

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/299485510>

Identitarian Populism in Britain

Chapter · May 2016

DOI: 10.1057/978-1-137-55679-0_9

CITATIONS

0

READS

159

2 authors, including:



Vasiliki Tsagkroni

Leiden University

17 PUBLICATIONS 18 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Integrating through the Digital: Analyzing the Role of ICTs and Social Media in Refugee Settlement Processes [View project](#)



Call for Papers: Refugee Crises Disclosed: Intersections between Media, Communication and Forced Migration Processes [View project](#)

9

Majority Identitarian Populism in Britain

Gabriella Lazaridis and Vasiliki Tsagkroni

Introduction

In the 2014 European Parliament elections, Eurosceptic and far-right populist parties made an impact: the French Front National (FN) gained of 24.85 per cent of the popular vote, the Greek neo-Nazi Golden Dawn party 9.4 per cent, the Italian Five-Star Movement (M5S) 21.2 per cent, the Sweden Democrats (SD) 9.7 per cent and UKIP 26.6 per cent. Europe's vote pointed to a Eurosceptic surge challenging the already established mainstream parties in its member states.

Far-right populist parties as we know them today began to emerge in the 1980s, while parties that were linked with fascist ideology in the past (e.g. MSI¹ in Italy) started to evolve in order to create a more legitimate image and attract the electorate. By adopting a majority identitarian populist rhetoric and emphasising socio-cultural and identity issues,

¹ MSI (Italian Social Movement).

G. Lazaridis (✉) • V. Tsagkroni



these parties have experienced growing success. This form of populism will be examined in this chapter as part of the rhetoric of the far (radical and extreme) right representatives on the British political scene: namely UKIP (UK Independence Party), the BNP (British National Party), and the EDL (English Defence League).

With the Euro-crisis and the pronounced socio-economic issues that ensued, far-right populist parties have sought to point out the potential threats to EU member states' national identities, based on a rhetoric enriched with elements of authoritarianism, populism, ethno-nationalism and welfare nationalism that often targets the 'other' (immigrants, Muslims, homosexuals, the Roma, etc.) as one of the major threats to 'the nation and its people'.

In the UK, although the far right was not as popular as in other European countries (such as the Nordic countries) in the late 1980s, a combination of circumstances in the late 2000s brought a change to the domestic political scene. Rising rates of immigration (see Migration Observatory 2015) and general concern about multiculturalism (see David Cameron's criticism on state multiculturalism,² 2011), together with increasing Islamophobia and the economic crisis, created a fertile ground for the support of far-right populist representatives.

UKIP, although active since 1993, managed to achieve a strong performance in the 2014 European Parliament elections, becoming the strongest party at the time in the UK.³ With its Eurosceptic discourse, xenophobia and strong anti-immigration policies, UKIP managed to make a breakthrough on the country's political scene and increase its political influence (Ford et al. 2012). On the other hand, EDL, a protest group formed in 2009, managed to create a sense of cultural alienation

²David Cameron told the 47th Munich Security Conference in 2011, attended by world leaders, that state multiculturalism had failed in the UK, echoing a similar argument put forward by Angela Merkel who in 2010 declared that attempts at creating a multicultural society in Germany had 'utterly failed'.

³European Union electoral results for 2014: UKIP: 27.49 per cent, Labour: 25.40 per cent, Conservative: 23.93 per cent (see http://www.europarl.org.uk/en/your-meps/european_elections.html).

regarding ethnic minority groups in the UK, focusing mainly on anti-Islamic sentiments and pointing out cultural divisions within society. Finally, the BNP is another acknowledged representative of the far-right scene in the country that has managed to attract the attention of the public, especially under the leadership of Nick Griffin since the early 2000s.

Our research ocuses on hate speech and crime, such that the overall research question might be conceived as the relationship between the activities of political groups and individuals, and incidents of hate crimes and 'othering'. We argue that although it seems questionable at present whether the existing far-right populist representatives can achieve greater electoral results (UKIP gained 12.6 per cent in the national elections of 2015), the decline of class identity and the loss of faith in traditional ideologies, along with controversy about Britain's future with the European Union, the ongoing extended rhetoric of securitisation of migration in Britain, and the economic crisis, can still foment and give a new impetus to such groups.

The chapter is structured in three main parts. The first section contextualises the chapter theoretically (which includes a discussion of 'majority identitarian populism' and its impacts), outlines the rationale for choosing EDL, BNP and UKIP as case-study groups, and the methods used for gathering our data. In this section a historical, socio-economic and political contextualisation is provided, which helps us understand the rise of such groups in the UK. The second section focuses on describing what they do and how they do it, raising questions of hierarchical control, response to opponents, and the difference between group and individual activists and supporters, and especially their diversity of thought and action. The third section focuses on counter-strategies by organisations that adopt the role of an 'anti-body' and ways they combat the phenomenon of majority identitarian populism.

