the treaties at times, it was still seemingly the most consistent in expressing its dislike and the most discontented (Staab 2013; Watts 2008).

Since the UK joined the EU, part of the political elite was seeing the institution as an entity eroding British sovereignty, territoriality and autonomy as a nation of its own. This was also

reflected in public opinion, as evidenced by Jones (2007). Reasons such as the single market and its economic opportunities, enhanced collective security, et cetera were no longer seen as good enough to keep them in something that was allegedly destroying Britain from the inside. One thing that reflected this attitude was the fact that interest in the elections held for the European Parliament had decreased as time went by, and that the UK had one of the lowest turnouts of all members (Jones 2007: 162-166). The EU was not seen as something which represented British people, and it was hard to hold an entity accountable for things that allegedly did not serve the needs or wants of the UK, or to regard its statutes as legitimate.

The Euroscepticism had old roots. In the 1980s and early 1990s, Margaret Thatcher, for example, was firmly against the idea of European integration even if she thought the trade deals and the common market essential for Britain. The economic benefits were too great to ignore, so to speak. This was what Britain Stronger in Europe clung to, as the campaigners felt that remaining in the EU would give them the best of both worlds. After all, they had gained concessions on being able to remain in the single market without the Schengen agreement or the common currency (Staab 2013; Watts 2008). Yet, the regionalism of the EU and the globalisation phenomena together were considered as growing inequalities which distorted the distribution of wealth and widened the gap between the rich and the poor (Grenade 2016: 512). The single market was a cornerstone of the EU and required the movement of labour, the free movement of people, to be viable. This was, however, creating tension in public discussion, and immigrants were blamed for taking jobs from British citizens and threatening their rights. With immigration, in this case with the European movement of labour, the people needed the same benefits as the native population from health care to democratic rights (Grenade 2016: 512-513). In the end, immigration turned out to be a decisive factor in the referendum campaigning. UKIP (the United Kingdom Independence Party) and Vote Leave took advantage of it while Britain Stronger in Europe failed to reassure the citizens about their concerns.

According to Freedon (2017: 1), it was as if people in the UK were afraid of Europeans more than they were of refugees or immigrants from outside Europe. As the public discussion showed, immigration was connected more with the freedom of movement of the Europeans than the refugee masses of the Middle East or workers from elsewhere. For example, with refugees, there was a national quota, whereas there were no restrictions for the European migration. The EU citizens could come and go as they pleased, and as Vote Leave liked to emphasise, the coming far outweighed the going. This was also noted by the Guardian in

2014, suggesting that one of the main drivers behind British people's negative attitudes towards immigration was that the debate was primarily about numbers (G291114/3). The thought of the population growing even more – and what that could bring – was frightening. There was also a common perception of the health care system failing, house prices rising, infrastructure falling, and a shortfall of places at schools, all due to immigration. Even if the net economic contribution of migration was positive in the UK in recent years, the recognition of the newcomers' efforts and what could happen if they left were absent from the consideration of Brexit's effects (Gietel-Basten 2016: 674-678).

However, the UKIP with its populism was not the first party to be against the European Union. One of the things which affected public opinion hard was the lack of a strong pro-European lead from British ministers (Watts 2008: 268). When leaders were not backing the European Union, it was no wonder that public opinion was slowly turning against the establishment too. Even the political elite seen as pro-European were displeased with their continental counterparts (*ibid.*). The first pro-European leader since Edward Heath was Labour's Tony Blair, and he believed there were merits in belonging to the European Union beyond the common market, but only if Britain could create space of influence for itself. Yet, when he was focused on building that and maintaining relations with both Europe and the USA, he forgot to do the same inside his own borders. As mentioned earlier by Jones (2007), very little is actually known about Europe by the British public, and public opinion was increasingly negative. Overall, the attitudes of the latter towards the UK's membership of the EEC, and later the EU, could be described by what Geoffrey Martin, one-time head of the European Commission office in London, once said:

“The British have not seen Europe as an opportunity. They regard it as somewhere between an obligation and a mistake” (Watts 2008: 268).

In addition, David Cameron was an actor in making Brexit happen. As has been established, he promised the referendum as part of the Conservative Party's General Elections campaign. He was also a prominent figure of Britain Stronger in Europe after getting his hard-sought deal from the European Union to stop the seemingly never-ending immigration flow. Cameron seemed confident that the pro-European side would win and, perhaps because of that, did not seem to think he needed to work much to convince the public to Britain Stronger in Europe. For example, he did not appear at the last debate before the ballot on June 21st at Wembley Arena in London. However, Britain Stronger in Europe overall was less vigorous than Vote Leave. It was not just Cameron's lacklustre performance as one of the leading

figures which caused them to lose. Labour was also accused of underwhelming support by Brexiteers, particularly after the referendum results.

The rallies arranged by Brexiters also brought the matter much closer to the layperson. Their claims especially resonated well with them. For example, the money spent on the EU could allegedly be used for bettering the ailing British health care system. Yet, whatever reasons there might have been, it was made clear that during the 43 years since the country's joining in 1973 to the referendum of 2016, the UK had been on the periphery during the integration efforts. There have been those who supported Britain in the EU, and those who did not. There have been those with no opinion at all, particularly since knowledge of the European Union was quite low in the referendum context. In any case, it seemed that the lack of enthusiasm towards the EU has been more constant during the years than the commitment towards it, and this surely contributed to Vote Leave's triumph in June 2016.

Overall, a few key issues were raised during the campaigns, and most of them can be divided into the three categories of immigration, economy and identity as either something which affected the themes, or which were affected by them. These three issues will be examined in more depth in Chapter 5. The next chapter will discuss the methods used in the present study.

3 DISCOURSE AND MEDIA

In this chapter, the theoretical and methodological framework of the present study is discussed. Because the data of the study derive from the printed media, the logical choice of approach is discourse analysis, particularly critical discourse analysis (CDA). In addition, content analysis (CA) is used to complement CDA. Media discourse is also discussed in its own subchapter.

3.1 Discourse analysis

In the most abstract sense, *discourse* is an analytical category describing the vast array of meaning-making resources available to us (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak 2011: 357). However, if described more concretely, it is basically social use of language. Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak (2011: 358) argue that since discourse is socially influential, it gives rise to important issues of power and has major ideological effects. Discourse is not restricted by any sort of bounds but what the society or what we ourselves set for us, and sometimes not even by those; it is socially constitutive as well as socially shaped (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak (2011: 358). The focus is on the relationship between structure and action; texts and interaction (Fairclough 2001a: 124); what the texts include, continuity and change are all things with which the approach is concerned. The contexts of the texts matter, as the texts are often framed to enhance arguers' rhetorical interests (Fairclough and Fairclough 2012: 93) as the representation of their goals and legitimising what is being presented before the audience. Therefore, understanding what is said is necessary but so is how it is said and what tools are used. Discourse studies aim for transparency.

3.1.1 Language and discourse

Language use is always both a linguistic and a social activity (Pietikäinen 2009) since language is not powerful on its own (Wodak 2001: 10). Language is more than just something we speak and write according to rules; it is something we use to create different nuances and meanings, how we express ourselves and the things around us. Furthermore, it is important to remember that language is not objective either. It is full of meanings and history, and there may not even be exact equivalents in other languages for specific terms. Therefore, language is intertwined with the way we as human beings act. Language is in all ways that matter a sociohistorical and political construct, and it gains power by the use powerful people make of

it, for example by how politicians influence people to gain their favour in the times of elections and to support their ideas, not unlike how producers market their products. It changes as the people who use it change.

Pietikäinen (2009) also notes that a discourse researcher analyses language – how it is organized and how it changes – to know more about the contemporary world, not just about the language. Every instance of language use makes its own small contribution to reproducing and/or transforming society and culture (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak 2011: 370). People can legitimise or delegitimise particular relations of power, culture and ideology without even being conscious of it (Fairclough 2001b: 33). When something becomes common sense, it no longer is something unnatural but a part of life (Fairclough 2001b: 89). This is part of the reason why representation is an important aspect of language as language represents the reality and the present. People express themselves through language, and having themselves represented through language validates their being. This can be called voiced culture (Fairclough 2001b: 89).

Mautner (2008: 48) adds that the specific contribution that qualitative discourse analysis can make lies in making explicit the linguistic means through which representations of reality and social relationships are enacted, to which Wodak (2008: 2) adds that it provides a general framework to problem-oriented social research. A key word to use here is intertextuality, which basically means that all texts are connected to other texts both past and present. Without the connection to the context, texts themselves have no meaning, and important linguistic means and social actions may be left unnoticed. This does not mean that if there was no representation of something before, it was not something valid or did not exist; context can prove that something had a place in the world before there was a word for it. Discourse studies is interdisciplinary and builds on connections between linguistics and history, social studies, cultural studies and more. These four are also linked to the present study as the coverage of Brexit in the British newspaper media ties to its historical background, today's social situation, the meeting of cultures, and the effect these have on the language people and media use.

3.1.2 Critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) focuses on power structures and investigates how language is connected to social practice and what influence it may have. As Fairclough, Mulderrig and

Wodak (2011: 357) describe CDA, it can be seen as a problem-oriented interdisciplinary research movement mixing different approaches which are united in their shared interests in the semiotic dimensions of power, injustice, abuse, and political-economic or cultural change in society. CDA's discursive nature enhances particularly well contemporary society's power relations, especially those between media and politics (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak 2011: 369). One of the key issues for the analysts using CDA is how to make their analyses relatable to the critical activity in everyday life when the analyses are produced in academic environments (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak 2011: 373). There is, however, no division between academic and everyday environments that cannot be crossed, even if the criticism used in daily life does not draw from theories or methodologies while academic research requires a basis to validate it.

As a social means, language is akin to building blocks of the reality we live in. It is important to understand that all people have their unique points of view which have been built through their lives, and the language they use represents what they believe in and who they are. For example, if one looks at an online newspaper's comment section, it is easy to see warring ideas of how things should be. However, as Fairclough (2001b: 19) notes, while all linguistic phenomena are social, not all social phenomena are linguistic even if they may have a language element in them. The text, the representation, is a product rather than a process. It is the outcome of how people look at the reality around them, the product of the process of what they see and interpret through their own experiences. People internalise what is socially produced (Fairclough 2001b: 20), which is shown by the way they use their words, how they act, what they consider as right or wrong. Discourse is where these aspects meet. Reality and discourse involve a combination of many different processes that are always in change.

CDA studies of power also focus on the building of ideology and identity as well as on the legitimisation of actions, and on how domination and manipulation are being used in public. Van Dijk (2008: 85) defines the approach by how it studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context, typically applying both micro and macro levels of analysis. He is also of the opinion that in order to be able to use CDA well, there is a need of integration of various approaches before the users can arrive at a satisfactory form of multidisciplinary analysis (van Dijk 2008: 99). This is why the present study also draws on content analysis. CDA does not have a set of relatively fixed methods tying to it even if it follows standards of analysis the same as the other approaches. This makes it – and discourse studies overall – ideal for

approach-integrative research. After all, the research process often starts with the topic rather than the method (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak 2011: 358-359). Van Dijk even calls the approach discourse studies instead of discourse analysis (van Dijk, 2008: 2-3) because it uses any relevant method it needs, rather than just one particular method. As it is, discourse studies are not limited to only linguistics but they also focus on social activity and the effects it has on discourse.

3.2 Media discourse

Key areas of social life are becoming increasingly centred on the media (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak 2011: 359), and this is particularly true with politics. Before, politicians may have found it harder to reach their audience but nowadays they barely have to speak before whatever they say makes it to the front page of a newspaper, on television or onto social media, to be seen by the world. This sort of publicity also provides greater chances of being discredited but the possibilities often outweigh the downsides. In addition, Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak (2011: 360) note that the increased importance of language in social life has led to a greater level of conscious intervention to control and shape language practices in accordance with economic, political and institutional objectives. This provides the media an ample opportunity to spin news however they wish, just as the politicians and their assistants do too, and technology has made reaching the audience easier than ever before. With all the constant input, it has been made necessary for audiences to be constantly on their toes, for it is easy to get lost in the barrage of information.

Typically, mass media material requires a framework, a theory, a vocabulary, and an analytical focus in terms of which the researcher can construct a suitable context for analysis (Krippendorff 2013: 33). Krippendorff adds that a stereotypical aim of mass media analysis is to describe how a controversial issue is ‘depicted’ in a chosen genre as well as analysing the descriptions of how something is ‘covered’, ‘portrayed’ or ‘represented’ in the media (2013: 34). It is, however, important to notice that even with mass media, it is impossible to report everything happening around the world. Depending on the audience, different types of news take the forefront. This sort of selectivity shows that the media take an active part in shaping the world as we see it and our understanding of it, as noted by McCullagh (2002: 15). If particular media are being partial to something, the effect on the readers will be lopsided too, and may define their sense of reality. The interpretation can change if the knowledge of context is limited, but also according to the values and beliefs the readers hold. While

analysing texts, one needs to look not only at the texts but also at their reception and effects, as well as at the context in which they appear in and who the audience is (Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak 2011: 370-373) as they reveal reasons for such selectivity.

This pattern of selectivity constitutes a distortion and a misinterpretation of significant events and issues in the world (McCullagh 2002: 16). McCullagh (2002: 16) also states that more often than not both British and American newspapers do not pass as fair media for their type of news coverage is influenced by their political affiliations; thus, their coverage is meant for the part of the audience who share their ideals (2002: 18), and this trait is not limited to just the mentioned two nations. Printed media is not required to be objective if they do not wish to be, and they often offer information with the framing peculiar to the medium. Using particular words to describe events, people and issues clearly calls attention not only to the language but the attitudes too. These practices insert meanings behind discourse that often try to appeal to the emotions of the audience, and the aim of CDA is to make these sorts of meanings transparent for the rest of people by looking at them critically.

Information is also often merely implied. Nonverbal messaging is an important part of communications and, for example, printed media utilises it in the way articles are structured; some of the key parameters include visuals, page layout, frames, boxed inserts, font, style and size (Mautner 2008: 43). The front page is often what makes people decide to buy a paper. The bigger and more eye-catching the header is, the better. In addition, where the articles are placed matters too; which articles are given the space to influence the readers, which are put in the last pages with relatively small coverage or even left out. Pictures and photographs, especially now with all the colours, draw attention more than a thousand words will, and for a reason: with a quick glance, they do tell more than the words one does not have time to read. Cartoons are specifically crafted to make social commentary with minimalistic perfection. Boxed inserts work the same way, with the enticing quotes emphasizing the main points the authors want their readers to notice. Using figures and charts has also been found a good way to attract attention (Mautner 2008: 38), since numbers are easier to compare than more abstract concepts, for instance immigration issues. Overall, the analysis of printed media aims to identify meaning-making resources on various linguistic levels, focusing in particular on devices used to position readers into adopting a certain point of view (Mautner 2008: 49).

Understanding the effect of different media's use of language has an important part in understanding the politics of today and the past. In addition, Chilton and Schäffner (2002: 3)

point out that the study of politics and of language in relation to politics involves certain ambivalence with regards to empirical facts and subjective or group values. There are no hard facts that can be picked up from studying political interaction, only interpretations. There is no easy way to define what politics even is. Yet, if the premise that politics is largely language is correct, then there is abundant empirical evidence in the form of text and talk (Chilton and Schäffner, 2002: 4). What limits the data, however, is using context to characterise what is considered political or what is not. Nevertheless, it can be said that politics and the influence of the politicians are based on agreements and, as McNair (1995: 18) notes, the importance of an informed, knowledgeable electorate dictates that democratic politics must be pursued in the public arena. People vote according to what they have heard, read and learnt, and the possibility to do so, and to question politicians' motives should be freely available in the public sphere. Yet, it can also be debated whether politicians truly want an informed electorate, or if one can even exist.

Events, such as elections, create material that has many political functions and implications, and often different media have their own opinions of things. As Krippendorff (2013: 55) states, citing Klein and Maccoby (1954), differences in news coverage of political campaigns have been correlated with editorial endorsements. Sometimes the bias is questioned, and there have been evaluations made to judge the accuracy of reporting and pure favouritism which can be surprisingly hard to distinguish from each other. Krippendorff (2013: 59) and McCullagh (2002: 23) both note that it is often assumed that journalists and the printed media are committed to being fair to all sides in their reporting, which, in practice, may be hard to follow when papers practise selectivity in ways that may conflict with the journalists' own beliefs. McNair (1995: 27) adds that for a variety of reasons, the media's political reportage is subjective and partisan instead of objective and impartial. He suggests that political actors practise a mix of manipulating the public opinion as well as concealing and suppressing inconvenient information, and that these traits are being pursued by media institutions (McNair 1995: 26). Yet, no one can truly say for whose benefit it is because of the selectivity used in the public sphere. When most if not all practise selectivity, it is impossible to know all facts.

The effects media discourse has can be both micro level as well as macro in the sense that they can affect individuals as singular units or as masses (McNair 1995: 28). With linguistic tools of both spoken and/or written texts, media can interfere with the thought processes of

the readers and nudge them to see the point they wish them to see or leave one side of the story unveiled. In a larger picture this may cause, for example, movements of the masses. In micro level studies, the effects of media are more concerned with the individual level, often investigating newspapers, while the macro level studies are more concerned with masses and speeches. Both levels of studies, however, can be used while conducting a study as they do not cancel each other out but rather enhance the other. Interpretation is what media discourse studies is all about, which means that a critical reading of the texts presented for consumption is needed every single day.

3.3 Content analysis

Content analysis is a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from texts (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use (Krippendorff 2013: 24). What this means is that content analysis is interested in studying texts in order to find out more about particular phenomena or actions and, as Hansen et al. (1998: 95) note, to be able to say something about the messages, images, representations of texts and their wider social significance. Krippendorff (2013: 27) explains that the method also takes into account that all texts are produced and read by other people, not just the analysts, and that texts are bound to have some sort of an effect, small as it might be, on their readers regardless of who they are.

Krippendorff (2013: 28-30) has counted six features that define content analysis which are as follows: texts have no objective qualities; they have no single meanings; the meanings do not have to be shared by others; they speak to something other than the given texts; texts have meanings relative to particular contexts, discourses, or purposes; and, finally, the nature of texts demands that content analysis draws specific inferences from a body of texts of their chosen context. While the readers are not pressured to read something, Krippendorff suggests that reading requires an attempt at making sense of something and, thus, commits to it. A consensus of what is understood is not necessary since there are as many ways to read a text as there are people. As Krippendorff explains, interpretations may vary, but there are still characteristics in texts that can be used to make conclusions, which then can be discussed for further inferences. The meanings are always connected to context. Content analysis looks for answers for particular research questions, and as such expects a more systematic approach than what a lay-reader may have on offer.

Content analysis can be used for many purposes, which include comparing media and the communication they use and searching for defining traits and differences from texts (Weber 1990: 9). These can include campaign materials as well as other political texts, and cultural and social situations. Other instances where the method can be used involve looking for patterns that have commonality within the particular material. The approach can also offer insight into relative prominences and absences (Hansen et al. 1998: 95). Repetitive, routine, public, and institutionalized phenomena are easier to infer than rare and unconventional ones (Krippendorff 2013: 80). Weber (1990: 70) adds that measurement is the key in content analysis: counting the occurrences of meaning units, such as specific words, phrases, content categories, and themes.

Yet, Krippendorff (2013: 189) observes that counting is justified only when the resulting frequency accounts can somehow be related to what a body of text means in the chosen context or, as Hansen et al. (1998: 98) suggest, when counting is about occurrences of specified dimensions and analysing the relationships between those dimensions. As such, the method looks into more than just the linguistic aspect of discourse, and it has been found that content analysis and linguistically constituted facts work well together to capture features, such as attributions, social relationships, public behaviours, and institutional realities (Krippendorff 2013: 78-80). However, it is clear that texts acquire significance (meanings, contents, symbolic qualities, and interpretations) in the contexts of their use, as Krippendorff notes, and that the texts are always constructed by someone (2013: 38), meaning that there are agendas woven into them, and this is particularly true when discussing and analysing media material.

The present chapter has explored critical discourse analysis, content analysis and media discourse as part of the theoretical background of the study. The next chapter, Chapter 4, will discuss the aims and the data of the present study, and examine newspapers as objects of analysis.

4 AIMS, DATA AND METHOD

4.1 Research questions

The aim of the present study is to shed light onto how British newspapers treated Brexit and its development since the referendum announcement to the referendum itself and its aftermath. The focus is on the key issues that arose during the campaigning, and the language used in order to convey meanings and purpose for readers. This will be achieved by analysing two major British papers, the Daily Mail and the Guardian, which have differing opinions on Brexit and are on different sides of the political spectrum. The research questions of the present study are as follows:

- 1a) During the years from 2013 to 2016 leading to Brexit, how were the themes of immigration, economy and identity covered in the Daily Mail and the Guardian?
- 1b) How did the themes affect the overall coverage of Brexit in the papers?
- 2) What linguistic and lexical choices were made by the Daily Mail and the Guardian to influence their readerships and to enhance the newspapers' agendas?