Theoretical Context and Methodology

In recent studies the term 'populism' has created an ongoing debate between academics and has often been used as a synonym for far-right/extreme-right politics, e.g. Rydgren (2003) on radical right populism,

Mudde (2004) and Taggart (2000) on new populist right, Laclau (2005) on right-wing populism or Fella and Ruzza (2009) on populist parties.

For the purpose of the research this chapter is based on ‘populism’ which is approached as a ‘thin ideology’ (Stanley 2008) and a resultant style of politics which presents society in terms of a conflict between ‘virtuous and homogeneous people’ and ‘a set of elites and dangerous “others”’ (Albertazzi and McDonnell 2008: 3) who lie ‘outside the heartland’ (Zaslave 2008: 323). In addition, according to Canovan (1999: 3), populist movements along the political spectrum of left–right argue that ‘the people’ have been excluded from power by ‘corrupt politicians and an unrepresentative elite’ who purposely ignore the interests and opinions of the electorate.

Nevertheless, neither is this form of populism the sole preserve of particular groups and parties and nor is populism a synonym for the far right, extremism or fascism. ‘Majority identitarian populism’ (Johnson et al. 2005) can be identified with more clarity in the approaches of mainstream parties in relation to immigration and multiculturalism (Bale et al. 2011), with arguments that an out-of-touch elite has allowed changes to British society which advantage newcomers over settled Britons: these are sometimes, but not always, done as ‘dog whistles’. Majority identitarian populism focuses on the concept of identity as a tool for determining who belongs to what they see as the ‘majority group’, based on a number of characteristics, e.g., religion, or ethnicity creating a status where the ‘other’ stands against the ‘mass’.

Taken thus, such populism cannot be what defines a particular individual or group as far right or extreme right. The ideological heterogeneity (Anastasakis 2000) of far right has created a continuing discussion about the definition and terminology of this political family. The debate includes approaches on whether and how a particular group should be categorised as fascist, radical or extremist, with the ‘ideological core’ and/or the breaking of democratic norms (i.e., violence) as indicators (see Carter 2005; Eatwell and Goodwin 2010; Richardson 2011). Studies of the electoral success of groups like the BNP (for examples, see Ford 2010; John et al. 2006) are, however, more concerned with the populist politics part of their activity than with the core ideology or relationship to violence. For Eatwell

(2004) similarities with certain conservative policies raise questions about whether a clear line can be drawn between extremist and radical right. For Barker (1981) the reason is a form of ‘new racism’ that is not promulgating the old type of racism based on ideas of inferiority and superiority between racial groups but in contrast emphasises the group solidarity and exclusion of those seen as outsiders. This ‘new racism’ according to May et al. (2004: 223) does not ‘construct an explicit racial hierarchy but rather an immutable fixed and organic belonging of specific people, territories and states that in effect excludes and racialises all “others”’.

That said, and given the research focus on populism and hate speech and crime, we raise the empirical question of the relationship between this populist politics and hate incidents. Any relationship could have multiple forms, including those practising populist politics moving towards illegal methods or inciting others, or the more diffuse possibility that populist calls (by mainstream or non-mainstream politicians) can give others a licence to express hate. Indeed, while some opponents of the BNP argue that BNP activity increases hate crime, others (Clark et al. 2008; Koopmans 1996; Painter 2013) argue that it acts as a safety valve, allowing racist and other discontent a democratic outlet that might otherwise be channelled into non-democratic activity. It is important here to also note that the UK has ‘developed the most comprehensive and systematic approach to policing racist crime and violence’ in the EU (Oakley 2005), such that some incitement can and is prosecuted as a criminal offence. We are therefore mindful of the narrow band of ambiguous activity that is not illegal but may create a climate of fear and distrust where violence becomes more likely (Smith 2008).

It is this context that makes the EDL, BNP and UKIP contrasting case studies. Anti-racist activists accuse all three of problematic activity, with organisations such as HopeNotHate asking its supporters in 2013 whether UKIP should be added to the BNP and EDL as organisations it automatically campaigns against (Hope Not Hate 2013). At the time of writing, UKIP is both populist and popular. The EDL is populist but not popular, arguing that mainstream politicians ignore the threat from radical Islamism and Islam more generally, but EDL street demonstrations

usually only attracting a few hundred people, and a maximum of 3,000 (Bartlett and Littler 2011). While UKIP and BNP⁴ carry on their electoral activities, with occasional disruption from anti-racist or anti-fascist activists, the EDL demonstrations are heavily policed in order to avoid confrontation between EDL and opposition activists.⁵ This too may have an impact on how these forms of populist activism develop, both on particular occasions and over time, and how they are viewed by those engaged in them, those opposing them and those merely observing them.

This chapter examines the selected cases through fieldwork that concentrates on the perspectives of those who are active within populist politics against the 'others'. Fieldwork included analysis of parties' websites, looking at discourses and symbols, participant observation and semi-structured in-depth face-to-face interviews with members of EDL, UKIP and BNP as well as with representatives of groups who work with minority populations, that is those who are 'othered', and 'anti-body' organisations.

Before examining the main factors leading to the increasing popularity of far-right politics in the UK, we will briefly look at the socio-economic and political context that provided fertile ground for the groups under analysis. We will then proceed with an analysis of their political mobility and ability to respond to the demands of the public by adopting a populist discourse and proposing aggressive policies on issues like immigration and the EU.

⁴BNP publicly promotes violence in order to gain 'institutionalized power' (Heitmeyer 2003: 406).

⁵As Hilary Pilkington writes in her blog (<http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/when-is-a-kettle-not-a-kettle-when-it-is-on-slow-boil/>), a few years ago, during an EDL demonstration in Walthamstow, East London, around 600 EDL demonstrators found themselves on the receiving end of a barrage of eggs thrown by counter-demonstrators; they were surrounded for hours by police without access to water, food or toilets and, before finally being released, they were arrested en masse under Section 60 of the Criminal Justice Act (breach of the peace), regardless of whether there was any evidence that individuals had participated in any public order offence. The result was that many demonstrators declared they would never again attend a demonstration.

Economic and Socio-Political and Cultural Background in the UK: The Effect of Economic Policy Trends on Views on Diversity

It was by the early 1980s that Britain was arguably one of the most ethnically diverse countries in the world (see Jefferies 2005). As Jefferies (2005) underlined, the more recent waves of immigration have seen the terminologies of ‘refugee’ and ‘illegal immigrant’ become deeply engrained in the popular imagination and our actors, the press and popular polling have come to construct Muslim immigration on the one hand and Eastern European migration on the other as particular problems.

The major recession (1979 to the mid-1980s) prior to the ‘big bang’ of the devolution of financial services, next to the Great Depression of the 1930s and the financial crisis of 2008–2015, represented the deepest loss of industrial capacity and social cohesion in British history. Rapid and sustained de-industrialisation was accompanied by very substantial job losses and rapidly rising inflation. At the time, these economic pressures generated remarkably little ethnic tension. Indeed, the fact that the BNP was formed in 1982 as a splinter group from the fascist National Front, speaks to the fact that these conditions created real tensions amongst the ranks of far-right groups themselves.

The deregulation of financial services in the mid-1980s gave a widely acknowledged boost to local and regional economies; it laid the foundations for selective urban investment (the rebuilding of the urban centres of Liverpool and Leeds, for instance), low unemployment and a pronounced upward social mobility. Low average unemployment, notably in the south of England (see Demman and McDonald 1996) emboldened a political class to begin to move legislatively on LGBT issues. Inter-community tensions based on religion, skin colour or origin were moderate during this period. From 1999 the BNP dropped much of its rhetoric of biological racism and adopted a rhetoric which linked its core message to identity at the national and local levels (see Eatwell 2004).

With rising south Asian chain migration, towns and cities such as Leicester, Bradford, Burnley and Liverpool become both poor and

visibly non-white. This has had long-term implications for the national psyche and underpins some of the campaigning agenda of modern far-right organisations which have focused both their resources and their national message on the threat posed in which ‘whites’ might become a minority before 2070, an opinion supported by David Coleman from the Migration Observatory (Coleman 2010).

Nevertheless, as in many European countries, the financial crisis is a dominant issue in UK politics, followed by government’s austerity-motivated policies.⁶ Stripping out economic growth funded by the unsustainable accumulation of debt, the British economy barely grew between 1997 and 2015. The end of social mobility in the late 2000s created tensions within faith and migrant communities (between different ethnic groups and between the generations within ethnic groups) as it did between these groups and far-right populist groups. This does much to explain the sustained rise of groups such as UKIP, BNP and EDL, the latter focusing primarily on the threat that migration poses to ‘our’ (the British) state.