In seeking answers to particularly questions 1a and 1b, the study focuses on the three themes of immigration, economy and identity which emerged from both papers and from previous research into the topic, as well as from public discussion. Attention was paid to the papers' political orientations and opinions on the referendum, and their effect on the topic choices of the articles and the overall coverage. Therefore, the analysis explored the purposes of the texts. The second question focuses more on the content of the articles, and how language was used in them, delving deeper into the differences between the coverage offered by the Daily Mail and the Guardian. Particular focus was put on how the papers sought to influence their readerships. For that, altogether four key texts were selected from two dates to be compared. The present study also aims to discuss how the history and culture of Britain may have influenced the articles and, if they did, how those issues were used to enhance the papers' agendas as well.

4.2 The Daily Mail and the Guardian

4.2.1 Newspapers in the UK

The newspapers in the United Kingdom are widely spread and read; in the 1960s, 85-90% of the British adult population read a national daily regularly, and even in the 1990s the same number of people read newspapers at least once a week (Tunstall 1996: 223). Nowadays, though, their readership largely remains online. The newspapers used in the study are part of different types of papers; the Guardian is a daily broadsheet paper and the Daily Mail is part of what is called the tabloid national press. The Guardian has overall fewer readers than the Daily Mail. In 2015, the Guardian's net readership was 16,314,000 per month, compared to the Daily Mail's 23,449,000, as estimated by the National Readership Survey in the UK. The latter newspaper's printed version had a higher circulation than the Guardian's since its 10,636,000 prints a month were almost thrice that of the Guardian's, which was 3,653,000. However, online, their numbers were more of a match. With the online readership estimation, the difference in numbers was merely 830,000¹³ readers per month (Ponsford 2016), even if it was still in favour of the Daily Mail.

With a rich history behind them, the newspaper media in Britain have affected the political sphere, in one way or another, for a significant amount of time, and they have some unique traits. For example, the competition between the papers is brutal by European standards since most of the leading papers are published in London, and they have to find ways to make themselves differ from all the others (Tunstall 1996: 2), which might explain how unrestrained and free the papers are to express their own opinions to attract their desired audience. British people are also known for their tabloid national newspapers (Tunsdall 1996: 9), which are focusing more on entertainment and shock value, engaging readers with sensational pieces of news. Broadsheets, on the other hand, work at the other end of the spectrum. While tabloids focus on the entertainment value as the papers rely on sales and their news pieces are often comparatively short, broadsheets approach their audience with predominantly more serious stories with a longer word count; their readership is more geared towards the elite and the educated, so their pages are prime space for advertisers which are the papers' main source of income (Tunsdall 1996: 11-12). As these characteristics demonstrate, the newspaper media in Britain is split along social class lines (Tunstall 1996: 8).

¹³ The Daily Mail's online readership was 11,318,000 while The Guardian's was 10,488,000.

From the newspapers analysed as part of the present study, the Daily Mail is part of the right-wing press with a tendency to lean towards the Conservative Party and populism. It is most popular with middle to working class readers and can be counted as a midmarket paper. It was launched by Alfred Harmsworth in 1896 and was transformed by going tabloid when it merged with the Daily Sketch in 1971 (Tunstall 1996: 15). Therefore, it shares characteristics with the tabloid press by catering for entertainment but also has its fair share of political content influenced by the paper's orientation. Tunstall describes the newspaper's desired audience as affluent middle-class, middle-aged Middle or Southern England, but it has both Irish and Scottish editions as well. It is the second biggest-selling daily newspaper in the UK, after the downmarket leader The Sun. It is owned by the Daily Mail and General Trust.

The Guardian, on the other hand, is more in the left-centrist paper with a liberal ideology, and leans more towards the upmarket dailies with its younger and more highly educated readership (Tunstall 1996: 93-94). The paper's reader demographic is proven, for example, by how much of its advertisement space is used by recruiters compared to the Daily Telegraph's older readership (Tunstall 1996: 94). It was known from 1821 until 1958 as the Manchester Guardian, and it is part of the Guardian Media Group owned by The Scott Trust Limited which aims to secure and safeguard, for example, the editorial independence, journalistic freedom and liberal values of the press (The Guardian 2015).

The papers have very different agendas and opinions. As was shown during the Brexit campaigning – both prior and during – the Daily Mail was very pro-Brexit while the Guardian was pro-Bremain. The Daily Mail supported the idea of the UK striking out on their own, finding their own place as a single nation while the Guardian considered that staying part of the EU was the way to go. The papers clashed with contrasting opinions on all the related matters. Even almost a year since the referendum at the end of March 2017 when the article 50 was triggered by Prime Minister May, the papers held animosity towards each other's ideals. The Guardian is often called out online for publishing *remoaner*¹⁴ articles and scaremongering while the Daily Mail faces complaints of not facing the reality and living in a fantasy world. Interestingly, the papers themselves do not often take part in that debate. Instead, they follow their own agenda and continue to publish accordingly – but their comment sections do debate on the papers' merits, and loudly.

¹⁴ People unhappy with the referendum results, most often those who were in support of Britain Stronger in Europe.

4.2.2 The articles

The data of the present study are printed newspaper articles from the Daily Mail and the Guardian. Printed media was chosen for the analysis since examining all media – printed, online, broadcast news – was impossible for a limited study of this kind. Another reason why newspapers were chosen was that they are still widely read, despite the growing presence of the Internet and the apps, and are regarded as respected sources of news. The papers were accessed through Finna, a large database composed of the archives, the libraries and the museums Finland has, through the University of Jyväskylä's library portal which allowed the examination of the papers. The availability of the material also influenced the decision to study the newspapers in question.

The articles chosen had a few requirements that had to be met. There had to have been something published and available that linked to the European Union in both newspapers on that date. This was achieved by choosing dates around which something significant, such as EU summits, had happened. Matching data for comparison was preferred but not required. The texts also had to have something to do with the United Kingdom either directly, as in discussing the EU's effects on Britain, or indirectly while discussing one of the other target themes such as immigration. If these requirements were not fulfilled, then another date was picked. The articles were further chosen via keywords, for example the EU, Brexit and immigration, to narrow down the relevant material. In case of the Daily Mail, there could be three or more versions of the same article since the database included, for instance, the Eire and Scot versions of the paper as well as the different editions issued during the same day if there were any. From them only one version was chosen for further inspection, which in this case was the English version of the paper and the latest edition of the article.

The first articles were picked from the issue of 23 January 2013 forward, when former Prime Minister David Cameron swore that if his party won the General Election in 2015, they would ensure that a vote on the UK's membership of the European Union would happen. From then on two dates a year, about half a year apart, were chosen until from year 2016 there were six dates chosen. Altogether they amounted to 12 dates on which the articles that fulfilled the previously mentioned criteria were published and selected for analysis. After narrowing down the material, around 30 articles per paper were picked, 61 in total. Originally there was an attempt to only use 10 dates with only four for year 2016 but, for the sake of coherence and showcasing the changes across time, two more were added into the fold. The last date

included was 13 July 2016, when Theresa May became the new Prime Minister, as the date closed the circle David Cameron started. The articles were coded by shortening the newspapers' names, the date, and the number of the article during the date. For example, DM230113/1 refers to an article from the Daily Mail, from 23 January 2013. In case there are multiple articles from that date, the last /1 is the number to separate them from each other.

The key texts were chosen with similar criteria of having something to do with the EU and issues surrounding it, yet with one particular difference. While studying the overall image of the papers, matching data was merely preferred, now it was required for the simple need of being able to compare the Daily Mail and the Guardian. The dates were chosen from a similar time period from a year and a half to two years apart from each other, and are as follows: 23 January 2013 and 24 June 2016. Altogether, four articles were selected, two per paper, one for each date from each paper. The reasons for choosing these two dates in particular are as follows. The articles looked more in-depth into the content and context correlation from the period than the rest did, and they matched each other by their topics. It was considered important to consider longer rather than shorter time periods to see if the language and tones of the papers changed, and if there were some recurring themes to be found. Taking on a longer time frame also showed how the attitudes and the discussion evolved from the initial start to the aftermath.

The first date is also seen as the starting point of the Brexit countdown, which gave the analysis a basis to which to compare. The second date was the day after the ballot when the results were official. The articles gave a clear idea of what the newspapers thought of the referendum as they present check points of a kind in the referendum's development, the start and the end. For that, they were well in line to be studied further. The present study looked into how the articles are placed in the issues, what the overall tone was, whether the newspapers' political stances had an effect on their Brexit coverage, what the context of the articles were, etc., in addition to the written language and the linguistic tools, such as loaded words, used. This gave a better insight into how the newspapers dealt with the referendum, what the newspapers' opinions were and how they wanted to influence their readers.

4.3 Newspapers as objects of analysis

Newspapers have been to this day an important way of spreading information on contemporary events. Depending on the source and its reputation, printed media, such as newspapers, magazines and books, are often seen as trustworthy and, while electronic versions of those are gaining popularity and, in some cases, are already more popular, print versions are still selling well to this day and are widely circulated. While studying newspaper data, it is especially important to pay attention to two areas: news values and news sources (Mautner 2008: 33). According to Mautner (*ibid.*), selection – whether a piece of news appears in print or not – is conditioned by economic, political, cultural and social structures which are highly routinized. They play a key part in making clear what the paper deems newsworthy, and show what the paper values and wants to sell for its audience. The sources are, in addition, something to be concerned with when reading newspapers. Pieces of news are rarely without an opinion ingrained in them. Not mentioning a source can be meaningful and worth looking into too as a piece of news without one can be hard to confirm as truth, and thus reliable information, if all sources cannot be provided. Therefore, whether a source is mentioned or not says a lot about an article's trustworthiness, despite the fact that sometimes reporters cannot reveal their sources if those particular sources are confidential. Nevertheless, what gets published essentially establishes a sort of status quo the paper wants to maintain or change in the audience's minds. The papers may be biased, influencing the writing and use of source material.

There are plenty of argumentative devices to look for in textual analysis. As mentioned earlier in the previous chapter discussing discourse studies, language is full of semantically loaded words and the more loaded they are, the more they appeal to people and raise their interest. The trait of using loading is particularly common with tabloid papers that use more radical language but no form of media is free from the practice, especially newspapers, as the present study will show in the analysis of two different kinds of papers. The lexical choices create patterns a paper may follow, for instance to showcase a political agenda. Linguistic discourse analysis is a particularly good method for picking out the linguistic devices that direct the readers' attention. Another method is content analysis since, in the end, the content is what the readers reach out for even if discourse studies help to understand how and why a piece of news is presented the way it is.

One device to look out for is the establishment of rapport between author and reader (Mautner 2008: 43). Appealing to the readers' sense of self and common sense is important so that the readers are able to relate to the topic at hand. The authors often aim to construct a relationship between themselves and their readers, a commonality of interest one might say. For example, using pronouns such as *we* and *us* establishes a link between the authors and the audience and shows that they are in the same boat and on the readers' side. This brings a level of trust into play and the relationship is used to convince the readers that what they read is the truth. For printed media, this is especially crucial because they are often viewed as the more legitimate source of information than online media. It is, however, important to remember that the authors do not write the articles alone but that they, particularly in printed media, are carefully selected and approved before they are passed to print. An argumentative strategy often used is also linking a particular event, establishment or person to something else like labels, either with positive or negative connotations, depending on how the paper wants to sell the case. Metaphors accentuate this point, and particularly in tabloids the more vernacular the expression is, the more it resonates with the readers.

Another relevant analytic point of view is modality: the ways in which language is used to encode meanings such as degrees of certainty and commitment, or alternatively vagueness and lack of commitment, personal beliefs versus generally accepted knowledge or knowledge taken for granted (Mautner 2008: 41, see also Stubbs 1996). The present study is particularly interested in exploring the way the newspapers present their articles and the information in them, for example, whether the information is written with conviction or uncertainty, and the level of commitment the articles, and thus the papers, have for the issues covered. These can be illustrated, for example, by the use of modal verbs such as *may* and *must*. Tabloids often paint a black-and-white world for their readers and express strong opinions while more academically-oriented papers even hedge with stating what is true or not (Mautner 2008: 42) as they typically see the world in different shades of grey. People tend to crave for hard facts, and media are trying to cater to that need, but they are rarely offered when one is reading anything critically.

The media coverage of Brexit was massive, and everyone had their own opinions on the matter. The interplay of the paper and the event had a huge part in influencing the voting, and fuelled debates of identity, fear of the future, and disappointments of the past. Because studying all media on the topic would have been too difficult and large a project to cover for a

Master's thesis, the study was limited to the newspaper media and later to two papers which represent opposite ends of the British newspaper spectrum. As mentioned earlier, these two newspapers are the *Guardian* and the *Daily Mail*. The material is also more permanent and as such easier to collect and analyse than online or app versions of the articles, and the papers represent the mainstream line of printed media that sell to the target audience and, as such, can have the power to influence them.

The present study's analysis section focuses on the two papers, and on seeing the effects the historical features have on the texts as well as on how the papers convey meanings through their articles verbally and nonverbally; what was said and how things were said or if nothing was said at all. Things that were under consideration include the papers' opinions and political orientations and whether they affected the language of the articles. Brexit itself was a divisive event politically, and Prime Minister David Cameron had given his permission for the members of his government to campaign as they wished. It was interesting to see if the same division could be seen within the two newspapers and if it was, then what were the devices which helped to convey the points.

As introduced earlier in the previous chapter, the two methods of this study are critical discourse analysis and content analysis. Particularly one approach within critical discourse analysis, called the 'discourse-historical approach', is used in the study. The distinctive feature of this approach is its attempt to integrate systematically all available background information in the analysis and interpretation of the many layers of a written or spoken text, specifically taking into account the context (Wodak 2001). It is used to study texts which, for example, concern politics and/or phenomena such as racism and identity. The context in which the media worked has deep roots in recent history, and it became increasingly important to understand where the referendum had come from before the articles concerning the phenomenon could be analysed. One cannot claim to understand the reasons for the dissatisfaction towards the EU or the support for it until the events up to Brexit are investigated.

The analysis is divided into two chapters. Chapter 5 focuses on the articles as a whole through the themes of immigration, economy and identity, and Chapter 6 explores the key texts. Chapter 5 was conducted by first reading through the data carefully, keeping an eye out for the larger themes that emerged and the key issues which had been previously identified in the background section. This helped to limit the themes discussed in the present study to

immigration, economy and identity. It became prominent almost immediately that the data could not be analysed by quantitative methods on word level, thus the qualitative direction of the present study. Another thing which quickly became apparent was that the themes of immigration, economy and identity were connected more deeply than others. This eased the selection of which direction to take in the present study.

Furthermore, limiting the study to the three themes was done to narrow down the material from the sizable number of over two hundred articles to a more manageable and relevant data set. The remaining articles were then combed through to look for the word choices, citations, etc. used to convey meanings for the readership, like associating a particular event, opinion or person with negative or positive connotations. Content analysis was particularly useful in analysing the data, in particular the emerging patterns, relative prominences and absences, and repetitive use of strategies, words and themes itself. The placement of the articles in the issues was also considered in a limited capacity. It was not possible to study the whole printed versions of the issues, merely the articles and key details such as page numbers in the online archive. Unfortunately, additional details such as advertisements and pictures attached to the articles had to be left out from the study for this very reason.

For Chapter 6 the chosen key texts were examined so that the differences between the papers and their meaning-making tools would be easier to compare and analyse. The texts' topics mirrored each other with different points of views, and it became quickly clear that the papers considered different things relevant. The findings were linked to the existing context, such as events which were happening during the dates the articles were chosen from. Because Brexit was – and is – a political event, attention was paid to the political orientation of the papers and their desired effects on the target audience. Critical discourse analysis was used to study how the papers utilised language in order to represent reality. For example, attention was paid to how the papers seemed to build and maintain certain ideologies and identities characteristic to them through which they legitimised or judged actions of those they reported. Intertextuality and modality were also considered as well as the mood created by lexical and linguistic choices. These factors contributed to the analysis by showing how selective the papers turned out to be in their narratives, and how opposite these narrations were. In short, attention was paid to the linguistic and lexical choices made by the papers to influence the target audiences, with particular focus on intertextuality, modality, vocabulary, selectivity, representation and legitimation.

The summary of the study and suggestions for future study are presented in Chapter 7.

5 THE DAILY MAIL AND THE GUARDIAN ON IMMIGRATION, ECONOMY AND IDENTITY

This chapter examines the Daily Mail and the Guardian on their coverage of Brexit from 2013 to 2016 by focusing on three major themes which emerged in the collected material: immigration, economy and identity. The main emphasis is on news articles but editorials and opinion pieces are also analysed for their content and to shed light on what was published and why.

5.1 Immigration

Immigration was a major issue for the voters in the United Kingdom, as became apparent from the data. However, it was not instantly connected to the upcoming referendum. For example, immigration was not specifically mentioned in the Daily Mail's reportage of Prime Minister David Cameron's speech when he promised the referendum (DM230113) during the General Election campaign. Neither was it mentioned in the Guardian's articles on the speech (G230113/1; G230113/2). It is possible that this could mean that Cameron did not view immigration as a big issue at the time. It was equally possible, even likely, that while some British people were discontented with immigration, it was the upcoming referendum that brought it to centre stage. These observations were supported by the data, as the analysis will show.

By March 2014, immigration had already started to become one of the central issues, even if it was probably not connected to the referendum yet. The Daily Mail (DM060314/1) quoted Immigration Minister James Brokenshire, according to whom,

“Mass immigration has delivered cheap labour for a ‘wealthy metropolitan elite’ while making life harder for ‘ordinary, hard-working people’.”

The statement implied that while reducing immigration had not been on Cameron's immediate agenda a year earlier, it certainly was becoming part of it by March 2014. What the Daily Mail brought up was that only the elite got something out of immigration while the rest of the population continued to suffer. This would also become a major theme expressed by the paper, considered especially in chapter 5.2, because of the economic ramifications.

The Daily Mail (DM060314/1) called out the opposition, in this case Business Secretary Vince Cable of the Liberal Democrats, for accusing the critics of large-scale immigration for

wanting to drag Britain back to so-called medieval days. According to the paper, eight of ten voters were critical of immigration although no source was cited in the article. It was possible, albeit doubtful, that the numbers were common knowledge. However, citing public opinion without a source was not reliable journalism, even if on DM060314/1's part it was still quite effective. Numbers were easier to compare than more abstract concepts. With this, the paper seemed to aim to build rapport between itself and its audience, normalising the criticism. More importantly, it was a legitimizing gesture. Since DM060314/1 had presented majority numbers as against the opposition, Cable's words were clearly being questioned by the Daily Mail. In a sense, the paper was asking for the readers to reconsider the opposition's stance, especially since the article also blamed Cable for presenting "scare stories" as facts. This is something the paper would do on many occasions in future.

Building the division between migrants and British people continued in the Daily Mail. The heading of DM060314/2, for example, was provocative, claiming that

"Migrant workers do cost British jobs says 'buried' report".

The then unpublished report was done by the Home Office, Treasury and Department for Business and it was about the economic impact of mass immigration. The heading of DM060314/2 seems to suggest that the people in charge did not want ordinary citizens to know something, in this case that jobs were lost. DM060314/2 also pointed out that the pro-immigrants thought the study would undermine attempts at imposing stricter controls on overseas workers. Yet, the paper claimed that this was untrue since

"The Mail now understands that the study -- will clearly state that some Britons have suffered 'displacement' from the jobs market."

The article also pushed the pro-immigrants against anti-immigrants, and polarised the Liberal Democrats against the Conservatives. This became even more apparent in DM060314/1. The article explicitly pointed out that Cable was a Lib Dem while Brokenshire was a Tory. This division and the Daily Mail's preferential treatment of Brokenshire and his doubts over migration were used to discredit Cable's pro-immigration agenda as well as the leftist political side. DM060314/1 and DM060314/2 were particularly good examples of how the political division on immigration was already present years prior to the referendum, and how this was played up by the paper. The articles discussed here suggest that the Daily Mail has been building an anti-immigration case for a while.

The Guardian (G060314/1), however, took a different tone. Roughly said, it seemed that the Daily Mail was trying to affect the readers' emotions while the Guardian tried to engage the brain. There were similarities, however, in that G060314/1 also noted that there was "open warfare" between Cable and his cabinet colleague, Conservative Theresa May, over immigration. Unlike the Daily Mail, however, the Guardian insisted that people coming to work in Britain were not a problem but more of an asset. This also proved to be the paper's agenda later, as this chapter will show. The Guardian would defend this agenda, tooth and nail, against the Daily Mail's idea that immigrants were taking something from the British people.

Both papers also addressed the delayed publication of the report. The Guardian (G060314/1) took it to mean that the job displacement was overstated, while according to the Daily Mail (DM060314/2) it certainly was not. Both papers were clearly ready to look at the report from their point of view, and to find what could support their agenda. This could be observed from the way the Daily Mail and the Guardian addressed migration. For example, the Guardian focused on EU migration specifically (G060314/1) since Brokenshire's rejection of migrants was targeted at EU citizens. In DM060314/1, however, EU and non-EU migration seemed to have become indistinguishable and were mixed together into one migration movement. This and the article's tone suggested that the Daily Mail was against all sorts of immigration at the time while the Guardian was attempting to support it, particularly the freedom of movement within the EU borders.

Lost job opportunities aside, immigration raised other questions as well. For example, the Daily Mail (DM261013/2) released a news article on Calais of France, located on the other side of the English Channel. According to the article, the mayor of Calais complained that France was becoming lawless due to mass migration, in this case from the Middle East, heading towards Britain. The mayor was referenced in calling migrants

"A plague which is spreading to the town centre, disturbing the peace of residents and tarnishing the town's image".

The article presented the issue negatively but also in a typical tabloid style with its emphasis on shock value. For example, there seemed to be an attempt at showing what could happen to Britain if more migrants got past the Channel, thus bolstering the anti-immigration front. The situation was polarised to show there were no good sides to immigration, and that those who supported it were part of the radical minority.

The article continued the Daily Mail's (DM060314/1) theme that the majority of Brits were critical of immigration. The mayor's opponents were cited to have argued that she was trying to stir hatred over asylum seekers and fearmongering, but this part was short and placed at the end of the article. This illustrates how the Daily Mail represented the issue since it seemed the opposing opinions were only used to emphasise the paper's point. As the article showed, a negative bias towards immigrants had been going on for longer than merely the past few years and was a continuous issue pressed by the paper. In comparison, the Guardian offered no article which could be used to explore the immigration situation on 6 March 2014. However, it offered some insight into economics, which proved to be the issue that the Guardian considered more urgent and/or important at this point in time (see Chapter 2).

These trends were still to be found in November 2014 when Prime Minister David Cameron was reported to be trying to get the new deal mentioned in January 2013. This time, however, curbing immigration was part of the list of things he wanted, therefore bringing it more to the centre in the upcoming referendum talks. It created a disagreement between him and the rest of the European leaders. In the Daily Mail (DM291114/1), the reception of Cameron's speech in the EU was addressed by calling out Europe for branding him, as the face of the UK, a "blackmailer" since he vowed to "veto further expansion of the EU unless migration rules are reformed." This treatment was seen by the paper as shocking and unnecessary. However, the reported reception should not have been all that surprising. Freedom of movement and integration were core values of the EU, as was the idea that the needs of one should not outweigh the needs of others. Even more significantly, Cameron's deal would have affected the economies of the migrants' home countries from which it could have been argued that the UK was receiving preferential treatment.

According to the Daily Mail in DM291114/1, Cameron also admitted that more work could have been done to lower the migrant numbers. This failure he blamed on the Liberal Democrats for thwarting his attempts at restraining immigration and being generally hard to work with. This was yet another indication of a clear division of ideologies on immigration. The Daily Mail agreed with Cameron in DM291114/2. The article pointed out that the legitimate concerns of millions of members of the public were ignored in favour of not considering the danger of fast change, since those "most avowedly in favour of mass immigration 'have no direct experience of its impact'". As the Daily Mail's target audience was the middle aged of the middle class, the paper was clearly speaking to them. It was again appealing to its likeminded readership.

Yet again, the Guardian took another point of view as a paper with a more pro-European bias. In G291114/1 and G291114/2, unlike in DM291114/1 and DM291114/2, the paper interpreted Cameron's attempts as a pro-EU move. In the Guardian's narrative, Cameron had been pushing for more restrained migration which, in the end, would prove ineffectual. It would also go against the wants of countries with large immigration populations, such as Germany. In G291114/1, the Guardian even wrote that Cameron

“Faces the task of persuading 27 other governments to change EU treaties to enshrine discrimination against European citizens working in Britain.”

By looking at the articles, their topics and points of view, it seems that the Guardian had a more international orientation while the Daily Mail focused more on the domestic issues. A factor supporting this was that the Daily Mail seemingly hinted that the EU and its supporters were the enemy while placing the UK above others. This narrative was supported by the overall tone of the articles DM291114/1 and DM291114/2, and the lexical choices the paper made. For example, Cameron's speech on restricting immigration was called “full of common sense” and Cameron's efforts “draconian” against Britain's continental neighbours “screeching” their disapproval for the “blackmail”. The wellbeing of the UK was presented as more important than the collective wellbeing of the member states, and this included the freedom of movement. It seemed that, according to the Daily Mail, restricting the freedom of movement was important to Britain.

This was very unlike the Guardian that chose to argue that the real antagonists were people who did not have an open mind or concern for those beyond their country's immediate borders. While it has been shown previously that immigration has been an issue for a while, a change could be seen in the wider public discussion. In late 2014, both papers were talking of the bias against the EU citizens and EU migration which had not been as present earlier. For example, in the Daily Mail the bias against EU migration had been often hidden within the general bias against immigration, and the perceived injustice towards Britain, as was demonstrated by DM060314/1. At this point, the Eurosceptic views had become even more prominent in the media; the EU had become a perceived obstacle before what part of the British public wanted. G291114/4, the Guardian's editorial, even suggested that backing Cameron's agenda was an attempt at a fresh start on the immigration debate. Nonetheless, the paper worried if the change of pace was done too late since “under pressure from the rise of UKIP, [Cameron] has allowed the one issue to colonise the other”. In this case, this meant

immigration towering over other relevant issues. This is supported by how G291114/4 described the ongoing debate on the EU as follows:

“Mr Cameron set out seven ways to improve Britain’s relationship with the EU, only two of which focused on migration; since then, the whole relationship has seemed to be about migrants.”

Faithful to its narrative, the Daily Mail continued to focus on the negative sides of immigration. After winning the General Elections in 2015, Cameron was revealed to be planning to hold the EU referendum in June 2016, on the condition he managed to make progress on a deal with Brussels on curbing migration (DM171215/1). This also confirmed that the Guardian’s quote from above had become a truth. However, both papers noted that the German Chancellor Merkel apparently kept her stand on the “no negotiation” possible on the principle of free movement. The Guardian (G171215/1) also added that the question of discrimination would be discussed in February 2016. Still, the Daily Mail remained hopeful about possible concessions on restricting the influx of EU workers, possibly on account of the UK being a big economic contributor to the EU. The article also wrote derisively about the former PM John Major’s words that the UK would face a “very acrimonious departure” if they truly left the EU. On immigration, he claimed that leaving would only allow France to sneak more illegal immigrants into the UK. However, the Daily Mail insisted that his words were “scaremongering” and untrue.

The Guardian (G171215/1), while also quoting Major on the “acrimonious departure”, did not focus much on the immigration aspect. Instead, the article pointed out that Cameron was “not seeking a complete breakthrough” at the current summit. Rather, he wanted reassurance that either his proposals to cut in-work benefits for EU migrants would be picked up or an alternative was created to stop the flow of migrants. The Guardian seemed to imply that Cameron had learned how the European Union worked at last. Unlike the Daily Mail, the Guardian did not put immigration or migrants in a negative light. On the contrary, it seemed to call for their rights. G171215/1 also pointed out the EU leaders and their extreme political views on migration that Vote Leave “highlighted”. One of these was “Slovakia is built for Slovaks, not for minorities” which Slovakia’s Prime Minister Robert Fico was claimed to have said. In the Guardian’s context, the quote seemed to ask if the British people wanted to be on the same level as him. In a sense, the Guardian was claiming a higher moral ground over the issue and, as it seemed, over the Daily Mail.

The year 2016 did not offer many changes in the two papers' opinions; on the contrary, it seemed to deepen the chasm between the two different sides as the Daily Mail and the Guardian's reportage established. In early February, the Daily Mail (DM030216/1) called Cameron and his deal with the EU over restricting migration "a great delusion" because it did "little or nothing to curb mass immigration". His demands had included a mechanism to ensure that children of EU workers would be paid local rates equivalent to those from where the workers came themselves and that unwanted EU legislation could be blocked. Cameron achieved both of them with some changes from the EU but his most famous achievement was what would be known as the emergency brake. DM030216/1 expressed its disappointment at the deal since the emergency brake was merely useful for restricting benefits, not immigration itself. Essentially, the brake would allow EU members to restrict access to in-work benefits, up to four years, if they could prove their welfare system was facing intolerable pressure. However, because of a clause added by the EU, the brake would fully deny in-work benefits for only one year after the employee would start contributing to the system, and could only be used for seven consecutive years at once.

This was also possibly the moment the paper finally lost its faith in Cameron. It had been waning for a while, as the Daily Mail's article in November 2014 (DM291114/2) suggested, but claiming that the deal would have been worth joining the EU if they had not been a member already was too much for the paper. In turn, the Daily Mail started responding even more positively towards the more radical side of the political right and the UKIP of which it had been more sceptical in 2014 in DM060314/1 and DM060314/2. The political right and the UKIP, like the Daily Mail, showed significant disappointment in Cameron's deal with Brussels because of its ineffectiveness. Yet, Cameron's inability to get all his demands was predicted by the Guardian in G291114/1 and G291114/2. Despite this, the Guardian reacted to Cameron's efforts positively. He might not have got exactly what he had looked for, but, instead, he gained something better. The Guardian (G030216/1) rejoiced in the basis for a deal which also won Cameron Home Secretary Theresa May's backing. The emergency brake was also discussed, and Britain was indicated to have the right to use it in case the UK voted for Bremain. Even if the European council would have to approve it first to make it legal, the Guardian wrote that as a win for Cameron. G030216/1 also quoted Cameron's enthusiasm in staying a member – or joining, since "he would even recommend EU membership if the UK were already outside the Union." This was quoted by the Daily Mail (DM060316/1) as well, yet with a mocking tone, which sums up the difference between the papers' opinions well:

“Incredibly, he claimed the deal was so good that he would recommend Britain joining the Brussels club – were it not already a member.”

The difference between these papers can be understood by considering the way they discussed the emergency brake. DM030216/1 simply considered the emergency brake a failed deal in its new form. This was because it was no outright ban on the EU worker benefits but merely a restriction which would, in four years’ time, end with them becoming eligible to benefits again. As the Daily Mail said, it was possible that it would not reduce the immigration numbers by much. The Guardian (G030216/1), on the other hand, was much more understanding in that a ban would have been impossible to begin with. After all, it would be extremely difficult, if not even impossible, to be a member of the EU and ban its citizens’ freedom of movement. The restriction the Tories were after was presented as a big concession on the EU’s part and a definite win for Cameron. Therefore, the Guardian seemed to see the result as the best of both worlds.

This indicated an existing trend in which the Daily Mail wanted everything all at once while the Guardian was willing to negotiate and even accept concessions. Especially the latter can be observed in G030216/3, an opinion published in the Guardian, which pointed out that Cameron had finally learned how the European Union worked, complementing G171215/1. According to G030216/3, this was the outcome of Cameron seeing with his own eyes that it was not possible for him to force his way on the issue of immigration – especially when some of his opponents were among the people he wanted to keep out. In short, he had to negotiate and accept his place as one of the many – which the Daily Mail did not seem to accept.

However, it was only on 15 April 2016 that the lines were officially drawn as the Brexit and Bremain campaigns began. The Daily Mail (DM150416/1) started by writing about the leader of the Labour party Jeremy Corbyn and how he claimed that the migrant numbers were not too high – even though EU membership had allegedly allowed wages to be undercut by migrant workers. While reporting his words and “grudging backing” to the EU, it was also noticeable how the Daily Mail was using the opposition to back its agenda. While the numbers might not have been too high – which the Daily Mail fundamentally disagreed on, although not vocally in the article – the opposition by Corbyn’s words had admitted that it was because of the EU that wages were lowered and, if that idea were to be continued, the lost jobs would also be because of the EU. However, Corbyn’s endorsement of the EU was almost more damaging for Bremainers than Brexiters because of its lacklustre nature. In addition, in an article (DM150416/4) commenting on DM150416/1, Corbyn’s words were noted to be at

“variance” with worries of workers with undercut wages, young people who cannot get jobs, overcrowded schools and strained hospitals, all of which were attributed to mass immigration.

What is interesting is that the articles from the Guardian (G150416/1 and G150416/2) on the same date were not as overly focused on the issue of immigration. This followed the Guardian’s line of thinking that migration was not a major issue, and thus the paper did not focus on it as a main selling point. In its articles, the paper was more focused on the aspect of economy than immigration. This is perhaps because immigration would not guarantee the paper an easy win with its audience or, more likely, because economy was the tool with which the Guardian hoped to catch its readership’s attention. The targeted audience came to play in the coverage of the campaign launching scene, which was handled particularly strongly by both papers. After all, the Daily Mail’s readers were possibly more affected by immigration than the Guardian’s, as was implied by DM291114/2. This could be explained by the fact that the Daily Mail’s audience were part of the middle to lower classes while the Guardian’s the upper middle to upper classes (Tunsdall 1996: 11-12). In addition to the differences in the readers’ socio-economic standings, there were also major ideological and political differences between them which probably led them to favour one paper over the other. Both papers voiced the fears and discontentment of their readers’ but because the audience was different, the reflection of those were also different in the data.

The month of May 2016 brought up the Daily Mail reporting a “record number of jobless EU migrants in Britain,” 270,000 of them (DM270516/1). The number might not seem overly large but, as the Daily Mail pointed out, it was against the promises of Cameron who allegedly aimed to reduce the numbers to tens of thousands. A “hammer blow”, the paper called it, for both Cameron and the freedom of movement. As Cameron was a major face for Britain Stronger in Europe, this was indeed a blow to his and the campaign’s authority. His broken promises created a shadow over his deal as well, which the Daily Mail gladly used. In the background, more people than ever were trying to cross the Mediterranean to Europe to get away from the Middle Eastern and African crises. Yet again, the Daily Mail brought up the EU migration and non-EU migration together. Vote Leave offered their own solution to the problem: if Britain votes Out in the referendum, net migration “could be cut to somewhere between nought and 100,000”, a goal more forgiving and achievable than Cameron’s was. The Daily Mail was building a case against Cameron and the Bremain campaign, rather well helped by the Prime Minister himself.

While Cameron seemingly did not encourage the battle for immigration, the President of the United States, Barack Obama, certainly did. According to the Guardian (G270516/1), Obama said the world needed a united Europe. He demonstrated his support by saying that while there was a danger of creating an us versus them culture, integration of people of diverse backgrounds created a stronger society. The background to both his speech and the current downward spiral of the discussion was the deepening conflict in particularly Syria. G270516/3, the Guardian's editorial, for example, called for the European nations to stop arguing over borders and start helping the refugees – of which over 100,000 had fled to Europe in merely two months, according to the paper. The emphasis was clearly on everyone being in this together. The term used in G270516/3, however, was "refugees" instead of "immigrants", and vice versa in G270516/1. This makes it clear that the Guardian separated the two terms and did not blur the line between them, unlike the Daily Mail, which kept referring to the two as one and the same.

June 2016 brought in the referendum date and the end of the debate. The Daily Mail (DM220616/2) reported that London and Scotland voted in rather than out, unlike many other parts of the UK. For example, the Daily Mail noted that the Tory shires, industrial towns and coalfield communities were more likely to vote Leave while cities would prefer Remain. Considering the election climate and the views shown by the paper prior to the referendum, it is possible that the Daily Mail implied that those who had suffered more from immigration and those who felt robbed by the EU were more likely to vote for Brexit. In this scene, it was the poor working class opposing the wealthier city dwellers and business people. This also showed in DM220616/3 in which the Daily Mail listed reasons to vote Leave, such as being able to control borders again as well as asylum seekers and create a better migration system; being able to deal with foreign rapists and killers and keeping out undesirables; protecting the public from terrorism – implying that immigration was causing more of the like; and protecting public services which, as the Daily Mail had argued earlier during the campaigns, were swamped because of immigrants. Turkey was also brought up as the UK had been heavily against it joining the EU. It must be pointed out, though, that no treaty had been signed with Turkey and the EU had not given it a green light¹⁵, which G220616/2, quoting Scottish Tory leader Ruth Davidson, also addressed as very improbable to happen in near future.

¹⁵ As of 2017, this seems unlikely to happen in the near future since the current leader of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdogan, is a Eurosceptic and going towards implementing changes to the Turkish state that go against the principles of the European Union.

The Guardian made no such list, but the paper tried its best to convince its readers that Bremain was the only right answer. This happened, for example, in G220616/1, the overview of the Guardian's panel of the Brexit debate at Wembley Arena. It has to be noted here that Cameron did not attend the debate, which possibly tarnished Britain Stronger in Europe even more, since leaders of the Brexit campaign such as Boris Johnson did. The Guardian even admitted – albeit a little grudgingly – Leave winning the debate, but only to a “half-attention entertainment watcher”. The paper still attempted to discredit Vote Leave referring to the panel. For instance, Johnson said he was there “to ‘celebrate’ immigration”; by reducing it, the Guardian noted, and poked fun at him since

“Who doesn’t want less of things they really value, eh?”

According to G220616/2, another the Guardian's summary of the panel, Brexit would not be a silver bullet – a miracle to end all problems and immigration – and Johnson was accused of being a hypocrite and a liar. In turn, Johnson accused Khan, the mayor of London, of trying to dismiss people's concerns as simply prejudice. All in all, the debate offered no last-minute changes. One side thought immigration was bad for Britain, the other thought it was a strength. Khan even listed groups of EU migrants who had contributed to British public services and thanked them in an attempt at painting them in a better light.

The day after the voting, immigration was brought up but it was not the main driving force anymore as there were other, more immediate problems to deal with, such as economic issues, the reception of Brexit, and David Cameron's resignation as the Prime Minister. While the Daily Mail was rejoicing in Vote Leave winning, the Guardian was pensively examining Bremain's loss and the future of Britain. G240616/2 connected the sense of identity to immigration, noting that it was never just about xenophobia or racism but about the sense of control that had been lost. The article also suggested May 27th as the day Vote Leave gained the upper hand, after the revelation of the migrant figures, and pointed out that the referendum morphed from reconsidering the British position in Europe to immigration. However, as the analysis has shown, this change was there even before Cameron's broken commitments. It may have been about issues such as the economy and identity as well, but the referendum had been more about immigration than anything else since 2014, when immigration rose to become the top issue over any other. It was only now that the Guardian was seeing it as well, having focused more on the economic aspects prior to the results. The Guardian did, however,

accuse some Brexiters of being xenophobic and racist in G240616/2 and G240616/4, even if it was carefully calling it more of a fringe movement.

However, immigration was back on the agenda by the time Theresa May was elected as the new Prime Minister. She was noted to have a tray full of things to cover what Cameron had not. According to the Daily Mail (DM130716/1), she would have to resolve questions of freedom of movement, and she was even warned not to make too many compromises on border control in case she wanted to stay in the single market. Restraining immigration was, after all, allegedly the will of the people, as the Daily Mail's view of the voting results suggested. In addition, the growth of immigration was a thing that needed to be stopped, pronto. But all in all, the paper seemed to remain hopeful for May to take the reins. The Guardian (G130716/3) was not as positive, and called May's agenda "markedly illiberal". The paper was also critical of her "disturbing zeal" in trying to restrict immigration. What G130716/3 pointed out was that immigrants were often also the most vulnerable of people, and implied they might come under attack with May in power. July's issues made it clear which side was the winner in matters of immigration: the Daily Mail was demanding Brexit's dues while the Guardian was horrified of what was to come.

Overall, immigration grew from being one of the many debated issues to the biggest one. This was partly due to the space given to it by the newspaper reportage, particularly on the tabloid side, and partly because of Cameron's attempts at competing with UKIP's crusade against immigration. As the present data suggested, the Daily Mail in particular saw merit in reporting the negative sides of immigration; however, the Guardian gave it far less space. In any case, the analysis shows that the immigration issue grew larger than it was originally supposed to be and was eventually connected to most of the other key themes as Chapters 5.2 and 5.3 will establish.

5.2 Economy

The economy was another big issue for Brexit. There were debates on whether the United Kingdom would do better with or without the European Union. In other words, if they were getting their money's worth out of it or not. This was demonstrated by how Vote Leave emphasised what the UK could do with the money flow to the EU instead of letting it pass through their fingers. According to the Daily Mail in January 2013 (DM230113), Cameron wished for Britain to have "a looser, more trade-based relationship with Brussels". This

brought up the major argument between Britain and the EU on what was better for all member countries, further integration or a looser union. Historically, the UK has been on the latter's side since joining the EEC, and often for economic reasons. The Daily Mail also reported how gaining concessions for allowing the eurozone countries¹⁶ to grow closer politically and economically was Cameron's ideal result. The Daily Mail also brought up how Britain took up France's place as Germany's biggest global trade partner. Therefore, Germany would be more reluctant to let Brexit happen, DM230113 implied, since it would want its interests protected. It is possible that this was brought up because of Germany's influence in the EU. In the same breath, after discussing Cameron's speech, the Daily Mail added a "shopping list" of what Britain could demand from Brussels with Cameron's deal. This amounted to control over further integration and lessening the hold the EU had over Britain economically.

In G230113/2, the Guardian took a different tone to the Daily Mail, just as it did on the issue of migration. The article referenced Cameron's words from the previous year, that "Britain's interest – trading a vast share of our GDP – is to be in [the EU's] markets". Unlike his more ambiguous stance on immigration, Cameron seemed to think that staying in the single market was worth the membership for the British economy, since they could also influence writing the rules. It was important for the Guardian to emphasise that the positive sides of being able to affect the world inside the Union outweighed the negative sides of being just one in the crowd. The paper also cited Vince Cable, the Business Secretary, in calling Cameron's timing a disaster as he called for a vote "in the midst of a recession" when people were naturally more inclined to be dissatisfied with the current situation.