From the Past to the Present: Far-Right Populism in the UK

The most successful post-war representative of the far-right scene in the UK, the National Front (NF) was formed in 1967. Despite denying accusations of fascism, the party was linked with neo-Nazi movements within the UK (e.g. Blood and Honour UK and British Movement) and abroad and was associated with the strong xenophobic nationalist rhetoric advocating biological racism and opposed non-white immigration that still underlines that ‘the multiracial Commonwealth is a farcical relic of an unfortunate past which should be disbanded’ (NF 2015). Although NF managed to attract minority support at local level, the party would be proved incapable of gaining any form of electoral success (Eatwell 2004). In the general elections of 1979, with 303 candidates, the party managed to attract 0.6 per cent of the popular vote, which was to be

⁶For more, see David Cameron, Age of Austerity, 2009: http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2009/04/The_age_of_austerity_speech_to_the_2009_Spring_Forum.aspx.

the highest performance in the party's history. NF declined towards its gradual extinction in the mid-1990s, despite efforts to revive the party by Ian Anderson in 1995. Nevertheless, it was in the mid-1990s and early 2000s that the far-right populism mobilisation started to emerge on the British political scene.

Formed in 1982 as a fragment from the NF (Goodwin 2011), BNP under the leadership of John Tyndall, former leader of NF, and of Nick Griffin since 1999, dominated the far-right scene for almost a decade, by adopting a more moderate populist profile, abandoning extreme language and biological racist rhetoric (Halikiopoulou and Vasilopoulou 2010), similar to later efforts of other far-right parties in Europe e.g. Marine Le Pen and the French Front National or Gianfranco Fini and the Italian MSI. However, despite the efforts of Tyndall to distinguish the newly formed party from its predecessor NF and from links to neo-Nazi movements, BNP would still be identified with neo-Nazism, racism, violence and rhetoric on denial of the facts of the Holocaust. The party started participating in the general and local elections in 1983 but it was not until 1993 that it achieved its first electoral success when Derek Beackon was elected as a councillor in Millwall, London.

The change of leadership in 1999 would signify a modernisation reform of the party, with Griffin isolating the extremist elements and transforming BNP into a more moderate version of the far right, closer to similar parties in other European countries, e.g., Italy and France. In the local elections of 2002 the party managed to gain three seats on Burnley Council and continued increasing its popularity in the following years; in the European elections of 2004 it won 4.9 per cent of the vote. It is between the years 2008 and 2010 that the party reached its highest rates of popularity, with Richard Barnbrook winning a seat in 2008 on the London Assembly, and in the following European elections of 2009 it managed to win two seats in the European Parliament by gaining 6.3 per cent of the popular vote.

BNP is self-identified as British nationalist with fundamental core values which call for national and cultural regeneration (BNP 2005). Under Griffin's leadership the party has focused its rhetoric on ethnic nationalism, anti-immigration policies and opposition to Islam and the alerting threat of multiculturalism, claiming that white people will be 'ethnically

cleansed' and calling for an 'immediate halt to all further immigration' (BNP 2005). The economic policy of the party is to oppose globalism, economic liberalism and *laissez-faire* capitalism (BNP 2005). In addition, among other policies, BNP advocates harsher sentences for criminals, opposes same-sex marriage, embraces tradition, heritage and civility and is opposed to European integration (BNP 2005).

Nonetheless, regardless of the efforts to renovate it to a more modernist party, the BNP failed to maintain its success (see Goodwin 2011). For Hainsworth (2008), several reasons have managed to prevent an electoral breakthrough like that of far-right counterparts in other European countries, e.g., Denmark or the Netherlands: poor leadership, the anti-fascist tradition in Britain, internal divisions between representatives of the far right in the country and the associations of far-right groups with violence and street politics (Hainsworth 2008). Similarly, for Eatwell, despite the fact that there have been developments in the country that could have favoured racial and extreme nationalist policies, such as increasing migration rates, increasing unemployment, the decadency of urban centres and opposition to European integration, the conditions for possible success of far-right groups would include the legitimacy of the group, increasing personal effectiveness and a strong decline in confidence in the system, factors that have proved insufficient in the case of Britain (2004: 325–330).