The Daily Mail (DM060314/1 and DM060314/2) was not buying this argument, however. According to its articles, the economic benefits of the EU were more helpful for the employers, and not the ordinary people who needed them the most and who were paid less. In other words, companies were given more money while wages were pushed down. DM060314/1 implied that if migrant numbers were restricted, the Brits who were being sidelined and even oppressed would have it better. DM060314/2 even claimed that for every 100 extra foreign-born working-age immigrants in the UK, there was a reduction of 23 in the number of Britons in employment, and that between 2005 and 2010, 160,000 British people in the UK had been displaced, or left jobless, by the influx of foreign workers. The use of

¹⁶ Countries with single currency, the euro.

statistics worked to persuade the readers to see with their own eyes that there were always British people who were getting sidelined by foreigners in the working sector.

The Daily Mail emphasised its point that only companies benefited from the migrant workers while the public did not, especially since they only brought more costs with them which would eventually fall on the British taxpayers (DM060314/2). This point would also become their main narrative of economic matters, similar to their immigration narrative. Unsurprisingly, the Guardian disagreed. According to G060314/1, a reduction in EU migration would only mean an increase in the budget deficit and a slower reduction in public debt. The paper was clearly in support of freedom of movement, and the EU membership was seen as an economic benefit. This showcased another clear clash of ideology between the Daily Mail and the Guardian. In G060314/1, Vince Cable was reported pointing out that the 1.6 million migrants employed in Britain made up only 5% of the workforce. What was more, the article claimed it was not a one-way street either since 1.4 million British citizens lived elsewhere in the EU.

What could be deduced was that the economy debate was slowly turning into another side of the immigration issue. Yet the nearly equal exchange of working force presented by the Guardian was not acknowledged by the Daily Mail. The two papers differed in their definitions of foreign workers and immigrants. While the Guardian focused on the movement of labour within the EU, the Daily Mail grouped the EU migrants with those coming from outside the EU's borders, including the Commonwealth countries. However, when the debate would heat up a couple of years later, the workers from the Commonwealth were not treated with the same contempt as the EU migrants by Vote Leave. Only then was the distinction between the two – and their values to the British – differentiated in the Daily Mail. This observation is supported by DM030614/1 and DM030614/2 in which all migration to Britain was combined as one movement, “mass immigration”, while the EU was not mentioned at all. In comparison, in the Daily Mail’s issue of 22 June 2016 (DM220616/3) two years later, the migration was separated by area of origin. The EU migrants were painted as taking space from more qualified people because of the laws.

“Under EU law, we must let in any EU citizen regardless of their qualifications. The result? Businesses can't get work permits for highly skilled or educated people from the Commonwealth, U.S., Australia and elsewhere outside the EU.”

In November 2014, the Daily Mail (DM291114/1) was back with another argument against further EU expansion. According to the article, Cameron demanded that the economies of

new countries applying for membership and joining the EU must reach a certain economic level before they could have access to the freedom of movement. With his demands, he quite possibly wanted to eliminate the economic pull from poorer to richer countries. The Guardian actually followed a similar line of thinking in G291114/3 in that if there was less difference in pay between Britain and the country of origin, there would not be a similar incentive to move to another country in search of work. The idea was supported by the Open Europe thinktank. However, they also noted that while demanding a higher economic level from the applicants might reduce migration, it would not eradicate it. Overall, what the Daily Mail (DM291114/1) seemed more concerned about was that Cameron's demands would stop migrants from claiming in-work and, crucially, out-of-work benefits for four years after they arrive. It would lower Britain's attraction as a work destination and soothe the Brits fearing for their jobs. This was particularly because some immigrants were more willing to work for less than British workers while the Brits would need to pay benefits for them too.

According to the Guardian (G291114/1 and G291114/3), Cameron's suggestions did not seem too much of an outrage. His demands were listed as wanting a four-year period before immigrants could receive in-work benefits, stopping child benefits for children living outside the UK and, lastly, requiring EU workers to leave Britain after six months if work had not been found. G291114/3 suggested the first demand would probably get the most opposition since it put British and EU workers in an unequal position. This was since the second demand was not commonplace in Europe, and the third was not a large breach either. However, in G291114/1, the former defence secretary Liam Fox was quoted saying that

“There’s the whole issue of the euro, the instability of the eurozone, and the economic threat it poses to the United Kingdom.”

Essentially, this meant that the UK's problems with the EU included more than just immigration. The worry over the economic situation was, in many ways, towering over other issues, even if immigration was the issue with which the public discussion was most concerned, thus reflecting on the reportage of the papers. It was also possible that the immigration issue was a reflection of the economic concerns. After all, it was easier trying to argue against immigration than to compare the economic advantages and disadvantages of the EU against each other.

Yet, the Guardian (G291114/2) also found signs of Cameron wanting Britain to stay in the EU. By signs, the paper meant that Cameron did not set the bar for renegotiations of

continued membership too high for the EU to accept. By having lower requirements, Cameron was assuring that investment in Britain would not dry up. However, the article pointed out that some business sectors, such as agriculture and catering, would be wary if Cameron's ideas would come to pass. The sectors relied on cheap eastern European labour and if there was no more flow of it into the UK, it would challenge the current economic climate of those sectors. They would have jobs but perhaps no workers since the British people might not want to work in the same conditions. This may be something the Guardian was trying to express with its phrasing of a "reserve army of cheap labour" and pointing out that some jobs were already inherently changed, and that not all workers – British or otherwise – would be willing to do them any longer. It also cemented the Guardian's stance that immigration was not bad; after all, it was not bad for the British economy. The Daily Mail, on the other hand, seemed to think that the British economy was not too badly off despite immigration. This was also something which would become more prominent as time went on.

A year later, in December 2015, the debate over Cameron's deal and the subsequent possibility, even certainty, of the referendum was getting more heated. The economic issues were on the table through the year, and the Guardian strongly held on to its opinion that the UK would be better off economically in the EU than out of it. In G171215/1, the Guardian discussed the research the leader of the Britain Stronger in Europe campaign, Lord Rose, published on the costs of a possible Brexit. According to the article, businesses and consumers could be forced to pay a "heavy" price if the UK was to trade by WTO¹⁷ rules and not the free trade agreement of the EU. Essentially that could have meant £176 a person and £426 for every household in Britain a year.¹⁸ The Guardian pointed out that it would be an economic nightmare to leave the EU because of tariffs and forfeiting all existing deals, and the high probability of getting worse deals than Britain had now. The figures presented in the research seemed like the scaremongering which the Guardian and the Daily Mail accused each other of using. In this case it seemed particularly clear since the research was designed to back up former Prime Minister Major's claims that Brexit was dangerous, as G171215/1 admitted. This questioned the purpose of the research and its validity, even if it seemed legitimate at first glance. Even so, the paper still used the research to validate the Guardian's stance on Brexit, reporting on it as any other legitimate source.

¹⁷ World Trade Organisation.

¹⁸ The figure was based on UK imports from the EU at a value of £220bn, facing a tariff set at a level of 'most favoured nations'.

The Daily Mail's take on the matter was very different. DM171215/2 attacked Major's claims with rebuttals of its own. When Major said it would be dangerous to leave and Britain would get a "substandard deal to enter the single market", the paper quoted business leaders who denied the negative economic effect Brexit could have. In addition, it was said that it would be in the interests of the EU to make the deal with Britain. According to DM171215/2, in 2014, the EU sold the UK £61.7 billion worth more in goods and services than the UK sold to the EU. All points mentioned amounted to a conclusion in which Britain would be financially fine without the EU, but the EU would need Britain. DM171215/2 also pointed out that other non-members had it better than Britain in that they did not have to pay the net contribution but, nonetheless, had comprehensive free trade agreements with the EU similar to what the member states had themselves. What became apparent was that the Daily Mail thought the UK should strive for the same, and that it was certainly achievable.

The coverage of the economy in 2016 brought even more dissatisfaction in both the Daily Mail and the Guardian. The Daily Mail (DM030216/1) called Cameron's deal a "manifesto surrender", as if Cameron – and the British people – had to bend to the will of the EU. Economically, that meant that benefits continued to be given to immigrant workers' children who lived abroad. However, the funds were now arranged according to the rules of the claimant's home country which could mean lower rates. Nonetheless, according to the Daily Mail, this gave way to a prospective bureaucratic chaos. Not even the European Council President Donald Tusk's promise of giving Britain an exemption from further European integration and a boost for competitiveness soothed their feathers. The Daily Mail seemed to question that if Cameron, their Prime Minister, could not keep his pledges against the EU, what guarantees were there that the EU would keep theirs or that they would be and/or stay in favour of the British people?

The Guardian's narrative saw Cameron's deal more as a triumph, quoting him on his success and deliverance on his commitments (G030216/1). The financial draw from poorer countries to Britain was discussed, but it was reported that Cameron said that the new economic stance had to be negotiated since it would affect people across Europe. The paper's opinion that Cameron had learnt how to work the EU was enforced, which G030216/3 explored more in-depth. Cameron's recent history with the European People's Party (EPP) was mentioned as well as a sort of a learning experience. Since Britain had previously been withdrawn from the EPP by Cameron, the UK had not been at Marseille in 2011 to discuss the eurozone and its financial crisis. This meant that there had been no one there to look out for Britain's economic

interests, which forced Cameron to realise his error because his decision had lessened Britain's influence over economic matters in the EU.

As the Guardian presented the problem in G030216/3, it all boiled down to the question of whether a non-euro country could protect its interests when the majority that shared the currency were looking out for theirs. This has been one of the biggest issues economically between the UK and the EU. The Guardian's coverage suggested that since Britain held onto its currency, unwilling to change to the euro, it was automatically left in the minority. This was because the majority of the member states, including influential countries such as Germany and France, had joined the single currency project. In addition, the paper pointed out, after the withdrawal from the EPP, that "Cameron [appeared] to have grasped that Europe [worked] better as a dialogue than as a confrontation", particularly in economic matters. The mood the Guardian set with its articles was that being in the EU was the right thing to do. It was better to be part of something as influential and rich as the European Union since it was in Britain's economic interests, minor hiccups notwithstanding.

As was demonstrated in Chapter 5.1, the Daily Mail's attitude towards immigration was largely negative. DM150416/1 drove the wedge against it even further through a discussion of the economy. According to the article, Labour's Jeremy Corbyn admitted that migrant labour undercut wages, and the EU membership was the cause for that. In addition, he blamed big businesses for exploiting migrant workers, and even the British themselves, in their failure to invest in their own workers. The latter was something at which the Daily Mail seemed to scoff. The paper argued that because of migrants there were many lost opportunities for the British people to gain work for a reasonable wage. The Daily Mail seemed to imply that if no immigrants had come, wages would be up and no one would be unhappy – that if the UK had never joined the EU, everything would be better than today, disregarding that it was the EU which lifted the UK from its economic slump in the 1970s.

In the same Daily Mail's issue, DM150416/2 and DM150416/3 turned its attention to the NHS which was one of Vote Leave's main points of interests. According to DM150416/2, the former NHS boss Sir David Nicholson claimed that leaving the EU would not mean more funds for the health care system. His words were subsequently discredited by the paper. For example, he was dubbed as "the Man With No Shame" in both articles, dismissing his experience, for having previously been involved in NSH's Mid Staffordshire's scandal in which a number of patients died as a results of poor care. In the same breath, the Brexit

manifesto was quoted in an improved light, as if to ask the Daily Mail's audience who they were more willing to believe: someone who had lied to them previously or someone who had not? Would it not be better to spend the £350 million a week on the NHS than the EU? This claim, later proven as false, was one of the main driving forces behind Vote Leave, and also something that is seen as giving the campaign an edge over Britain Stronger in Europe.

DM150416/3 covered in more depth Boris Johnson and Michael Gove's calls for taxes to be used for British people and not Europeans but the question that was posed was the same in both articles: after all, should the taxes not have been Britain's money instead of the EU's? What was again ignored in the articles is that part of the money was coming back in terms of funding and relief, and used in projects agreed and paid for by all 28 EU member countries. This was either the use of selectivity to convince their audience, or because there was no space to mention everything. As Jones (2007) demonstrated, the British people were relatively ignorant of how the European Union worked, so omitting details would have been easy. The Daily Mail – and Vote Leave – were merely taking advantage of that.

On the other hand, the Guardian's coverage of Vote Leave's official launching made an effort to discredit the campaign on its first night. G150416/1 reported how the BBC's Laura Kuenssberg pointed out that much of the £350m figure was actually spent in the UK. In addition, the paper noted, she forced Johnson to concede that some of that money did come back after she accused him of "not being completely straight with the public". This detail was something which the Daily Mail ignored, and the Guardian elaborated on. According to G150416/1, Johnson still claimed that the money was touched by EU officials and insisted that much of it "vanished into the wide blue yonder", by which he meant the poorer EU countries.

The Guardian seemed to bristle when Johnson attacked something which the paper had been defending for years: that the EU membership was the safest option for the UK. This was shown by how the paper reported some of Johnson's more vernacular use of language in an attempt to undermine his message for his "Eurosceptic disciples". For example, when Johnson spoke of a new possible deal between the UK and the EU after "boasting" about British trade and exports, such as "saucy knickers" for the French, he was quoted saying

"Let us say knickers to the pessimists and the merchants of gloom and do a new deal that will be good for Britain and good for Europe".

Like the Daily Mail (DM171215/2), the Guardian (G150416/1) reported Johnson saying that it was in the economic interests of the EU to make a deal with Britain. In the Guardian's narrative, this was also true, if only since a deal is certainly better than nothing. However, while Johnson claimed Britain Stronger in Europe lacked "idealism", G150416/1 seemed to imply that the current status quo was better than nothing at all. Therefore, by reporting Johnson's least credible words, the Guardian attempted to discredit Vote Leave and to discourage people from believing Johnson's promises, and to think for themselves.

As has been mentioned in Chapter 2, the UK already had a better deal than most others with all its opt-outs. The Guardian seemed to acknowledge that in G150416/1. It was doubtful, as stated in G171215/1 by Major, that they would gain a deal as good as they had now. However, Johnson also argued that trade would continue regardless of whether Britain had the EU membership or not (G150416/1). If inspected in this light, it was true, since it would make no sense to block Britain's access to EU's markets when it benefited them both. However, as suggested by Major (G171215/1), there was no way the EU would give the UK an even better deal if it was outside the Union. Despite this, Johnson's vernacular language use and humour were attractive to the layperson, and his points would prove an effective battle strategy, as the end results would show. What should have become a battle of equals, or even Bremain being stronger than Brexit, became a more one-sided fight where Brexiters pushed and Bremaners tried to mitigate the damages. This was certainly true in G150416/1, proven by how Johnson seemingly barely slowed down after accusation of dishonesty, which left the Guardian to its attempts at discrediting Johnson's claims further in its report.

Things started escalating faster in May 2016 due to the refugee crisis but also because of the revelation of Cameron's failure to curb immigration. The Daily Mail (DM270516/1) focused on the aspect of migrants settling in and Cameron's failure to address the issue. The article argued that Cameron's deal would do nothing to deter them either, as was also pointed out three months earlier in DM030216/1. This implied that if the deal had created deterrence, Cameron's previous failure might not have been as grievous. Yet, according to DM270516/1, migration from the EU's poorest corners was growing while migration from elsewhere, particularly from outside the EU borders, was not. Therefore, the Daily Mail argued that it was the European Union's fault that jobs were going to migrants rather than to British workers. This repetitive use of points was helping to hit the Brexit camp's points home. In addition, the Daily Mail and Brexiters had someone to blame for the defects in the system.

Their narrative had an enemy to battle against, and that entity was the European Union against ordinary British citizens.

On the other hand, DM270516/2 blamed a Bremin campaigner, the Chancellor of the Exchequer George Osborne, for “outrageously” scaremongering pensioners, when he suggested that Brexit could mean losses of up to £32,000 in retirement income per person. The modality used in the article was a key factor in this. The Daily Mail had a habit of using future tense in its texts to emphasise its points to make them stand out. After all, more hedging with *could* and *would* just do not strike a chord with readers the same way as a definite *will*. It also made it easier to polarise issues, to show that the other side is in the wrong. DM270516/2’s headline was a good example of that:

“Now Osborne says Brexit will cost pensioners up to [pounds]32,000”.

The “now” showcased exasperation, seemingly asking what ridiculousness was up next. Osborne’s claim was also compared to other claims such as how Brexit could, for example, lead to war, genocide and migrant camps in Kent. Next to these claims, the Daily Mail made Osborne and Britain Stronger in Europe a laughing-stock. What was more, according to DM270516/2, former Work and Pensions Secretary Iain Duncan Smith claimed that the threat was baseless. The tone of the article was overall slightly condescending. This was demonstrated by DM270516/2 reporting Pensions Minister Ros Altmann saying “Britain has done brilliantly being in Europe,” followed up by “Meanwhile, Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn will today warn that Brexit could put ‘parks, beaches and fresh air at risk’.” This was another non-flattering comparison for Bremin and again ridiculing its cause. The article showcased that Brexiters were, in fact, running circles around Bremainers, as was implied by the Guardian in April (G150416/1).

The Guardian (G270516/2) addressed Osborne’s speech as well. The paper admitted it was his attempt at wooing the elderly but also claimed that, economically, it was possible that a “reasonable” total of £170 billion could be wiped off the value of British pensioners’ assets. According to G270516/2, Brexiters were angered by all this talking down of the economy. For example, the article disagreed with Vote Leave Chief Executive Matthew Elliot’s claim that the British economy would be stronger than ever after leaving. G270516/2 pointed out the probability of stocks going down, inflation hitting hard and other economic threats. As its sources it used the Treasury, senior economic policymakers and experts. The Guardian even mentioned three of them by name: the Bank of England, the Institute for Fiscal Studies and

the International Monetary Fund. This was, quite possibly, an attempt at using the institutions' reputations to boost the paper's points. After all, if such big institutes were against the dangers of Brexit, then what hope was there left for economy?

The editorial of the Guardian (G270516/4) even accused Vote Leave of lying to the voters, pointing out how Brexiteers' financial claims, such as the £350m a week for the NHS, had been exposed as being misleading. Despite this, the claims were still up on the agenda and plastered all over the place for people to see – most famously on Brexit tour buses. G270516/4 then proceeded to do the math to show why it was a lie at worst, a purposefully misleading statement at best. According to the paper, the true net figure per week was not a £350m but £136m or £110m, depending on various factors – and either sum was a tiny fraction of what Britain spent each week on the NHS. However, for a layperson £350m sounded like a large sum of money because practically no one will have the opportunity to handle such numbers.

However, it should be questioned why these numbers were not made front page. Quite probably it was because the Guardian expected its audience to know Vote Leave's arguments to be lies. Again, it came back to how divided the newspaper media were in Britain. The papers published content that fitted their agenda or their version of truth. As demonstrated by Osborne's speech, the Daily Mail thought his economic nightmare a folly but the Guardian an alarming possibility. The number of economy-focused articles also proved how important the Guardian considered economic matters to be. Overall, on the examined dates, the Guardian had a wide coverage of economic issues in its published papers but the Daily Mail had merely a fraction of that.

To back up the point that Brexit was a bad idea, the Guardian (G270516/1) addressed Barack Obama's opinion on the referendum. Obama's speech was not published in the Daily Mail's printed version. The economic reason why he was against Brexit was that if Britain left, the UK would be placed at the back of the queue in any trade deals with the US. Despite their history together, and the British stance as being in-between the US and the EU, it was clear that Obama meant that the EU was a better ally and/or a trade partner for the US than Britain. In numbers, it made sense: the UK would be just the UK after Brexit but the EU would still have 27 other countries in it. As a trade area, it would be far greater than the UK and thus worthier of the investment. Perhaps this was why the Daily Mail kept Obama out of its printed issue of May 27th since it did not match the picture of Brexit the paper was trying to

sell. G270516/1 also implied that the US would not be interested in making the Commonwealth stronger again, with or without Britain leading the ship. Despite Anglospheric hopes, explored more thoroughly in Chapter 5.3, Obama seemed to think this was a past long gone and not an economically viable option.

And then came June. The Daily Mail (DM220616/1) took to the debate on the economy with a vengeance. The reportage included mention of the pound crashing when Leave became the favourite for the first time, and the claim that sterling “fell off a cliff”. However, the opposing side was not left unscathed by the Daily Mail. Bankers, who had mostly been for Remain because of the easy access to the EU’s markets, were accused of shamelessly gambling billions of pounds on the results. Ministers were blamed for bombarding the public with propaganda funded by millions of taxes – another large waste of money, like the EU membership fee. DM220616/3 battled against that propaganda with some of its own, the notion that Britain should be just for the British people again. This entailed that, for example, if Britain left, they could strike global deals again on their own and with none of the EU officials’ corruption. Job markets would not disappear either, and they would have their billions on top of that, for example to protect public services. What was more, they would not have to deal with the “rotten European economy” nor pay for agricultural relief for which the British people had no great need themselves.

From the economic point of view, it was all about how the UK was being restricted by being a member of the EU. There were no good sides; Britain was part of this increasingly bad deal which should be negotiated again in their favour. It was no surprise that a nation might want to place itself above the rest – but in a coalition of any sort it was mostly in bad taste. In this case, the economy was clearly mixed with issues of identity which also reflected one last point in DM220616/3’s list of reasons to consider leaving the EU: remaining in the EU held the possibility of losing control of “their” seas, referring to Britain’s past as a great naval power.