Formed by Alan Sked in 1993, and successor to the Anti-Federalist League, UKIP was set up to oppose the 1992 Maastricht Treaty which was supported by all three main political parties (see Daniel 2005). By focusing on opposing European integration and by developing popular far-right policies, the party managed to steadily increase its support from 0.3 per cent of the vote in the general elections of 1997 to 12.6 per cent in the latest general election in 2015; in the European elections of 2014, the party gained 27.5 per cent of the popular vote to become the strongest party in the country at the time. After a series of changes in leadership the party, under Nigel Farage, successfully increased its visibility from what Ford and Goodwin described as 'a large angry bear', that 'would stumble out of hibernation once every few years, briefly stir up popular discontent with Brussels and Westminster political elites, and then return to their slumbers' (Ford and Goodwin, 2014: 2). With a mixture of xenophobia, nationalism, Euroscepticism and populist rhetoric,

UKIP managed to address the concerns of the electorate and provide a moderate alternative compared to the BNP, thereby establishing its place on the national scene.

UKIP's constitution states that the UK shall cease to be a member of the EU and shall not thereafter make any treaty or join any international organisation that involves in any way the surrender of any part of the UK's sovereignty in order for the country to 'be governed by her own citizens and that its governance shall at all times be conducted first and foremost in the interests of the UK and its peoples' (UKIP 2012). In addition to encouraging withdrawal from the EU, in its recent manifesto of 2015 UKIP argues in favour of a political reformation to ensure that the 'government answers properly to Parliament and that Parliament is accountable to the people' (UKIP 2015), invoking populist appeals to show that the party stands for the 'people's' interests. In addition to the party's positions in favour of a reformation of the political system, UKIP underlines its role as a challenger to the established political parties. In essence, UKIP's anti-establishment credentials are illustrated by the belief that all mainstream parties are the same (UKIP 2013).

More specifically, based on Abedi's (2004: 12) criteria, (a party that challenges the status quo in terms of major policy and political system issues, that perceives itself as a challenger to the established political parties and that asserts that a fundamental divide between the political establishment and the people exists), UKIP can be characterised as an anti-political establishment party. An anti-political establishment party puts emphasis on the argument that the organisation of the party should be based on democratic values and demand direct involvement of the electorate in the decision-making process. Self-identified as a democratic libertarian party, UKIP argues in favour of a liberal economy, demands the repeal of the Human Rights Act and the removal of Britain from both the European Convention on Refugees and the European Convention on Human Rights, embraces patriotism against the threat of multiculturalism and asks for a political reformation in order for politics to reconnect with the people (UKIP 2015). As Nigel Farage stated in 2006: 'We're going to be a party fighting on a broad range of domestic policies and together if we're united and disciplined we will become the real voice of opposition in British politics'. He continued arguing that 'on the big issues of the

day you cannot put a cigarette paper between the three major parties' and played the populist card, emphasising that although people tend to 'place us as being right of centre, I would place us as being in the centre of public opinion' (BBC 2006).

The EDL was formed by Tommy Robinson in 2009, as a response to a demonstration against the war in Afghanistan, organised by the local Luton group of Al-Muhajiroun (an international and later banned organisation). The newly formed group focused its attention in two primary purposes: to draw attention to the growing threat of Islamic extremism in the UK and work towards the elimination of such propensities. A single issue-oriented protest movement, focusing on anti-Islamic sentiments in a greater effort to 'protect the inalienable rights of all people to protest against radical Islam's encroachment into the lives of non-Muslims' (EDL's Mission Statement 2015), EDL since its emergence has conducted numerous demonstrations across the country and succeeded in sustaining the public's attention despite accusations of violent acts, anti-social behaviour, racism and hate crimes. For Pilkington (2014) EDL's slogan 'Not racist, not violent, just no longer silent' motivates EDL's supporters in 'speaking out' and 'standing strong' in contrast to the 'politics of silencing' supported by the social distance between 'politicians' and the 'people' and cultural limitations on 'acceptable' issues for debate.⁷

Following the argument of Betz (2007) who underlines the sustained focus on Islamophobia across numerous European far-right parties, e.g., Switzerland, the Netherlands and Denmark, EDL offered an alternative on the far-right scene in the UK, suggesting selective multiculturalism and engaging pro-LGBT approaches. That said, drawing in other issues besides extremism—'denigration and oppression of women, the molestation of young children, the committing of so-called honour killings, homophobia, anti-Semitism' (EDL Mission Statement 2015)—does lead to a focus on Islam more generally as these issues are not limited to radical Islamists, and of course not to Islam either. For Bartlett and Littler (2011: 11), EDL attempts to moderate its political agenda (by supporting Israel, deriding racism and employing human-rights talk) and

⁷Pilkington has conducted ethnographic research on EDL under the auspices of the MYPLACE project. For more information see <https://myplacefp7.wordpress.com/>.

style (by advocating for less violence), which some factions felt was a sign of weakness. Other early supporters of the EDL have left to join more aggressively anti-Islam groups, feeling that the EDL has lost focus on fighting Islamism.

What differentiates EDL from UKIP and BNP to an even greater extent is the use of media for the purpose of communicating to the public. By using a wide range of social media, especially Facebook, EDL has managed to organise campaigns, cultivate street protests and other forms of direct action and organise its supporters by using online culture to promote its populist nationalist ideology (Jackson 2011).

Communication Strategies, Charismatic Leadership, Insignia and Beyond

In terms of structure and leadership, there are noticeable differences between the three groups. While UKIP and BNP follow a more typical party-political structure, including democratic procedures such as elected leadership, annual conferences and a number of active committees accountable for the party's policies, EDL has no formal membership and thus, it is difficult to calculate the number of its supporters. When it comes to the leadership, since 1993 UKIP has experienced more than seven changes in its highest office, with former leaders often turning their back on the party, a reaction that can be found in both BNP and EDL former leaderships. In the case of EDL for example, the founding leaders (Tommy Robinson and Kevin Carroll) decided to leave the group and work with Quilliam, a Muslim-led counter-extremism think tank, itself led by ex-Hizb ut-Tahrir⁸ activists, arguing that the EDL was becoming a home for far-right extremists (BBC News 2013). For all three, BNP, UKIP and the EDL, the group and the individual members change over time, with the degree of fit at least partially determining who leaves and who remains. This fit is, of course, relational: those leaving UKIP, for example, will include some like Alexandra Swann who see the party as too

⁸ This is an international pan-Islamic political organisation founded in 1953. Their goal is for all Muslim countries to unify as an Islamic state ruled by *sharia* law.

‘socially conservative’ and others such as Paul Weston of Liberty GB (an anti-fundamentalist, anti-immigration political party formed in 2013)⁹ who considers the party to be too soft on the issue of Islam.

Nevertheless, the public personas of Nigel Farage and Nick Griffin appear to be one of the most influential factors when it comes to attracting voters in the case of UKIP and BNP. The personality of the party leader is crucial when it comes to the identity of the party, as in the face of the leader the voter sees what the party represents; it appears that Farage and Griffin have managed to create a figure to which the electorate can relate. As strong charismatic demagogues and populist leaders, Farage and Griffin, in combination with a successful reformation of the public images of their parties, have led both UKIP and BNP to a new era and contributed to their electoral success. It is the perception of the value of the party leader, and the level of their effectiveness in convincing the electorate of their party’s worth, that creates a strong factor at the disposal of the party’s communication strategy.

Apart from the figure of the leader, a valuable element of the communication strategies of the groups under examination is their insignia, since what defines them is more than just a logo, a political message, a name or a personality, but rather a combination of all four.

The UKIP logo is a pound sign (£), with many activists wearing a gold lapel badge, opposition to the Euro being obviously necessary to the party’s euro-scepticism. Another symbol used is the pint of beer and the fag (cigarette): a number of young activists we interviewed mentioned the pint as something that should be in one’s hand. Party leader Nigel Farage’s most obvious image is that of being in the pub with a pint of bitter or a cigarette in his hand, or both. With its references to elements of British culture, this plays into ideas of Britishness, the ordinary against the elite and freedom from bureaucracy (UKIP would repeal the smoking ban). On occasion UKIP have been described as the ‘BNP in blazers’ (Hinsliff 2004): in reality, party activists are largely to be seen in business attire.

Unlike UKIP, EDL (and its offshoots) has a plethora of distinctive symbols and imagery deployed by its activists. The EDL logo appears

⁹Its Facebook page describes it as ‘patriotic counter-jihad party for Christian civilisation, Western rights and freedoms, British culture, animal welfare and capitalism’.

online and on pin badges and clothing, and is a Christian cross with the Latin *in hoc signo vinces* ('in this sign you will conquer') written below. Alongside this, their online presence often features images of medieval knights, a direct reference to the Crusades. Having said that, as stated earlier, an interesting point is that EDL has its origins in demonstrations against the radical Islamist Al-Muhajiroun,¹⁰ which itself used images of the Crusades.

At demonstrations, the primary offline activity of the EDL, the most visible symbol is the flag of St George (red cross on a white background). This is combined with slogans and symbols which reference Islam ('No Sharia', 'No more mosques'), and the British military ('Support our troops') and sometimes slogans which aim to distance the group from racism and extremism ('Patriotism does not equal Nazism'). The references to the military reflect the fact that the British military are engaged in operations against Islamic groups overseas, and more importantly, are a response to al-Muhajiroun and its successor organisations' protests against the military. Thus, the use of the poppy image was a direct response to the radical Islamists' burning of a poppy on Remembrance Sunday 2010 (BBC News 2010b).