G220616/1, in which the Guardian reported the panel discussion at Wembley Arena, was mostly focused on immigration but it also had a slice of the economy in the middle. Ruth Davidson of Britain Stronger in Europe was reported calling people to listen to workers, people who could not afford to take a risk on Brexit. This was explored further in G220616/2 with Davidson “grilling” Johnson on job security after Brexit to which he could not give a definite answer. The economic threat of Turkey which had also been paraded by Brexiteers

was also denied by Khan as scaremongering. However, it was clear that these were only minor points at this last stage. The worry over economic interests had waned to give space for debate over immigration as well as the idea of British identity. Even the Guardian, as possibly having used most of its resources, was less focused on the economic aspects than before.

The Guardian did, however, publish two opinion pieces, G220616/3 and G220616/4, where economic reasons were quoted. Curiously, the former was in favour of Bremain and the latter Brexit, although both were mostly pro-EU as per the Guardian's narrative. Both articles discussed Europe's failure at doing more for the economy but argued that there was potential – although only one of them was willing to wait it out inside the Union. The Guardian presented argument pieces both for and against the EU which was more than the Daily Mail allowed at this late stage. This may also indicate why Bremain lost. Overall, Britain Stronger in Europe seemed to be more willing to concede points made by dissatisfied Brexiters than Vote Leave was for Bremainers.

Two days later, Britain was on its way out of the European Union. The pound, which had been weakening against the dollar prior to the referendum, particularly after Brexit became the clearer winner, plunged to a 31-year low, as the Daily Mail reported in DM240616/1. The Guardian (G240616/1) also noted the rise and fall of the British pound, and how it fell more than 8% against the dollar. That, in turn, was a worldwide event as even “in Japan shares were in freefall”. According to DM240616/2, a new high for the value of the pound had been reached in 2016, but all gains had been lost and more as fears and anxieties of investors became reality. The Daily Mail did not – or could not – embellish the truth that, for the moment, the economy was shot. However, despite the current turmoil within the nation, there was one thing which Vote Leave had strived for and achieved: Britain was once again becoming an independent actor, and was affecting the world all on its own, and the Daily Mail was rejoicing in that.

The Guardian held onto a more depressed view, naturally as one of the losing side. G240616/2 lamented that Bremainers had made their case in terms of the economy, security and prosperity while Brexiters had spoken of taking back control, policing borders and repatriating their democracy. It was clear, as had been the case even prior to the referendum, which was the catchier tune; hearts over minds, even if the Guardian did note that many of the Leave-voting people were reasonable folk moved by reasonable anxieties about wages, housing and the frailty of national identity (G240616/4). Yet there was a bitter aspect to

G240616/2 because of Vote Leave's lies. It admitted that Brexiteers may have sometimes exaggerated but Brexiters had been shameless, particularly with the £350m claims (G240616/2), which had turned out to be a "whopper" (G240616/3). Johnson and Vote Leave's claims had seemingly unravelled at last, although G270516/2 had reported on the intentional misleading earlier as well. According to G240616/3, there was no silver bullet for immigration but leaving the EU would hit the economy, as was already being proven.

Things had calmed down a little by the time Theresa May was appointed as the new Prime Minister. The Daily Mail (DM130716/1) still reminded her that if the economy took a hit next year too, she would be pressured to do something about it, such as cutting taxes. Brexit had hit the NHS as well to which DM130716/1 just noted that the institution was heading for a full-blown funding crisis. This was after Vote Leave's claims had been publicly confirmed as lies. The Daily Mail wondered if May could achieve all she had promised or what had been previously planned but the paper had hope that May had potential to surpass Cameron's legacy. DM130716/3 even included a whole article on how Cameron was "pleading" for May not to destroy his hard work, particularly over the foreign aid budget which was emphasised to have cost British people £12 billion a year. By this stage, when the economy was in a small slump, it seemed like a sacrifice which could be made in favour of the British people. It was even implied that the money might go to waste or be mishandled because of corruption. In short, all the better to stop with it.

DM130716/2 also addressed triggering Article 50, and how getting a new trade deal with the EU might take years and leave Britain in limbo. According to the Daily Mail, this was suggested by Phillip Hammond, and it quickly caused a backlash from both Brexiters and the Daily Mail. Hammond was quickly pointed out as a member of Britain Stronger in Europe, and he was accused of scaremongering. This implied that there was a need for this sort of emotional uplifting in the referendum's aftermath. The economy was not the same after the referendum, and this clearly worried people. It seemed plausible that, if someone said that this uncertainty might last even longer than the two years after triggering Article 50, there were going to be fears to be alleviated. In DM130716/2, by undermining Hammond's suggestion, the Daily Mail might have attempted to do some emotional uplifting for its audience.

The change in the news reporting was evident in the Guardian too. While immigration was still an issue, the economy was a more evident one in early July. Another thing becoming clear was that the Guardian did not share the Daily Mail's faith in the new Prime Minister.

According to G130716/2, the Guardian's editorial, May set many tasks for herself, such as striking a balance between access to the single market and the freedom of movement, but she may not have it in herself to make it all work. The Daily Mail also seemed to acknowledge that there were problems to be solved but it was more focused on being strong, independent and British. The Guardian, however, pointed out that these problems were substantial. For example, the paper claimed there was no money to do it all, the referendum results did not have much of a majority, and then there was a headache called Europe. What was more, the NHS was suffering, as was the overall economy. However, while the Guardian was not as enthusiastic as the Daily Mail over May, it was implied that they would wait and see where she would take Britain.

This mostly neutral tone was changed in G130716/3, an opinion piece published in the Guardian. Even the title called May out for perhaps not being what the UK might need:

“Theresa May is no liberal – and her rise to PM is no cause for celebration.”

The article mixed immigration and the economy, calling May's handling of immigration policy “markedly illiberal”. The section of the policy regarding illegal working, for instance, was pointed out to have made it harder for employers to hire from abroad and for universities to attract students. The act was called out for representing an expansion of the state towards a more authoritarian model than liberality. Although this was a slightly far-fetched idea, it was still published in the paper the same day May became the Prime Minister. Her developments in her previous post as Home Secretary included seven bills and 45,000 changes to the rules. In addition, in G130716/3 immigrant barrister Colin Yeo was quoted accusing her of being quite happy to hurt families and to damage the economy. The article brought the more ambiguous editorial into question – was the Guardian truly just waiting to see how she would handle things, or merely waiting for her to fail to meet the expectations?

As the data has established, the issue of economy was favoured by the Guardian the same way as the Daily Mail favoured the issue of immigration. The two issues were, however, connected because of the ramifications migration and the freedom of movement could pose.

5.3 Identity

The last emerging theme to be explored in this chapter is the issue of identity. Its presence has been there since the beginning. For example, it is notable that both the Daily Mail

(DM230113) and the Guardian (G230113/1) picked up on these Cameron's words in January 2013:

“It is time for the British people to have their say; it is time to settle this European question in British politics.”

The words were said in his General Election campaign speech. The reason the quote above was important was the connotations the phrase had. It separated Britain and the EU from each other, and gave power to the British people as a whole. It was clear that both papers seemed to want to connect with their readers' sense of identity, either as British or as British in Europe or even European. In terms of identity, however, their ideas differed, as was the case with the issues of immigration and the economy as well. The issue of identity became more complex as time went by.

The Daily Mail's idea of that identity seemed clear enough. The British people were separate and different from being European or other members of the EU. This was demonstrated by pointing out that Britain would be heading for the exit door unless the EU handed back key powers (DM230113). There were just too many unnecessary rules and regulation dictating British lives. Therefore, since the beginning, the Daily Mail's stance seemed to have been Britain first, others second. This was not necessarily against the integration and the ideals of the EU although demanding returns of “key powers” indicated separate identities.

The Guardian (G230113/1), however, dismissed the notion of separation, even if, according to Cameron in G230113/2, the British people might be tired of fighting alone against the EU's status quo. In its articles, the Guardian questioned if the referendum and British interests were in alignment, or if Cameron knew what he wanted. This the paper demonstrated by quoting two of Cameron's previous interviews, in which he both said that the words “Europe” and “referendum” could go together, but also that “when I look at what is in our national interest we are not some country that looks in on ourself or retreats from the world”. This could be a sign of the growing Anglospherism, in that it would separate the British identity from the European but let it keep its place as one of the world powers. However, the Guardian seemed to question if leaving the EU was the answer Cameron was looking for, if it was not merely weakening the UK as a whole.

When Edward Snowden revealed his findings on the US spying on the EU leadership, particularly on German Chancellor Angela Merkel and France's President Francois Hollande, the relations between the UK and the US, and the UK and the EU, were questioned.

According to the Guardian (G261013), Merkel saw Cameron siding with the EU. The paper quoted her, saying:

“David Cameron was present at the discussion. He listened to it. He wasn't against it. That is silent acquiescence as far as I go.”

The Guardian also noted Cameron's mission at averting a breach between the EU and the US, a British role which dated back years, even decades. As suggested in Chapter 2.2, Britain had built part of its national identity around the idea of being a bridge between the US and the EU. Yet, when the talks were opened with the US, Britain opted out, quoting the so-called Anglophone Five Eyes pact¹⁹ as a reason. Although an understandable move because of possible breaches it might have caused in the pact, it was still one of the many reasons setting the UK apart from the EU. The Daily Mail, on the other hand, took a stand against this criticism of the British and American intelligence services. According to DM261013/1, the British people merely showed dedication to their country, and the article presented allusions to patriotism. In addition, the Daily Mail implied that Cameron might have been more unwilling to agree with Merkel than the Guardian suggested, in that Cameron might have been pressured into signing a statement with other EU leaders.

The trend of separating the British people from Europeans continued in late 2014 when Cameron gave his speech on the possibility of Britain leaving the European Union if the EU deal was not revised. Besides his demands, his speech and its response brought out the differing ideologies and identities of the British people. As was demonstrated in Chapter 2, Britain had never been a fan of further integration and had acted against it on many occasions. Another pillar of the EU, the freedom of movement, was a thing the UK was not particularly fond of. The Daily Mail attacked Cameron's critics for being against millions of British people made to feel guilty for their justified grievances in DM291114/1 and, in particular, DM291114/2. They made it seem like immigrants were at fault for eroding Britain and the British relationship with the rest of the EU. In that sense, the Daily Mail was blaming the EU for these perceived injustices. Naturally, the Guardian opposed this view. G291114/4 was a little pessimistic towards Cameron's nod to traditional British openness for all people, particularly since he was essentially trying to restrict it.

The way these two papers did not see eye to eye said a lot of the climate. Based on the reader demographics and the fact that British papers often reflect their audience, it could be claimed

¹⁹ The intelligence-sharing between the US, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand.

that the average middle-to-lower class, middle-aged British person was sceptical of immigration. Some might even go as far as to claim that Britain was only for the British people. On the other hand, the younger and perhaps overall more highly educated Brits might have felt that different cultures were not clashing but intermingling. On the matter of identity, this might suggest that the average Daily Mail reader was afraid of immigrants coming to take opportunities, perhaps of work or benefits, from them. They were not in as great an economic position as others, and perhaps could not afford to be as generous. The Guardian readership, however, seemed to be in an overall better economic standing and perhaps were not as tied to their British identity as the Daily Mail's. It is possible that because of their differing environments some were able to be more tolerant or even welcoming than others. In public discussion, it seemed that those defending immigration were people and institutions of power but the little people the Daily Mail fancied defending were more concerned about their loss of identity – and financial opportunities.

As a response to Obama on how the UK should stay in the European Union if they wished to have influence at world stage, the Daily Mail declared that the US did not understand what the Brits were now going through. According to DM250715/1, the former Environment Secretary Owen Paterson referred to the American War of Independence, saying that the US fought not to have laws imposed on them, so Obama should understand the desire of the British to make their own laws in their own Parliament. It was a rather strong opinion to have been published, to compare and liken the British position as a member of the European Union to people standing up to gain independence from their colonial masters. Another thing which seemed to infuriate the Daily Mail was that Obama seemed to imply that Britain, the country which had once controlled the territory that would become the United States, would be weaker outside the EU, and made a better ally inside it. He seemed to say that Britain was inferior to the US outside of the EU. Quite possibly this was why Obama's words had a reaction like that as they certainly did not cater to the British identity as one of the leading powers in the world. They also did not boost the image that the grass would be greener outside the EU. Because of this, it was curious that the Guardian only chose to publish its article on Obama's interview online. Because Obama was encouraging the UK to stay in the EU, it would have made sense to give him the space in the printed version of the Guardian as well.

The Daily Mail, however, continued to protect Britain's stance as one of the leading powers of the world and its opinion that it would stay as such even without the European Union.

DM171215/1 accused Major of scaremongering and lying, and even of talking Britain down by suggesting that they could not stand on their own two feet in the world. It was certain to the Daily Mail that the UK deserved better than the EU could offer. This was confirmed by DM171215/3 as the article complained that Cameron was demanding pathetically little from Britain's partners. It even suggested that if the EU was true to past form, they would be willing to concede even less. However, as was demonstrated in Chapter 2, Britain had the best deal out of the member states and the most concessions. It could be deduced from this that, despite calling other member states partners, the Daily Mail placed the UK above the rest. This idea was reflected in DM171215/2 as well. The Daily Mail – and Brexiters – seemed to believe that the UK would again have its sovereignty, which had allegedly been previously lost, in addition to better trade deals outside of the EU than inside. This would perhaps be since it would no longer be ignored as just one of the many, and would have deals tailored just for it.

According to the Guardian (G171215/1), however, Britain seemed to be withdrawing from others when the world was seemingly coming together. The paper expressed concern over this since if that were the case, it could be a hard bite to swallow for the country later on, especially since Britain was used to having clout over things. This could imply that the UK was indeed more used to lead than to follow, as suggested in Chapter 2. For example, compromises seemed like difficult things to grasp when they did not favour the country. In addition, G171215/1 addressed something Brexiters were highlighting: that some of the EU leaders had extreme political views, and that they had power over decisions that affected British daily lives. According to Brexiters, laws should be decided by the people they voted for, not by EU politicians who did not share their values. This was another thing the Guardian was concerned about, again coming back to the issue of identity: Britain did not share the continental values.

While the British history tied them to Europe, their cultural identity seemed to be apart from it. Historically, Britain had directed its endeavours more towards the ocean and left the continent mostly alone, except when Britain was attacked and drawn in that way. Geographically, as an island, it had the possibility to isolate itself, unlike its continental counterparts. Perhaps it could be a natural progression that, historically, there were not many willing to speak well of Europe. This was explored more in depth in G171215/2, a very pro-European opinion published in the Guardian. It lamented that there were no great leaders to speak in favour of the European Union and European unity in Britain. The opinion piece was

hopeful that Brexit would not happen but noted that any changes would be easy to deem inadequate by Eurosceptics. Nothing was as good until British people only were to decide things, in the classical nationalist thought pattern. What it amounted to was that those with clearer ideas of their identity were louder than the rest, and in this sense Brexit was already winning in December 2015. Brexiters had a ringing message which Britain Stronger in Europe lacked. After all, it was easier being just British rather than part of a collective, a leader than part of the negotiation table. The upcoming referendum was increasingly dividing Britain between those more willing to close their borders and those wanting to keep them open.

The year 2016 only deepened the chasm between global and local thinkers. The Daily Mail's response to David Cameron's deal (DM030216/1) painted him as a traitor to Britain, deluded and selling their country short. This was because, as the Daily Mail reported,

“The Prime Minister claimed he had secured ‘substantial change’ to the UK’s relationship with Brussels – despite having broken two key Tory manifesto pledges.”

The Daily Mail (DM030216/2) also seemed to imply that Cameron was undermining the UK's position as a sovereign country even further. It reported that while Britain could now even block unnecessary or unwanted Brussels laws, the same trick could be used by others to stop legislation that favoured British interests. What seemed to become even more clear was that, as alluded by the Daily Mail, this change might have been good had the EU countries not gained a similar power over the British people as the British people got over them.

In addition, what seemed to displease the paper even more was that Germany welcomed the proposal. This could be because, unlike the Germans, the British people did not generally think that better integration of national parliaments would increase EU citizens' acceptance of Europe. However, Germany's point of view had been different to the UK's since the beginning. This could be possibly stemming from the fact that, geographically, Germany was in the middle of Europe. It had no need to be, even could not be, apart from the continent; integration was better than separation, especially considering Germany's role in the Second World War. Therefore, this was a choice of preferring separation that Britain seemingly made, and had made for centuries, and was attempting to make again, with or without Cameron.

The Guardian (G030216/1) pointed out, however, how Britain-focused Cameron was. While the Daily Mail called Cameron deluded, the Guardian noted how his heart beat merely for Britain, and not for the EU or Europe. The paper was glad, however, that Cameron had

acknowledged that he could no longer go demanding things and expect them to happen. According to G030216/3, Cameron had realised that diplomacy was about more than banging on tables. This statement was something to be considered. It seemed to imply that the UK was used to ordering others around, that their identity was somehow tied to such pride, as was suggested by G171215's articles. Identity-wise the EU was a learning curve but from what can be gathered from the articles, it was not something made willingly.

The Guardian did a longer piece on the UK's Britain-centric politics as well in G030216/2. It criticised the government's focus on domestic issues, such as the NHS over Europe, since, as the article claimed, the continent was "beyond question an existential issue of economic and international security for Britain". In addition, G030216/2 expressed disappointment for no one doing anything to rise to defend that line of thought. It seemed to imply that Cameron, with his new more "diplomatic" stance on the EU, was no longer the best possible leader for the British people, and put the blame on "Daily Mail-dominated Britain". What this means for identity, though, can mostly be seen through context. Britain has not had truly pro-European leaders for a long time, as has been noted, and Cameron could not reach the whole of the electorate either. The Euroscepticism was rooted in the major media as suggested by the Guardian's comment on Daily Mail, as well as in politics. The Guardian was calling out for those who did have European identities in addition to their British ones to stand up and fight for their future before it was too late.

The official starting point of the campaigning revealed the fractures between the British and the European identities even further. According to the Daily Mail (DM150416/1), a government report showed how the EU laws undermined UK sovereignty. The article also mentioned there having been previous reports, although those were mentioned as being more helpful for Brexiteers to "trumpet". However, with this newest report, the Daily Mail turned the situation around and implied the previous reports were less than completely honest. Again, the paper was pushing forward its 'us' against 'them' narrative. The EU laws were not supposed to mess with the UK's own, just as the European identity should not erode the British. This might be partly because Britain did not have its own one specific constitutional law. Its legislature was different to its continental counterparts. For example, the British Parliament could change the constitution by passing new statutes, which would be more difficult with just one constitution to follow. The EU laws pushing against Britain's unwritten and uncodified constitution would have, no doubt, felt like a threat to some. It was no surprise the UK's sovereignty came under question in public discussion.

The Guardian (G150416/1), on the other hand, focused on Johnson's Vote Leave speech and claim that there was not a shred of idealism in Britain Stronger in Europe. This was a crucial division point for identity issues. What Johnson saw as idealism was to focus on the British identity and Britain as a whole to counter the European-centric mindset. However, what the Guardian and Breximbers saw as idealism was the possibilities of the wider world through association with Europe. They were different sides of idealism and identities mixed and pushed against each other. G150416/2 focused on a related issue, the voting demographics, over which the paper was growing even more concerned. The younger people were more likely to vote for Brexit than the older generations; yet, the older voters were more likely to actually vote.²⁰ There were multiple issues linked to both sides, but for identity, it came down to one question: did one feel European as well as British? Young people who had grown in the European Britain would more likely check 'yes' rather than 'no' if that question had been asked. However, the older generation which had seen the changes and lived in the Eurosceptic Britain were the opposite. This could also explain why they were more likely to vote in Brexit's case.

Yet the biggest clue on the issues of identity was its linkage to the issue of immigration. The Daily Mail (DM270516/1) attacked Cameron on his failure to curb the immigration numbers, particularly from Europe. According to the Daily Mail, what was happening was not with the consent of the British people, and the only way to triumph was to take back control over borders. What is interesting is that the European migration was singled out. DM270616/1 mentioned that immigration from the rest of the world had declined, unlike that from Europe. Thus, the only viable option was to leave the EU and restrict the freedom of movement. This showcases what had already been made clear earlier, only it was more straightforward this time: the British people were not the same as Europeans since the Europeans do not belong in the UK. On the other hand, things would be better and Britain would be ever greater if it was standing on its own again. The Daily Mail (DM270516/3) continued with that theme while interviewing the Mayor of London, Sadiq Khan, mocking him on his view that the UK would be diminished if Brexit happened. This was not the case, the paper professed later by quoting former Europe Minister David Davies, since the referendum was not so much a case of "Little Englanders" wanting to quit the EU as "Little Europeans" who made it harder for the British to trade and cooperate with the rest of the world.

²⁰ This was also something the outcome of the referendum of June 2016 confirmed.

This fought against the reasons the United Kingdom first sought to join the EEC. Britain's place in the world had been diminished over the years after the Second World War as its empire was breaking off piece by piece. The Commonwealth nations were also looking more into their own matters, and Britain was left to find its place while the ground was shaking under its feet. Britain's economy was in a slump, so it sought allies from the thriving economic community next door – the EEC. Ironically, Davies said the EU was in a 1970s style decline. It was true that, while being a member of the EEC and the EU, Britain could not make trade deals on its own anymore. Yet it could now sell its goods without tariffs in Europe, and making the trade deals now had the backing of the rest of the member states. It was tailored to one size fit all which, apparently, Britain did not fit. It was constraining, and it was not British, and the English Channel had never seemed as wide as it was now.