The BNP's logo, on the other hand, is a direct reference to the party's ethno-nationalist and British-nationalist character: a Union flag-infilled heart with the party's name. According to Griffin, the new logo 'illustrated exactly what the party is about' (BNP 2015), replacing the Union flag-infilled 'BNP' logo that was previously used. The new insignia, according to Derek Adams, 'softens the image a bit which is what we need'.

What is significantly important in all three cases is the contemporary use of new media and online spaces as part of their communication strategies, leading to what Jackson and Gable (2011) describe as a 'revolutionised extremist activity'. Online networks like Twitter and Facebook have been created, offering a space for public discussion, both measured and crude, and attract comments from all sides of the debate. In other words, a public forum is being created for policing by campaigners, defacement by opponents and disagreement within the groups' sup-

¹⁰This is a terrorist organisation that was based in Britain and has been linked to international terrorism, homophobia and anti-Semitism. It was banned in 2005.

port base. As Jackson and Gable (2011), in their research on *Nationalism extremism on the internet* point out, BNP encouraged members to engage with social networks in order to proclaim their political dogma and declare their party affiliation, whereas in the case of EDL, as previously stated, the group has managed to mobilise large parts of its supporters to participate in direct activities but has also explored the internet to create online networks with other organisations and groups.

Ideologies, Values and Rhetoric in Perspective

Mudde (2005) suggests that to identify as far right someone has to focus on key elements, such as nationalism, xenophobia, racism and immigration, that appear to be referenced more frequently than other elements in the discourse on right groups in Europe. Mudde's (2004) approach, along with Norris' (2005) theory on market-oriented elements of supply and demand in relation to the public's needs, could provide an extended explanation for the rise of far-right populist parties in the UK.

Our analysis of the three groups under examination and the interviews we conducted clarify the perception of the concept of cultural identity and its relations to the 'other'; in that sense, representation can be related to various versions of stereotypes such as gender (see de Beauvoir 1971), race (see Hage 2010) or religion (see Said 1978). In Gillespie's (2006) view, 'othering' leads people to differentiate in-group from out-group and Self from Other. In the case of EDL, UKIP and BNP, one of the main focuses in constructing the image of the 'other' is migrants, with an additional focus on Islam as a threat to British cultural identity. For Minkenberg (2002), radicalising ethnic, cultural and political criteria of exclusion serves to construct the nation with an image of extreme collective homogeneity (2002: 337). This perception addresses the elements of nationalism, xenophobia and racism, which are strong in all three cases.

As I look ahead, I am filled with foreboding. Like the Roman, I seem to see 'the River Tiber foaming with much blood'. That tragic and intractable phenomenon which we watch with horror on the other side of the Atlantic

but which there is interwoven with the history and existence of the States itself, is coming upon us here by our own volition and our own neglect. Indeed, it has all but come. In numerical terms, it will be of American proportions long before the end of the century. Only resolute and urgent action will avert it even now. Whether there will be the public will to demand and obtain that action, I do not know. All I know is that to see, and not to speak, would be the great betrayal. (Powell 1968)

In his ‘rivers of blood’ speech (1968), Powell underlined that Britain must be ‘mad, as a nation to be permitting the annual inflow of some 50,000 dependents, who are for the most part the material of the future growth of the immigrant-descended population. It is like watching a nation busily engaged in heaping up its own funeral pyre.’ Nigel Farage, in an interview in *The Guardian*, said of Enoch Powell: ‘Enoch Powell was an extraordinary fellow. I admired him for having the guts to talk about an issue that seemed to be really rather important—immigration, society, how do we want to live in this country’ (Farage 2009). Powell’s approach summarises Barker’s (1981) argument on ‘new racism’ and correlates with the understanding of a form of nationalism linked to a cultural sensibility in Britain. From this perspective, racism, although it started as an ideology forming prejudice against people of colour (Fryer 2010), has managed to evolve from biological inferiority to cultural racism, anti-immigrant racism and Islamophobia, focusing on cultural differences, an approach popularly engaged by British political discourse since the early 1980s.

There is no doubt that some UKIP interviewees exhibit ‘othering’ attitudes and behaviour, whether as part of political campaigning or not, but this is not unique to them. Surveys used to examine far-right supporters’ attitudes find that those attitudes stereotypically associated with the far right are widespread among mainstream voters too. For instance a 2009 survey suggests that 13 per cent of UK adults—6.5 million—think that black people are intellectually inferior, and 26 per cent—13 million—opposed civil partnerships (Cutts et al. 2011). These numbers surpass the numbers voting BNP or even UKIP, and while they can be characterised as potential support for BNP or UKIP, they also demonstrate that such attitudes are compatible with mainstream voting.