In G270516/1, the Guardian latched on Obama, who held onto a view of a united Europe which was both strong and democratic. The article seemed to point out that, although it might be part of human nature, people should not withdraw to the perceived comfort of familiarity and alikeness; that people, and nations, were stronger together when there was variety. It hailed the European Union as one of the most progressive institutions for that. Similarities in patterns of thinking dated back to the 20th century, and further. Alliances have always been important, and a perfectly good partnership needed equality. What the Guardian seemed to think, however, was that the UK was reaching for something more than what others had, even more than it already did, which became the crux of things. Bremainers wanted progress on terms of all; Brexiters wanted progress on their own. Admittedly, the European Union had much to do to reach the ideal state of matters. G270516/3 addressed this flaw by calling out the EU's handling of the refugee crisis. Yet the EU was also something unprecedented, and the Guardian was willing to forgive the flaws because of the potential, as well as the fact that identity- and readership-wise the paper was more international than, for example, the Daily Mail.

On the other hand, the Daily Mail (DM220616/1) seemingly celebrated the division among the British people. The paper denounced Bremainers as “bully boys”, and commended Brexiters for having “the guts” to defy “the elite”. The picture painted was that of a classic grassroot-level defiance against the establishment. Nigel Farage even said he could not imagine there had ever been a campaign in which ordinary folk had been subjected to so many threats. This threat, then, was the powerful, the wealthy and the foreigners trying to control what the common folk were doing. According to DM220616/2 and the preliminary

results, the area famed as the birthplace of British democracy, where Magna Carta was signed, voted against the EU membership by a majority. The Daily Mail used this historical connection to justify their cause. If the British ancestors from 801 years ago had the right idea, then surely their descendants had it too. Perchance this would be a new democratic revolution for the British people. After all, as the Daily Mail pointed out, King John was forced to sign Magna Carta in 1215 to reduce his autocratic power, establishing the principle that the law should apply to everyone.

What this was meant to imply was that Britain was part of a group which had questionable accountability, as had been noted by the paper earlier in DM150416/1. The Daily Mail seemed to imply that there needed to be a change, and Britain could be the one creating the needed change by leaving since the European Union was certainly not. Leaving would also solve problems which DM220616/3 brought up, like giving the UK its sovereignty back, removing meddling by foreign judges and giving back control over the seas. The British identity has been tied with the seas for centuries; they explored the world, conquered lands and won the famous battle against the Spanish Armada, establishing the pecking order. Although nowadays it was more of an economic question of fishing, the wording implied losing the British identity.

On the last day prior to the referendum, the Guardian did not focus much on the issues of identity. The discussion on identity was more of a by-product caused by the belief that working towards a common goal was better than going off alone – often while discussing economic matters. This was reflected well in the differences between the Daily Mail and the Guardian. As Chapter 5 has suggested, the Daily Mail tried to affect the emotional side of its readers, getting them to relate to its articles while the Guardian wanted to appeal to the rational side. This was, naturally, partly due to the reader demographics and the newspaper culture of the UK but also caused by the papers' own stances. Still, G220616/2 did seem to note the identity issues, however derisively. It was noted that Johnson said that the referendum day could be the UK's Independence Day. This also showed how historical factors affect the way people think. Britain has only ever been under the Roman control over a millennium ago whilst it was not yet Britain as we know it. However, the independence days celebrated by people are often celebrated because the nation was freed from the suppression of another power. Johnson equated this suffering with being a British person in the EU, and the Guardian disagreed.

G220616/2 also pointed out how other immigrants might also wish for stronger controls over immigration. This was done by using Gisela Stuart, the chairman of Vote Leave and a German immigrant, as an example, and comparing her to a British-born Andrea Leadsom who also argued for Brexit. This showed how the sides were divided but the lines might be blurred. Some immigrants could have adopted a British identity and considered themselves British, the same as someone born from British parents. Yet again, however, this brought up a question of who could be considered British that has been an underlying theme in the present chapter. Asking who the British people were was something no one could produce an answer to satisfy everyone, not the Guardian nor the Daily Mail nor either campaigns. It was an issue which would not become any clearer after Brexit became reality. In the days after the referendum the papers reported a rise in calling out non-whites and immigrants – even if they had been born in Britain – to go back to where they came from. This was proof that the division between the people was quite large and that the issue of identity, and possibly xenophobia, was lingering in the background. Or EU-phobia, as G220616/3 called it, hoping that in case of Brexit, Britain would not be the cause for the European Union to fall apart.

After the vote, the Daily Mail (DM240616/1) again quoted UKIP leader Nigel Farage thanking the British people for voting for what was right since the Eurosceptic genie was now out of the bottle. The discontent was revealed, and it was time to do something about it. The divided identities were the main point on which the paper hammered by focusing on the division. It showed how the urban area of London, where the so-called elite lived, voted for Remain while the poorer areas voted mostly to Leave. What also became clear was that the younger demographic truly did vote for Remain more frequently than the older. However, now that the vote was over, the issue of identity was not on top anymore. It was similar to the question of immigration in that sense, and the two had been tied together quite often since migrants were seen as threatening the British identity and livelihood. Still, the focus was on the economy since it was the area of British life directly threatened now.

The Guardian held onto a similar pattern, in that it mostly focused on economic matters post-referendum, and most of its nods to identity issues came from the immigration discussion. As part of those who had advocated for Britain Stronger in Europe, the articles of June 24th were full of bitter disappointment. Accusations of unspoken xenophobia were brought up in G240616/2, and the article also claimed that the results legitimised an undertone of racism. Another point the Guardian was drilling in was that people did get their say, as per Cameron's wishes, but that this say was divided by geography and class. It was implied that the results

were voted in by the uneducated, since Brexit's support was at 68% among those whose education stopped at the GCSE while 70% of university graduates supported Remain.²¹ While the Daily Mail was ready to face the new challenges after Vote Leave's victory, the Guardian naturally showed only disappointment in the results. The Guardian's editorial (G240616/4) said Britain's place had to be rethought and that the country's very idea of itself will have to be reimaged.

Identity-wise, the Guardian (G240616/2) blamed the referendum campaigns for enhancing differences. This, while probably mostly meant towards Vote Leave, was something which encompassed Britain Stronger in Europe as well. While Brexiters invoked hatred and discontent over the European Union's treatment of the British people and Britain, Brexiteers accused the British people of basically being obtuse and uneducated. Neither side was winning points from the other camp, and this was reflected in the Daily Mail and the Guardian's reportage. The papers wrote to their targeted audience so they were not likely to endorse the other side; even while the Guardian posted an opinion of a person voting for Brexit, it was still filled with support for the European Union as an idea.

The Guardian was still voicing its displeasure with the results and was pointing out how the 48% of Brexiteers and their wishes should be taken into account as well. Scotland became something of a way for the Guardian to express itself. It had already noted how Scotland had voted for Remain in G240616/1, and how Nicola Sturgeon accused Johnson of a whopper regarding his dissolving promises and called for another Scottish referendum (G240616/3), so Scotland became somewhat of a safe haven for the Brexiteer-minded since the majority of England voted for Leave. Therefore, it was natural to see the pattern of separation between Scottish and English identities where a division was already perceived in G130716/1. However, the articles from July 13th did not merely discuss the division but also possible things to bring the Brits together, such as the new Prime Minister Theresa May. For example, she was noted to have a real passion for Britishness and keeping the Union of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland together. G130716/2 also focused on her being the second ever female Prime Minister which could potentially mean great things and unification of the newly divided nation.

The Daily Mail was overall more upbeat but it had its sources of annoyances as well. DM130716/2 pointed out that a six-year negotiation period would not be accepted. Leave was

²¹ The Guardian quoted YouGov for these figures.

voted, so Leave it was. In other words, Brexiteers were to blame for any delay and complication, as the article quoted John Redwood, a former Tory minister:

“This process is being made deliberately complicated by people who are not too keen to leave the EU at all. It is perfectly possible to achieve it in a few months.”

Bridging the gap between the Brexiteers and the Brexiteers was not seemingly on the Daily Mail’s agenda. The article was more of a response to the petition for a second Brexit referendum, which the MPs would discuss in September. The Daily Mail was more eager to discredit the movement before it managed to grow larger than the four million signatures it had already attracted. The tone was in line with the attitude that winners write history, and this history should have the British touch on it. The paper also seemed to see May in a much more positive light as she seemed more certain to align with Brexiteers’ line of thinking based on her history than Cameron had prior to his deal from February.

The analysis has shown that the issue of identity was not seen as much as an issue, particularly in comparison to the two other examined themes. Rather, it was seen as connected to others such as immigration, the question of sovereignty and in a lesser sense economy. The Daily Mail’s coverage was also more connected to the issue of identity than the Guardian’s. The data suggests this was due to the papers’ audiences’ sense of self and the papers’ attempt at connecting to their readerships. Overall, Chapter 5 has examined how the themes immigration, economy and identity have developed from January 2013 to July 2016. The issue of immigration grew from discontent over missing opportunities into a question of what it meant to be British, while the subchapter on economy showcased how the issue grew increasingly divided over those who saw economic merit in foreign workforce and those who felt that accepting it threatened the British culture. In the light of the analysis, it can be argued that the narratives of the papers competed against each other, with one defending the status quo of the UK in the EU and the other the idea of the UK as an independent nation, where the latter eventually won the popular vote.

In Chapter 6, the analysis explores the meaning-making tools the Daily Mail and the Guardian used to influence their readerships and present their agendas. This is done by focusing on articles with similar topics on a specific date, so the differences between the papers can be seen more clearly.

6 DISCOURSE AND INFLUENCING THE AUDIENCE

The present chapter aims to provide an in-depth analysis on four topically matching articles, two by the Daily Mail and two by the Guardian, taken from 23 January 2013 and 24 June 2016. Critical discourse analysis is used to break down how the papers used their linguistic and lexical choices to influence the reader. The focus is particularly put on intertextuality, modality, vocabulary, selectivity, representation and legitimization. The key texts are considered and compared to each other, exploring how the newspapers handled the issues through the language they used, paying attention to the contexts of the dates with the presented content.

6.1 David Cameron promises the referendum 23.01.2013

On 23 January 2013, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, David Cameron, held a speech as the leader of the Conservative Party. In it, he pledged that if his party would win the upcoming General Elections of 2015, a referendum would be held on whether the UK should leave the European Union or not.

Both articles, the Daily Mail's DM230113 and the Guardian's G230113/1, were front page news pieces which means they were meant to be the one piece of news which would get the audience to buy the paper. This reflected on how the headlines and articles were presented overall. The Daily Mail relied more on physical sales which meant it had to be eye-catching to be able to snag the readers' attention. This seemed to be working as the paper was the second widest spread of all British papers. However, since the Guardian was not as reliant on the physical sales and got its monetary backing mostly elsewhere, such as advertisements and reader donations, it could afford to have less provocative presentation. Although the present study did not have the printed versions of the issues available, this conclusion could be drawn from the way the Guardian had longer sentences and paragraphs as well as the overall more reserved attitude presented. On the other hand, the Daily Mail's presentation was a quicker read. The difference in presentation was also due to the target audience, and what they expected from the papers.

Without its two additional short pieces of news, *The British Shopping List* and *Brussels Slaps Levy On Banks*, the Daily Mail's DM230113 had altogether 937 words and 23 paragraphs. In comparison, the Guardian's G230113/1 had 917 words and 18 paragraphs. DM230113 used

more a sentence per paragraph style of writing than the Guardian, which is why while the two articles were, more or less, the same length. This was possibly to make sure the readers got the optimal amount of information with merely a skim or through the first few paragraphs if they wished. The Daily Mail utilised direct quotes more than the Guardian did, with DM230113's 16 quotes being twice as many as G230113/1's 8. Quotations draw the readers' attention as they differ from the ordinary reportage, and a well-placed quotation can offer a more powerful message than a paragraph of text. Another noticeable trait was that the Daily Mail left the pieces of news which did not fit its narrative last in the article. The Guardian, however, seemed to report things more evenly, although by the end it was clear that the paper's opinion on the ramifications of Cameron's pledge was mostly negative.

The Daily Mail's DM230113 started strongly in favour of Cameron's pledge. There was one main headline with two others connected to it. In the online archive, they were crammed together but the form and usage of semicolons suggested one major headline heading two minor ones. All of the headlines referred to the same article, DM230113, and were quite possibly placed on the front page, as the form suggests. The article was, in addition, placed on page 1 which supports this observation. The headlines were eye-catching:

“You will get an in or out vote on Europe;
 PM to pledge EU referendum by 2017;
 Give back powers or British voters will reject EU, says PM”.

The combinative use of headlines was quite clearly designed to enforce the main ideas behind DM230113. For example, they told the audience that they would get a say in whether or not the United Kingdom would stay in the European Union. The headlines were also promises. The first and second headlines were promises to the British public while the third could be interpreted as a promise of retaliation to the EU. This was done by the use of modal verbs and imperatives. Modality expresses degrees of commitment and lack of commitment in a sentence. In DM230113's headline's case, *will* suggested commitment, and the Daily Mail pointed out Cameron promising that commitment in the main headline. The two minor ones emphasised this through selective use of vocabulary. For example, the word *pledge* in the second headline had similar connotations of commitment as the *will* in the first headline. The same was done by showing what the ultimatum was by using the imperative verb *give* in the third headline. If the British demands were not answered, according to the Daily Mail,

Cameron – and the Tories – was committing to leaving, again by using the modal verb *will* combined with the verb *reject*.

The Guardian (G230113/1), however, did not share the Daily Mail's black-and-white point of view. In addition, the Guardian's headline did not catch attention the same way with its wording or tone nor did it address the readers the same way. Their styles of reporting were thus different from the beginning. G230113/1's headline merely stated the gist of the text:

“Cameron to pledge in-out vote on EU: Revise terms of our membership or trigger British exit, PM tells Europe.”

As can be seen, the headline started with a comment that framed the message before moving on to cite the Prime Minister and ending with a reporting clause. This means that the Guardian reported Cameron speaking for his whole nation while he addressed Europe. What is noticeable is that G230113/1 did not use modal verbs in its headline. Rather, the imperative verb *revise* was used to quote Cameron's message, after which the present tense, *tells*, was used to report to his audience. In addition, compared to the Daily Mail, the Guardian's (G230113/1) headline did not address the readers directly like DM230113 did. Both used pronouns to address the audience, yet the use was different. DM230113 used the word *you* to address the readers directly, empowering them. G230113/1, on the other hand, used the word *our* to encompass the whole audience, but this was done indirectly since the word was used in a quotation. Both pronouns were meant to emphasise that the referendum was a question for every Brit. DM230113 affirmed this in the first word of the article's first sentence, *voters*, which came from quoting Cameron who addressed the whole nation in his speech:

“Voters will be given the chance to leave the European Union by the end of 2017.”

This, in turn, was a question of representation. DM230113 used the personal pronouns and modality to establish its relationship between the paper and its audience. The paper seemingly appealed to the readers' sense of self and common sense, building trust between them so that the readers would support the Daily Mail's narrative and feel that the paper represented them. Not much later, in DM230113, Cameron was cited for his words:

“It is time for the British people to have their say.”

This, therefore, affirmed that the power in this debate belonged to the British citizens themselves, and not to the EU or the government. The words above were also quoted by the Guardian. Whereas the Daily Mail interpreted Cameron's words as a promise to the British, empowering them and giving them a voice, the Guardian seemed to see the words more as a

threat to Europe. In G230113/1's headline, the verb *pledge* was used more neutrally because there were no modal verbs to set the mood. What made it more of a threat, however, was the ending: "—PM tells Europe." The Guardian reported Cameron speaking to the EU, not to the British. In this context, the Guardian seemed to interpret that Cameron was giving the EU an ultimatum instead of merely giving the British people a choice in the matter.

Modality was used more than just in the headlines too. The Guardian used it mainly to report on what Cameron said or would do. For example,

"The prime minister *will* say: 'The next Conservative manifesto in 2015 *will* ask for a mandate from the British people for a Conservative government to negotiate a new settlement with our European partners in the next parliament.'"

Here, it was reported that Cameron would say something, reporting a level of commitment on his behalf and certainty of G230113/1's reportage. In addition, the direct quotation from him also held the modal verb *will* in which Cameron also committed to his words. However, the Guardian also used modal verbs with a lesser degree of certainty. This showed that the Guardian was merely speculating for the moment, thus using a vaguer modal verb to express that. For instance,

"The PM, who has briefed Hollande and Merkel on his speech, is understood to have accepted that he *may* have to table his demands outside a formal treaty negotiation."

DM230113 only used the modal verb *may* once while referring to someone else's words:

"Critics, such as Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg, have suggested there *may* be no significant EU treaty change, meaning there will be no prospect to negotiate a return of powers."

The Daily Mail's DM230113 used *will* for 30 times in its article, not including the headline, and twice the modal verb *must*. The Guardian's G230113/1 used *will* just 20 times, most of which was when the article referred to what Cameron was going to say. Otherwise the present or perfect tense was mostly used by both papers. However, compared to DM230113 using *may* only once, G230113/1 used it four times altogether.

Curiously, on the account of a selective use of vocabulary, the Daily Mail linked the EU to Europe in its first headline although the two are not the same. While most of the European countries are part of the EU, it certainly does not mean all of them are. The Guardian does the same with its headline, "—PM tells Europe". The paper also used the term *Europe* to call what most likely meant the European Union and its members, equating all of Europe together.

While the Guardian is mostly pro-EU with its opinion, the separation between the UK from the continent is present here too. This is, however, not unique to Britain but part of wider rhetoric to either show togetherness or separation from the European entity. Therefore, what can be deduced here is that from DM230113's headline, the UK is deemed different from its continental counterparts through identity, which also legitimises the referendum.

The examples above are also connected to intertextuality. In short, intertextuality means connecting texts to each other, for example, by quoting and reporting on Cameron's speech, which, as has been shown, was used by both papers. Reporting itself is never disconnected from intertextuality since the basis of journalism depends on discourse and texts being interconnected. Another example of intertextuality is linking the present to the past. Texts gain weight through their connections to other texts, particularly ones made in the past. DM230113 did this in the first few sentences, pointing out that there was a precedence to the referendum:

“It will be the first time millions of voters have had their say on the European Union since the referendum on staying in the Common Market in 1975.”

This connects two different texts together. There is an implication that this precedence is what makes this new one more important. In a way, the Daily Mail legitimises Cameron's pledge to hold the referendum though this linkage. It had been done before so it could be done again if people were dissatisfied with the situation. Right after, it was pointed out that the ultimatum given by Cameron to Brussels was *historic*. What the British people were part of was a historic event. The word choice also implied the event's importance.

Using intertextuality through historical context was done by the Guardian as well. For example, it was mentioned that the deadline of the referendum would bring an end to the issue which had *bedevilled* the Tory leaders for a long time. G230113/1 brought up the referendum of 1975, perhaps to create a precedence for the possible future negotiations Cameron was hoping for.

“The PM, who has briefed Hollande and Merkel on his speech, is understood to have accepted that he may have to table his demands outside a formal treaty negotiation. This raises the prospect that he could follow in the footsteps of Harold Wilson who negotiated small changes to Britain's EU membership terms outside the treaties ahead of the 1975 referendum.”

What the Guardian seemed to be hoping for was that Cameron could do the same as Wilson. This can be deduced from the intertextuality practiced in the quote above by connecting the

article to the past. The 1975 referendum ended with the UK staying in the EEC. Therefore, G230113/1 seemed to hope for Cameron and the EU to be able to satisfy the British public to stabilise the status quo. Both references to history were hopeful in their own way. This can be seen from how the Daily Mail sought to empower the people so they could make a choice like they did over 40 years ago, while the Guardian hoped Cameron might be able to do the same as Wilson did, and thus keep the UK in the European Union. Both papers chose texts that supported their narrative.

David Cameron's demands were mentioned early in the Daily Mail's DM230113 too. Handing back key powers, as the headline suggested, and rejecting EU's integration were the main points, as the paper reported:

“The Prime Minister will reject the founding EU principle of ‘ever closer union’, insisting that powers must flow back to, not just away from, member states. He will insist he wants Britain to remain in a more ‘flexible, adaptable and open’ EU.”

The important thing here was that the Daily Mail acknowledged that the demands were against the founding principles of the EU, yet if concessions were not granted, leaving the EU was more than likely. According to both DM230113 and G230113/1, Cameron was reportedly willing to consider even leaving the Union if his demands were ignored. These concessions, as mentioned by DM230113, included a ‘looser, more trade-based relationship with Brussels’.

This brought up the question of legitimisation and representation again. Using modal verbs *will* and *must*, the Daily Mail suggested that Cameron was in the right to represent the wellbeing of the British people. In terms of vocabulary, quoting Cameron on his words ‘flexible, adaptable and open’ to describe what the EU should be, brought implications that the Union was not those things right now. This would, then, raise the question of whether the UK should even be in the EU which was the point of Cameron’s speech. However, using the modal verbs and quoting Cameron’s choice of words, DM230113 legitimised Cameron’s mission and, therefore, his place as the representative of the will of the British people.

According to the Guardian’s G230113/1, however, the Prime Minister’s office insisted that Cameron was not hostile towards the EU. This was something the Guardian questioned immediately afterwards. By using the word ‘insist’, the Guardian implied that the office was unsuccessful in convincing that Cameron was not hostile, especially since it was backed by notions of possible threats, such as the possibility of leaving the Union. As demonstrated by the previous quotation, Cameron’s stance was not described as favourable to the EU either by

the Daily Mail. Yet, while the Guardian saw Cameron as threatening and making waves, the Daily Mail interpreted Cameron as committed to his cause of looking after the UK's interests. This, again, came back to what the papers thought right for the British.

The Guardian's strategy seemed to be to contest Cameron's speech by quoting, for example, other politicians who did not see eye-to-eye with Cameron on the matter, thus delegitimising him and his agenda. This is also another example of intertextuality because G230113/1 referred to other sources which in this case were people. For instance, after reporting Cameron's assurance that there could be an eventual exit, the deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg was said to have rejected Cameron's pledge, calling it "a false promise wrapped in a union jack". By quoting these words, the Guardian attempted to, again, discredit Cameron. Clegg, as reported by the Guardian, called Cameron out for lying to the people he was supposed to be representing. It was also pointed out by the Guardian that Clegg's opposition meant that the draft legislation for the referendum would have to be drawn up by those outside the formal government and parliamentary routes. The timetable of Cameron's demands was also raised to question. With Clegg's dismissal, Cameron could only table his demands in Brussels after the next General Elections, held two years past the current date. His success in doing so was therefore questioned, as was, again, his leadership and ability to represent his people.

According to DM230113, Clegg suggested that there might not be an opportunity to negotiate a return of powers. Since Germany and France put forward notions for deeper economic and monetary cooperation, it could have meant that a major new treaty was inevitable, which the Daily Mail seemed to take as a positive. This would thus give Britain the opportunity to make its own mark. However, as the Guardian demonstrated, it was possible that his response might come a little too late to be added to the agenda because that was only possible if the Tories won the elections. What truly makes these notions a 'boost' for Cameron, was the way the Daily Mail called it that. After describing the notions, DM230113 reported that

"In another boost for Mr Cameron's strategy, Britain yesterday overtook France to become Germany's biggest global trade partner for the first time in the modern era, meaning Mrs Merkel will be more reluctant than ever to countenance a British exit from the EU."

Economically, as the Daily Mail suggested, Britain was in a strong position to make its demands. This again legitimised Cameron's pledge since he could stand a chance of making good with his promise. Nonetheless, the Daily Mail pointed out that the referendum promise

was going to be one of the dividing lines in the upcoming General Elections. For example, the Daily Mail quoted Ed Milliband, the leader of the Labour Party:

“In October 2011, he opposed committing to an in/out referendum because of the uncertainty it would create for the country. The only thing that has changed since then is he has lost control of his party and is too weak to do what is right for the country.”

The Guardian quoted Milliband similarly, that he would define Cameron as “a weak prime minister, being driven by his party, not by the national economic interest.” These words settled right into the Guardian’s liberal agenda. Another pro-European senior figure, although he or she remained unnamed which already discredited the source some, called Cameron’s efforts dynamite and dangerous in G230113/1. The attempt was to delegitimise Cameron’s aims and prop up the status quo.

Despite this, the Guardian was surprisingly neutral compared to the Daily Mail since it presented the main ideas of the speech before starting to discredit Cameron’s pledge. This might be so that the audience would know what there was to discredit and trust that they would arrive at similar conclusions as the evidence was presented. DM230113 left the naysayers to its narrative until the end of the article. However, as the overall tone had been hopeful and decisive for the referendum, the placement of these complaints implied that they were not as important, but an afterthought. Tacked on were also, for example *The British Shopping List*, which implied that this was what the British people would get and what they deserved. However, what also set the difference between the Guardian and the Daily Mail were Cameron’s demands. While for the Daily Mail they were the carrying force, the Guardian only mentioned them in the last few sentences.

In short, what differed was more up to the interpretation of Cameron’s message, what his words represented to the papers, which in turn reflected on the choice of words. The Daily Mail used modality and selective use of vocabulary to add a level of certainty to its reportage of Cameron’s speech, further bolstering the message and legitimising it. The Guardian, however, was more cautious on its use of modal verbs and also used the vaguer ones to show things were not so black and white. The criticism and delegitimation of Cameron was also present since, unlike the Daily Mail, the Guardian saw Cameron’s ultimatum to Europe as a negative thing. However, essentially, the core of Cameron’s message was reported in the same way: Britain would leave if nothing changed.

6.2 The referendum results 24.06.2016

The articles, the Daily Mail's DM240616/1 and the Guardian's G240616/1, presented here report on the referendum results. They both go into depth about which areas voted Britain Stronger in Europe and Vote Leave more prominently. They also discuss the immediate aftermath and reactions to the results, both within the UK as well as internationally.

The Guardian's (G240616/1) news piece was almost three times longer than the Daily Mail's, being 1421 words to DM240616/1's 594 words. Both were, however, front page news in terms of placement. The difference between the articles can be explained by the fact that the Daily Mail's issue from June 24th was a Brexit special edition and thus had more in-depth articles later dedicated to the details. Neither of the articles went into much detail on the referendum process itself. This is possibly because that was covered by other articles the previous days such as DM220616/2 and G220616/2.

The Daily Mail's article started with a short and on point headline, declaring:

“We’re out!”

It said everything it needed and more in terms of representation. The *we* referred to the British citizens as one entity. They were all in the same boat on this, no matter what anyone voted. It expressed certainty and commitment although no modal verbs were used to emphasise it. *We* as a word is an all-encompassing term, including everyone it is targeted to, but it also excludes those who are considered outsiders. In this case, the outsiders were other Europeans, because the British people were leaving the EU which was what the *out* of the headline referred to. Thus, it became very apparent what the Daily Mail was representing – the British people – and the headline also enhanced one of the findings of Chapter 5.3 that indicated a growth in the reporting of the ‘us versus them’ narrative.

There were a few sub-headers in DM240616/1 after the main header which offered more information of things to come, describing the events by how

“After 43 years UK freed from shackles of EU;
PM in crisis as voters reject Project Fear;
Leave surge sends pound to a 31-year low”.

The headlines were driven by intertextuality since all three were referring to other events or texts. In the first and the third one, the past was referred to. The third sub-header pointed out

the severity of the economic situation while the first one referred to the long relationship of the EU and the EU, starting from 1973 until 2016. The driving point is the word *freed* which created the tone for the Daily Mail's DM240616/1. The word establishes that there were past wrongdoings towards the British people by the enemy of this narrative, the EU. Europe – or the EU – was tying Britain down with *shackles* to a single continent or institution. The headline could imply there being dissatisfaction in that since, historically, the country had influence all over the world through the Commonwealth, and the Daily Mail had developed the narrative of the British identity as being separate from the European identity during the campaign. This, again, would involve intertextuality since the Daily Mail was indirectly referring to its own past texts.

Yet, Britain overcame those restraints and the *Project Fear*, as Britain Stronger in Europe had been referred to, despite the support Bremainers had from Cameron and elite. Calling Britain Stronger in Europe *Project Fear* was selectivity at its worst. It branded the opposing side with negative connotations while simultaneously elevating Vote Leave. The vocabulary used in the headlines was divisive: it informed the readers that there was a right and wrong side in the issue and that the right side had won today. The use of the word *voters* in the second headline affirmed this as the citizens had decided, legitimising the results and calling the current leadership into question.

In comparison to the Daily Mail's (DM240616/1) headline, the Guardian's (G240616/1) headline was more neutral. It stated that the

“EU referendum night drama points to clear political divide”.

The use of the word *drama* pointed out how the night was not just one side overpowering the other but that there had been, and still was, a tighter battle between the sides going on. The results, therefore, did not represent the whole nation. This was also stated rather straightforwardly by the night ending in a *political divide*. Neither side was, technically, winning yet despite what the Daily Mail was reporting. The vote was not then yet legitimated despite the results being pro-Brexit; the battle was not won yet, as the selectively neutral vocabulary implied. The headline was part of the Guardian's narrative which implied that the referendum results would not be swept under a carpet nor that the losing side would accept their dues quietly – as was the manner of a political division. This was also demonstrated by G240616/1 quoting politicians such as Leanne Wood, leader of Plaid Cymru, and Alex

Salmond, Scotland's former first minister and member of Scottish National Party, respectively, on how there might be renewed talk of independence:

“I've said all along it was in Wales's best interest to stay in the European Union but you must always look for opportunities.”

“Scotland looks like it is going to vote solidly remain; If there was a leave vote in England, dragging us out the EU, I'm quite certain Nicola Sturgeon would implement the SNP manifesto.”

Naturally, this was done in a whole different manner than the way UKIP leader Nigel Farage had spoken of it. Farage legitimated the results in the Daily Mail (DM240616/1) through the widespread Euroscepticism and defiance in the face of “bully boys”, calling the polling day the “Independence Day”. The Guardian (G240616/1), on the other hand, brought up the other side of this talk about gaining independence, this time from the United Kingdom, since the referendum results seemed to treat, for example, Scotland wrongly. This was, again bringing up that the close results did not represent all British people and thus was not a legitimate judge of opinion. In the context, Salmond's words were understandable and required from the readers the ability to connect to the 2014 Scottish referendum. Intertextuality was in play G240616/1 then. As the public discussion had shown, one of the key reasons Scotland had voted to stay in the UK in 2014 was because they were able to stay in the EU as well. If Scotland had left the UK and gained independence, it would have lost all the UK's deals as well as the membership. Yet, at this point, the talk of independence was mostly to emphasise satisfaction or displeasure over the current situation and delegitimating the results.

Seeing as the Daily Mail was all for Brexit, it was easy to see the header having a positive tone to it, a cheerful sort of ‘we did it’, especially since the first sentence of DM240616/1 supported this idea:

“A huge revolt by Middle England last night gave a stunning victory to Brexit.”

The sentence implied several things which the header had already pointed out. *A huge revolt* was equated with *a stunning victory*. Using the vocabulary as the article did was again legitimising the results. *Middle England* also has several connotations here. For example, while it does refer to the geographical division of votes since the Middle Englanders pushed Vote Leave to win, it also points out that the elite lost against the common people. This theme is further explored by the word *revolt*. The word often has negative connotations since it expresses attempt at escaping the status quo. However, in the Daily Mail's (DM240616/1) case, it was equated with *victory* and winning at something, which in turn turned *revolt* into a

good thing. Compared to the Guardian's (G240416/1) use of the more cautious phrase *political divide*, DM240616/1's expression had turned the event into a cause to be won. The Daily Mail even called the voting a "bitter referendum battle". It is worth to be noticed that both papers were using the word *bitter* to describe the campaigning, showcasing the seriousness of the situation and the depth between the two sides.

However, repetition was a tool which the Daily Mail was fond of using to get its points across. First, it was clear that this was a fight against the elite by the so-called lower classes as, for example, DM060314/1 and DM220616/1 had noted earlier. It also brought continuity and repetition to the Daily Mail's narrative which could be seen from its narration of immigration, economy and identity in Chapter 5.1. The heroes in DM240616/1's scenario were the Middle Englanders, the overlooked and underappreciated, who were not part of the metropolitans. In addition, they were heroes to Brexit specifically. This is because while the *we* in the headline refers to the all-encompassing 'we' since the results were final, the paper acknowledged that Bremainers would not be happy with it, thus excluding them from the hall of glory.

The first sentence was repeated with different, more informative words in the next sentence:

"On a massive turnout, there was a historic rejection of Brussels in safe Tory seats and Labour working-class heartlands as Leave scored an astonishing success."

As can be seen, the *huge revolt* turned to a *massive turnout*; *Middle England to safe Tory seats* and *Labour working-class heartlands*; *stunning victory* to *astonishing success*; and *Brexit to rejection of Brussels*. The only thing that changed was the added *historic* before *rejection of Brussels* which gave another nod to the importance of history and making it. This was another example of intertextuality since there had to be an understanding of what the deal with the referendum was. The use of the word *historic* alluded to a once-in-a-lifetime experience or event which Brexit certainly was. It was the first member of the European Union to want to – or vote to – leave, not counting Greenland. Later, as was mentioned earlier, Farage declared "Independence Day" which, again, stated historic importance. The header's narration of British freedom from the European Union correlated with Farage's statement. The Daily Mail was using the same tactics as before as shown by DM291114/1 and DM291114/2. It was making the EU the enemy of Britain, by taking away its national sovereignty and pride which had now been reclaimed by reversing the commitment to Brussels.

The Guardian called the referendum day and results night chaotic and confusing. According to its recount, everything had made it seem like the Bremain campaign would win; even Farage had conceded Brexit's loss early on. In addition, the pound experienced what G240616/1 called a mini-rally. Yet, "things went into reverse", the Guardian reported, a little uncharacteristically. The Guardian's overall style is more about stating and compelling its readers to believe its words through wit and facts but the way G240616/1 was written was almost as if it was reciting a tragedy and the use of vocabulary reflected this. For example, expressions such as "time after time" and "as morning dawned" were used to set the downtrodden mood. The description of the voting process even ended with:

"Any slight hope that a bitterly fought campaign might end in some approximation of harmony were soon dashed."

From the Guardian's point of view, Brexit winning was a certain tragedy. However, the paper reflected the bitterness of losing on the first pages, not leaving it for the editorials or opinion pieces. It was not unusual per se, since the British papers were biased overall, yet there was no attempt at staying neutral with the results in G240616/1's text.

What was an interesting comparison was the lack of modal verbs utilised in the articles. DM240616/1 used no modal verbs such as 'will' or 'must' in the article and only once used 'might' when someone was being quoted. G240616/1 did use 'must' once, also when it was quoting someone else, and 'might' three times. Compared with the Daily Mail (DM230113) and the Guardian (G230113/1) in January 2013, the difference is huge. This could result from the fact that, on 23 January 2013, David Cameron was determining what would happen if the Tories won the General Elections of 2015. There was no certainty except for what promises he swore to uphold and what the papers were willing to express. However, 24 June 2016 was the day after the promised polling day. The results were in, and the articles were recounting something which had happened in the past. It was then already something certain so there was no need to emphasise it with modal verbs. Making their point was then, instead, done by the use of vocabulary and selecting the words to best describe the papers' narrative: was the voting a success or not.

Selective reporting was also something to be noticed. According to the Daily Mail, there had been protests against the London-based political class in other parts of England. Again, the little people struck against the powerful; after all, as the Daily Mail crowed in 240616/1, the chances of Brexit winning had been barely at 10 percent. In short, it could be interpreted that

Brexit was a miracle in the works. The Guardian, however, pointed out how the two sides were locked at almost 50-50 for the longest time before the slow tilt towards Brexit happened. It also noted how more economically-deprived regions voted more likely for Brexit. The Daily Mail did a similar comparison although it emphasised the righteous fury against the, possibly, intellectually correct decision.

This deduction is based on the papers' narratives and common argument styles. While the Daily Mail promoted Brexit as the only viable choice, its means of doing so were targeting the emotional response of its audience while the Guardian insisted on backing the more enlightened narrative. This was showcased by how the papers treated the immediate economic situation. G240616/1 went from hopeful to depressed and pointed out how the currency markets did the same. DM240616/1 spoke of a plunge of the pound and a sudden drop in stocks, but these were mentioned as being worldwide events – therefore proving the United Kingdom as a very influential nation without the EU as well, and that more global economic trends were at play too, not just Brexit. It was later mentioned, however, that the fall in the pound was worse than in 1992 during Black Wednesday²². The nod to the 1990's inflation was bound to elicit a response from those who remembered it. The Guardian, however, gave an exact number to the drop, over 8%, and instead expected its readers to understand what a grave thing that was.

What became quickly clear in the articles was that they either attempted to legitimise or delegitimise the results based on if the results fit the papers' narrative and thus represented their target audience. This was done through the use of vocabulary and selective reporting to set the tone for the articles. Whereas the Daily Mail emphasised victory over the status quo, the Guardian seemed to reflect on what a disaster Brexit winning was. In any case, both were very surprised to see the results come out the way they did, and the reporting reflected that: the winning side was delighted while the losing side was decidedly not. What they both seemed to acknowledge, however, was one thing: the world was now changed. Yet, it was still to be seen if it was for the better or worse.

²² Black Wednesday referred to when the British government was forced to withdraw the pound from the European Exchange Rate Mechanism (ERM) after it was unable to keep the currency above its agreed lower limit. The same did not happen in 2016 since the British economy was stronger now than it had been 24 years ago, thus affecting things differently.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The present study has thoroughly studied the development of Brexit and the two official campaigns advocating either leaving or remaining in the European Union through their newspaper coverage. Both campaigns were widely followed and argued for and against during the analysed time period. As the study has demonstrated, the papers examined, Daily Mail and the Guardian, had very different narratives in their coverages, particularly on the themes of immigration, economy and identity. They were also very different types of papers. For example, the Daily Mail was a typical tabloid with its vernacular language use, while the Guardian was a typical broadsheet in that it had a more complicated and more essay-like style of writing. However, these traits were more about catering to their target audiences. For example, as suggested by Tunsdall's (1996: 9) study on newspapers, the Daily Mail's readership would be looking for information about recent events but also entertainment. The Guardian's profile was built more as a source of news, and thus the paper provided more details than the Daily Mail often did. It also had to convince its audience that it was reliable source of information. Although there are differences between the papers, they still utilised similar tools to argue against the opposition, such as referring to official sources, pointing out the flaws in the opposition's arguments and bringing up points which were close to their readers' hearts.

When the period between January 2013 and July 2016 was being analysed, the three main themes immediately distinguished themselves from the rest as they were so integrated they formed one larger issue together. The first was the theme of immigration as it started gaining ground as the years passed, and during 2016 it was the most emphasised aspect of Brexit. When the theme was analysed further, it became clear that the Daily Mail and the Guardian had different points of view to discuss immigration: the former through identity and the latter through the economy. This was an important find because it also showcased what the readers found interesting and where their values lied, since the papers catered to their audience as best as their previous experiences with the readers allowed. In addition, it revealed what the papers – and the campaigns – used to further their agenda both implicitly and explicitly: what they were discussing and, perhaps more importantly, how they were presenting their side. An example of this is how the examined papers defined the European migration, which was the heart of the immigration issue. With the Daily Mail, as DM060314/1 demonstrated, the EU and non-EU migration seemed to have become indistinguishable until closer to the 2016

referendum, while the Guardian did not seem to have trouble separating the two since 2013, the beginning of the examined period.

The themes examined in Chapter 5 were, overall, presented in a very polarised manner. In particular, the debate over immigration was quite heated. As examined in Chapter 5.1, the Daily Mail was largely against immigration, while the Guardian took a more positive outlook on the issue. Their discourse was often connected to other issues at hand, identity for the Daily Mail and the economy for the Guardian. The latter did not see immigration as much of an issue which is why its coverage did not seem to hang on the negative sides much and, perhaps because of that, did not see the reason to defend it either. What the Guardian did was to acknowledge possible problems, but mostly it accused others, such as the Daily Mail, of scaremongering instead of listening to what the paper considered facts. In addition, even if Britain Stronger in Europe had wanted to focus on other issues more, immigration was just something that came up again and again as it was one of the targets of UKIP and the Tories. As with the Guardian, it seemed that Britain Stronger in Europe only took up the immigration debate to argue against Vote Leave's claims. One of the reasons for the Leave winning was, quite possibly, that they were louder and more proactive, particularly over immigration. As demonstrated in Chapter 5, Cameron first tried to match UKIP in the debate before trying to backtrack and turn attention elsewhere. This would prove an unsuccessful endeavour as well since even at the Wembley debate immigration proved to be the most debated issue as G220616/1 and G220616/2 showed.

The economy was another big issue, but it was discussed in more depth by the Guardian than by the Daily Mail. This was because the Guardian was of mind it was one of the biggest reasons why the United Kingdom should stay within the European Union. As the paper saw it, the EU was giving Britain it all: the single market, no tariffs, a good reputation in the market and, most significantly, a competitive edge over most of the world. The Daily Mail agreed that these advantages were important, yet even the possibility of having to give the perks up was not seen as a deterrent from leaving. In fact, the Daily Mail speculated that the UK might be able to stay in the single market despite leaving the European Union itself. The fears the British people had about various things, such as the effects of further immigration and the possibility of economic disadvantages, were used to describe the tactics and the agenda of the campaigns. For example, Vote Leave was referred to as 'Project Hate', the way Britain Stronger in Europe had been called 'Project Fear'. By being referred as Project Hate, Vote Leave was blamed for trying to stir up fears about immigration, such as terrorism, lost jobs

and overcrowding of public services. Britain Stronger in Europe, as Project Fear, was accused of attempting to paint Brexit as an economic disaster. In this sense, the mixing of EU migration and refugees outside EU was a deliberate move by the Daily Mail. The effect this tactic was after could have been to build an image of overpopulated Britain. How could people survive economically if everything they knew collapsed? What the Guardian asked, on the other hand, was whether it was wise to give up on the advantages of immigration since immigrants, for example, made up a lot of the working population on the grassroots level.

The issues with identity explored by the papers could, on the other hand, be divided into two categories according to the papers' narratives. When examining the Daily Mail and the Guardian and the campaigns they endorsed in their articles, Vote Leave seemed to argue for a 'locally global' Britain while Britain Stronger in Europe insisted on 'globally local' Britain. This could be seen by how the Daily Mail integrated the issues of identity with the immigration and, in a lesser sense, the Guardian to the economy. The Daily Mail seemed to wish for immigration and threats to sovereignty to stop; a more consistent Britain, in a sense. This was supported by Freedon (2017: 1), according to whom public discourse in the UK had for decades inserted a caesura between 'Britain' and 'Europe', setting Britain adrift from its European geographical location and rendering it, sometimes provocatively, continent-less. The Guardian, on the other hand, wished to keep the borders open and ideally have an exchange of culture instead of cherishing merely one. That would mean an international Britain and a global mindset, identity tied to a wider community than what resided inside a nation's borders. This division affected the narratives of the papers' overall coverage, which in turn would affect the readership through how they identified themselves. The Daily Mail's approach appealed to the ordinary people who were afraid of being forgotten in the bigger picture which was not seen too fondly by the rest of Europe. In comparison, the Guardian wrote more the internationally-oriented and highly-educated in mind which in turn distanced the paper from the British lower and/or middle class. In short, the issue of identity divided the papers – and the target audiences – more effectively than the issues of immigration and economy since it was the theme connecting them both.

The themes were not the only one affecting the coverage and influencing the readership. Along with the content of the articles, the meaning-making tools used by the Daily Mail and the Guardian were important as well in order to create the rapport between the papers' and their audiences. Chapter 6 presented an overview of the linguistic and lexical choices the papers made by focusing on four articles published by them, two from 23 January 2013 and

two from 24 June 2016. While the themes are relevant, it is just as important to discuss how things were said rather than just what was said.

One of the most utilised tools the present study uncovered was intertextuality. The Daily Mail and the Guardian used intertextuality to offer proof to their arguments, often connecting their narratives to past texts as well as present ones. This was done by reporting on an event and then backing the paper's opinion in some way. One example of this was how the Guardian introduced the 1975 referendum to bring out the fact that the British already once chose the European Union when Cameron introduced the possibility of a new vote. The Daily Mail used the example as well but, rather, by legitimising Cameron's decision unlike the Guardian. In addition, the historical linkage to past events was more of a characteristic to the Daily Mail than to the Guardian. For example, on the coverage of the referendum results on June 24th, the Daily Mail mentioned Black Wednesday to evoke a personal connection to the drop of the pound. This is a trait of the Daily Mail's in that it tried to affect its readership more through feelings, such as those evoked by the memories from the 1990's, than numbers.

While the historical linkage was a prime example of intertextuality, what Brexit brought up more often was the linkage to official documents, such as government reports, and things said by officials and experts, such as politicians. This was done by both papers, particularly referring to the statements that would validate their points of view and legitimise their opinions. This was often done through the people in power who represented their agenda. In comparison to historical linkage, however, the statistics were the preferred method of the Guardian in using intertextuality to provide evidence. On the same topic of the drop of the pound, the Guardian mentioned that the fall was 8%, and seemingly expected its audience would know what that meant economically, and how it would affect them. The Daily Mail sought to introduce people to an example of what could happen; the Guardian did not. This was also a telling rhetorical trait that showed that both papers knew their target audience. The papers catered to what they thought their readership was interested in based on the assumptions and previous experience the papers had, while also hoping to shape the views of their audience. A similar thing could be said of the political people who sought to influence the newspaper readership. Another way to look at the coverage would be to suggest that the people in power were legitimising themselves through the press since they were making their opinions known widely and passing them as common sense. They were marketing their values as best as they could as could be seen in Chapter 5.

The articles examined in Chapter 6 indicated that the Daily Mail's texts were more provocative, in both content and style, than the Guardian's were. The language the Daily Mail used was more vernacular; the paper was eager to use similar language its readers used in order to be more relatable and to represent its audience. This could be seen particularly on the pronoun use in the headlines of the articles from 23 January 2013. The Daily Mail used the pronoun *you* to speak directly to the audience, empowering them, while the Guardian only used *our* indirectly through a quotation. While both pronouns were meant to speak to every Brit, the use of *you* was a more common way of addressing someone which linked to the earlier point of how the Daily Mail appealed more to the ordinary people than the Guardian did. This can also be seen by how the Guardian used more bookish expressions and metaphors, such as "bedevil" and "throw the gauntlet", which served to promote its reputation as a broadsheet paper and appeal to its target audience which was decidedly a smaller niche. This is not to say the Daily Mail did not put similar tools to use. For example, the paper used rather controversial vocabulary in calling the ties Britain had to the EU as *shackles* in DM240616/1. However, the analysis of the articles seemed to suggest that it was doing so less than the Guardian.

There were also other aspects to the papers' choice of vocabulary use. The words used were building the papers' narratives and the sense of right and wrong according to the driven agenda. Particularly the use of modal verbs and the word choices expressed the narratives and the agendas, as argued in Chapter 6. As has been mentioned, a signature trait of tabloids is a sort of black-and-white view, and this was also true for the paper which its choices of vocabulary showcased. The Daily Mail preferred using very exact language, such as modal verb *will* and *must*. They expressed certainty in what would be happening which is attractive to a layperson. They also added a certain level of legitimization to the words. For example, as pointed out in Chapter 6.1, the Daily Mail used *will* and *must* in DM230113 to suggest that Cameron was right to pledge a vote on the EU, strengthening the mentioned intertextual reference to the 1975 referendum. The Guardian preferred using strong modal verbs mostly in quotations, rather using words such as *may* that had a lesser degree of certainty, as they held more space for speculation and caution. It offered the audience a chance for criticism and doubt, shades of grey in a sense, which the Daily Mail did not.

The articles in Chapter 6 were contrasts to each other but also continuations in spirit. They were contrasts in that, for example, the Daily Mail on 23 January 2013 interpreted and thus

reported Cameron's pledge for a referendum as a good idea while the Guardian was more critical and wary of the possible consequences. On the other hand, the articles on 24 June 2016 were continuing on the same spirit: the Daily Mail held a more positive outlook on the future whereas the Guardian was despairing over the results of the referendum. There was also the matter of the presentation, both of the article and the information. The structure of the articles also revealed more about the way they were written. The Guardian used longer paragraphs and sentences than the Daily Mail did. The latter used a less complicated style of writing and the more certain modal verbs more to emphasise its points. The Daily Mail's published pieces were often very certain of their points and were coloured to especially enhance the beliefs of the paper. The Guardian, although it made its opinions clear on its editorials, often attempted a more impartial coverage or at least a subtler approach to influencing its readers. This was shown particularly when the Guardian would cover the points of view of the opposition, despite often nudging the readers towards the Guardian's agenda, while the Daily Mail would attempt to ignore there was an alternative or, if it did not, the paper would then attack the opposition.

This discussion has shown that the themes immigration, economy and identity, and the linguistic and lexical choices made by the papers clearly affected the overall Brexit newspaper coverage and the opinion of the British people, and thus the referendum results: the United Kingdom voted to leave the European Union on 23 June 2016. Had all papers been pro-Remain, it would have been extremely doubtful that Britain Stronger in Europe had lost, even with the years of lingering Euroscepticism. Clearly, it mattered that papers and the news media reached their audience. Thus, the circulation numbers were important. With the Vote Leave being supported by the highest circulation papers, such as the Daily Mail and the Sun, the Guardian's meagre print numbers, as well as a smaller online audience were less effective in supporting Britain Stronger in Europe. In addition, with the Guardian giving space also for the introduction of Vote Leave's issues, even if in order to argue against them, Brexit gained more ground in the newspapers than Breman did.

What also became apparent was that the papers' political ideology affected their coverage since, as has been shown, the right-wing Daily Mail was often against the leftist Guardian. However, it was clear that there were no clear party-political lines driving either Vote Leave or Britain Stronger in Europe since, for example, both campaigns had prominent politicians in their midst. In the end, the turnout proved to be larger than in the General Elections of 2015.

This meant that people knew about the referendum and the issues it covered to a point although some were still ill-informed. As pointed out in Chapter 2.3, the British people did not know much about the EU in general which was partly why many were not interested in voting in the EU elections. Now, though, they flocked to the ballot boxes.

The present study is indicative of the trends which affected the news coverage of the Daily Mail and the Guardian on Brexit but is not conclusive. The amount of data was not large enough to give but a small overview of how things proceeded from the papers' points of view. However, the study proved itself to be worthwhile. Because of Brexit's status as a relatively new, and still ongoing, event, there have not been many studies done on it yet. The ones, such as Grenade (2016) and Jensen and Snaith (2016), that have been made have mostly focused on the contemporary politics that made Brexit reality and the problems it could cause. There have been less made in the context of how media, particularly newspaper media, affected the outcome, although, for example, Hobolt (2016) touched on the issue. The present study provided information on Brexit as a phenomenon, such as snapshots into the debate which in turn offered insight into the campaigns and the groundwork. More importantly, it showcased how the papers attempted to further their agendas on the matter of Brexit. For future research, more papers could be added to be analysed; for example, ones with similar agendas, in order to find out more conclusive evidence on methods approaching the issue of Brexit. More data could also be added in between the current examined period and/or include a longer time period to analyse, so that the development of the situation would have a more in-depth examination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources (all newspaper articles and their codes used in the data)

The Daily Mail (23.01.2013 – 13.07.2016)

1. 23.01.2013: You will get an in or out vote on Europe (DM230113)
2. 26.10.2013: Lah-dih-dah and airy-fairy (DM261013/1)
3. 26.10.2013: British anarchists ‘are turning Calais lawless’ (DM261013/2)
4. 06.03.2014: Working class hit hardest by inf lux, says Tory minister (DM060314/1)
5. 06.03.2014: Migrant workers do cost British jobs says ‘buried’ report (DM060314/2)
6. 29.11.2014: I’ll veto new members to EU, warns Cameron (DM291114/1)
7. 29.11.2014: A fine speech... but it was five years overdue (DM291114/2)
8. 25.07.2015: Obama’s EU plea infuriates Tories (DM250715/1)
9. 17.12.2015: Vote on EU next June if Cameron gets deal (DM171215/1)
10. 17.12.2015: Wrong, wrong wrong! Why Major’s spin on Europe just doesn’t add up (DM171215/2)
11. 17.12.2015: Spare us yet another Brussels pantomime (DM171215/3)
12. 03.02.2016: The great delusion! (DM030216/1)
13. 03.02.2016: New ‘red card’ voting system could be used against Britain (DM030216/2)
14. 15.04.2016: CORBYN: EU MIGRATION ISN’T TOO HIGH (DM150416/1)
15. 15.04.2016: Man With No Shame says Brexit would hit the NHS (DM150416/2)
16. 15.04.2016: Let’s quit Europe and give [pounds]13bn to the NHS, says Boris (DM150416/3)
17. 15.04.2016: Even Corbyn doesn’t believe what he says (DM150416/4)
18. 27.05.2016: RECORD NUMBER OF JOBLESS EU MIGRANTS IN BRITAIN Hammer blow for PM as 270,000 EU nationals came here last year (DM270516/1)
19. 27.05.2016: Now Osborne says Brexit will cost pensioners up to [pounds]32,000 (DM270516/2)
20. 27.05.2016: Staying is ‘more safer’ said Khan, maestro of grammar (DM270516/3)
21. 22.06.2016: 2016.06.22 – BRITAIN DIVIDED Voters turn out in near-record numbers Brexit surge in working class areas London and Scots lining up to Remain (DM220616/1)
22. 22.06.2016: London and Scotland IN as swathes of UK vote OUT (DM220616/2)

23. 22.06.2016: UNDECIDED? READ THIS ESSENTIAL PRIMER... (DM220616/3)
24. 24.06.2016: WE'RE OUT! (DM240616/1)
25. 24.06.2016: SO, WHAT NOW? (DM240616/2)
26. 13.07.2016: From Heathrow to immigration - Theresa's groaning in-tray (DM130716/1)
27. 13.07.2016: Six years to get out of Europe (DM130716/2)
28. 13.07.2016: Dave's plea to May: Don't axe my foreign aid budget (DM130716/3)

The Guardian (23.01.2013 – 13.07.2016)

1. 23.01.2013: Front: Cameron to pledge in-out vote on EU: Revise terms of our membership or trigger British exit, PM tells Europe (G230113/1)
2. 23.01.2013: Front: Analysis: Moment of truth for a man opposed to risk (G230113/2)
3. 26.10.2013: NSA files: Cameron 'agrees' with EU over US spying: Cameron 'wasn't against' concerns, says Merkel: PM blames Snowden and 'newspapers helping him' (G261013/1)
4. 26.10.2013: Comment: This is a test for Europe: Member states have a duty to protect citizens from snooping. There is surely more to come (G261013/2)
5. 06.03.2014: Front: Deadlock as Russia digs in over Crimea: US 'making unacceptable ultimatums' as talks to resolve Ukraine crisis falter (G060314/1)
6. 06.03.2014: Comment: White face, blue collar: the 'left behind' voters only UKIP understands: Farage's supporters are not EU-obsessed Tories, but older working-class men. Labour can't afford to ignore their concerns (G060314/2)
7. 29.11.2014: Front: Merkel forces Cameron retreat: PM softens message on EU migrants after German intervention (G291114/1)
8. 29.11.2014: Front: Immigration: The day Cameron stopped trying to out-UKIP UKIP. But it's a gamble: Prime Minister sends out clearest signal yet that he wants Britain to stay in EU (G291114/2)
9. 29.11.2014: Front: Immigration: The figures - and their implications (G291114/3)
10. 29.11.2014: Migration: David Cameron asked some of the right questions. But he had few of the right answers (G291114/4)
11. 25.07.2015: NHS waiting times for elective surgery spiked last year, report finds (G250715)

12. 17.12.2015: Brexit will set UK back [pound]11bn in EU trade costs, research finds (G171215/1)
13. 17.12.2015: Britain's pro-Europeans need to find a Shirley Williams (G171215/2)
14. 03.02.2016: EU referendum: David Cameron wins Theresa May's backing (G030216/1)
15. 03.02.2016: The Guardian view on the EU debate: time to speak for Britain (G030216/2)
16. 03.02.2016: David Cameron has learned how Europe works: better late than never (G030216/3)
17. 15.04.2016: Boris Johnson urges crowd to interrupt live Channel 4 broadcast (G150416/1)
18. 15.04.2016: Who'd have thought it? Jeremy Corbyn could shape Britain's destiny in Europe (G150416/2)
19. 27.05.2016: Barack Obama says world needs a united Europe (G270516/1)
20. 27.05.2016: Brexit could cost pensioners [pound]32,000, chancellor says (G270516/2)
21. 27.05.2016: The Guardian view on the EU and the refugee crisis: stop arguing, and fix it (G270516/3)
22. 27.05.2016: The Guardian view on the Leave campaign: show some respect for truth (G270516/4)
23. 22.06.2016: EU referendum: our panel on Question Time at Wembley Arena (G220616/1)
24. 22.06.2016: Khan and Davidson clash with Johnson on immigration in EU debate (G220616/2)
25. 22.06.2016: What if the EU is doing the exact opposite of what it's meant to do? (G220616/3)
26. 22.06.2016: Remain and reform is wishful thinking -- the left should vote leave (G220616/4)
27. 24.06.2016: EU referendum night drama points to clear political divide (G220616/1)
28. 24.06.2016: The referendum campaigns have revealed a fractured country (G220616/2)
29. 24.06.2016: EU referendum: Sturgeon accuses Johnson of telling [pound]350m 'whopper' (G220616/3)
30. 24.06.2016: The Guardian view on the EU referendum: the vote is in, now we must face the consequences (G220616/4)

31. 13.07.2016: Ruth Davidson pokes fun at Andrea Leadsom and Boris Johnson
(G130716/1)
32. 13.07.2016: The Guardian view on Theresa May: new PM, same old problems
(G130716/2)
33. 13.07.2016: Theresa May is no liberal -- and her rise to PM is no cause for celebration
(G130716/3)

Secondary sources

- Chilton, P. A., and Schäffner, C. (2002). Themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse. In Chilton, P. A., and Schäffner, C. (eds.), *Politics as text and talk: Analytic approaches to political discourse*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Pub. Co, 1-41.
- Dijk, T.A.v. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Economist (2017). Geert Wilders's anti-immigration party does worse than expected in the Dutch election. The Economist, March 18, 2017. <http://www.economist.com/news/europe/21718929-nonetheless-new-type-identity-politics-emerging-netherlands-geert-wilderss>, accessed: 14.04.2017.
- Electoral Commission (2016). *Referendum on the UK's membership of the European Union*. <http://www.electoralcommission.org.uk/find-information-by-subject/elections-and-referendums/past-elections-and-referendums/eu-referendum>, accessed 14.11.2016.
- Fairclough, I. and Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political discourse analysis: a method for advanced students*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2001a). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE, 121-138.
- Fairclough, N. (2001b). *Language and power*. (2nd ed.). Harlow, Eng.; New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J. and Wodak, R. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Dijk, T.A.v. (ed.), *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction*. (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage, 357-378.
- Finnish General Election results of 2017. <https://vaalit.yle.fi/results/kv2017>. (14 April, 2017).
- Francis, E. (2016). May storms into lead as rivals battle for No 10: Gove and Leadsom race to challenge her, Home Secretary takes commanding lead. *The Times*, July 6, 2016, 1.
- Francis, E. (2016). Leadsom steps from the shadows to take on May. *The Times*, July 8, 2016,

1.

- Francis, E. (2016). Race to pick new cabinet as May gets keys to No 10: New prime minister will move in tomorrow Cameron draws up honours list to reward allies Duncan Smith cries foul after Leadsom pulls out. *The Times*, July 12, 2016, 1.
- Freeden, M. (2017). After the Brexit referendum: revisiting populism as an ideology. *Journal of Political Ideologies* 22 (1), 1-11.
- Gietel-Basten, S. (2016). Why Brexit? The toxic mix of immigration and austerity. *Population & Development Review* 42 (4), 673-680.
- Grenade, W.C. (2016). Paradoxes of regionalism and democracy: Brexit's lessons for the Commonwealth. *The Round Table* 105 (5), 509-518.
- Hansen, A., Cottle, S., Negrine, R. and Newbold, C. (1998). *Mass communication research methods*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hewings A. and Hewings M. (2005). *Grammar and context: an advanced resource book*. London: Routledge.
- Hobolt, S. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy* 23 (9), 1259-1277.
- Jensen, M. D. and Snaith, H. (2016). When politics prevails: the political economy of a Brexit. *Journal of European Public Policy* 23 (9), 1302-1310.
- Jones, A. (2007). *Britain and the European Union*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kenny, M. and Pearce, N. (2016). After Brexit: the Eurosceptic dream of an Anglosphere. *Juncture* 22 (4), 304-307.
- Krippendorff, K. (2013). *Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology* (3rd Ed.). London: SAGE
- Mautner, G. (2008). Analysing newspapers, magazines and other print media. In Wodak, R. and Krzyzanowski, M. (eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 30-53.
- McCullagh, C. (2002). *Media power: a sociological introduction*. New York: Palgrave.
- McNair, B. (1995). *An introduction to political communication*. London: Routledge.
- Pietikäinen, S. (2009). *Kurssi kohti diskurssia*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Ponsford, D. (2016). NRS: Daily Mail most popular UK newspaper in print and online with 23m readers a month. *PressGazette*, February 26, 2015. <http://www.pressgazette.co.uk/nrs-daily-mail-most-popular-uk-newspaper-print-and-online-23m-readers-month/>, accessed: 04.03.2017.
- Staab, A. (2013). *The European Union explained: institutions, actors, global impact*. 3nd ed.

- Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Steward, H. (2016). Michael Gove to set out Tory leadership stall after forcing out Boris Johnson. *The Guardian*, July 1, 2016, 1.
- Troitino, D. R. (2013). *European integration: building Europe*. Hauppauge, New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Tunstall, J. (1996). *Newspaper power: the new national press in Britain*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- The Guardian (2015). *The Scott Trust: values and history*.
<https://www.theguardian.com/the-scott-trust/2015/jul/26/the-scott-trust>, accessed: 10.03.2017.
- UK Parliament (2016). *The 1974-75 UK Renegotiation of EEC Membership and Referendum*.
<http://researchbriefings.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefing/Summary/CBP-7253#fullreport>, accessed: 14.11.2016.
- Watts, D. (2008). *The European Union*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). London: SAGE.
- Wodak, R. (2001). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE, 63-94.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE, 1-13.
- Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Discourse studies – important concepts and terms. In Wodak, R. and Krzyzanowski, M. (eds.), *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-29.

APPENDIX: Article 50

1. Any Member State may decide to withdraw from the Union in accordance with its own constitutional requirements.
2. A Member State which decides to withdraw shall notify the European Council of its intention. In the light of the guidelines provided by the European Council, the Union shall negotiate and conclude an agreement with that State, setting out the arrangements for its withdrawal, taking account of the framework for its future relationship with the Union. That agreement shall be negotiated in accordance with Article 218(3) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. It shall be concluded on behalf of the Union by the Council, acting by a qualified majority, after obtaining the consent of the European Parliament.
3. The Treaties shall cease to apply to the State in question from the date of entry into force of the withdrawal agreement or, failing that, two years after the notification referred to in paragraph 2, unless the European Council, in agreement with the Member State concerned, unanimously decides to extend this period.
4. For the purposes of paragraphs 2 and 3, the member of the European Council or of the Council representing the withdrawing Member State shall not participate in the discussions of the European Council or Council or in decisions concerning it.
A qualified majority shall be defined in accordance with Article 238(3)(b) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.
5. If a State which has withdrawn from the Union asks to rejoin, its request shall be subject to the procedure referred to in Article 49.