Analysis of parties of the far right (see Mudde 2004) shows xenophobic sentiments, underlines the threat of mass immigration and the potential creation of a multicultural society, and proposes strict immigration control and asylum policies. In France, since the early 1970s the Front National has adopted an anti-immigration rhetoric and called for 'assisted repatriation' (Hainsworth 2008); comparable examples are found in the Belgian Vlaams Blok, in the Italian Lega Nord, in the Swiss Schweizerische Volkspartei and in the Austrian Freiheitliche Partei Österreichs, among others. Norris (2005) argues that immigration is the 'signature' issue of the far right, and the fear of the 'other' that drives policies on immigration, asylum seekers and multiculturalism (2005: 132). Rejecting any form of multiculturalism is essential within far-right ideology and is often the reason that far-right parties have been accused of racism. Nation and national identity along with an ethnic and religious homogeneity are seen as things that need to be protected and secured by any threat posed by, for example, asylum seekers, Muslims, immigrants. In addition, far-right groups 'postulate a homogeneous society where national identity is passed on through blood and heredity' (Hainsworth 2000 in Moufahim 2007: 31).

Having said that, as underlined by a number of interviewees, it is important to note that there is a difference between the feeling that Islam and/or Islamism are a threat to the British way of life and hating Muslims just because they are Muslims; focusing more on the threat of migration and more specifically of Muslims towards British cultural identity ('Englishness'), one of the EDL activists we interviewed said:

Other people say 'I'm not particularly interested in the – in Englishness and that doesn't really bother me that much – I'm concerned about Muslims and them changing our way of life and so there's a whole – for some people Englishness is important, some it isn't, some think religion is important, some – 'ah- it's not so much about religion' – some people are really attached to the Christianity identity – some people see themselves as being atheists – so there's an interesting hotch potch of people who end up basically, becoming friends who become part of a network. (EDL4)

The official EDL website warns against ‘the unjust assumption that all Muslims are complicit in or somehow responsible for these crimes’ and describes Muslims themselves as the ‘victims of some Islamic traditions and practices’ (EDL Mission Statement 2015). Similarly to EDL’s approach, although UKIP in its 2010 manifesto rejected ‘blood and soil’ ethnic nationalism, it promoted the notion of ‘uniculturalism’ in opposition to multiculturalism and political correctness; in other words a united British culture that embraces all the races, colours and religions (UKIP 2010). BNP also claims not to be ‘against Islam per se’ but additionally signifies the potential danger posed to ‘democracy, traditions and freedoms by the creeping Islamification of Britain’ (BNP 2005). Nevertheless, a video released by the youth of BNP in 2014 creates a clear perception of the immigrant as the ‘other’.¹¹

Immigration rhetoric incorporating strong sentiments of xenophobia is among the most characteristic themes of the far right, with a distinguishing popular appeal within the electorate, something that can be identified in the groups under examination. Xenophobia, literally reflecting the fear (phobia) of the foreigner (xenos), is the sentiment in which far-right populist parties invest and ground their proposals of welfare-nationalist policies and anti-immigration measures (see Davies and Lynch 2002 in Moufahim 2007).¹²

Since the majority of immigrants originate from non-Western European countries, as Mudde (2002) observes, they are regarded as a threat to the cultural identity of the host countries and, therefore, are often accused of exploiting the welfare system, taking jobs away from native citizens and being responsible for the rising crime rate. In the interviews we conducted, while some described themselves as against uncontrolled mass migration but not against immigration as a whole, others were calling

¹¹BNP Youth—Real Version, Retrieved 2 May 2015 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q2snwxSGn-Y>.

¹²A detailed analysis of xenophobia and immigration can be found in Betz (1994), *Radical Right Wing Populism in Western Europe*. New York: St. Martin’s Press. pp. 69–106.

for a stop to migration until issues such as access to health and education services and the cost of interpreters were resolved.

The problem we have at the moment being in the EU, millions of people can claim benefits if they want. They haven't got a skill, they, they're not coming to work. (UKIP 4)

If you're going to come here and work and benefit the country and your community, I don't have a problem. But if you're going to come here just to sponge benefits and demand your laws and start breaking our laws, that's what we've got a problem with. (EDL2)

In addition, the homogeneity of the nation reflects issues like welfare chauvinism. The socio-economic policy of welfare chauvinism introduces a notion of 'our own people first', an exclusionist approach adopted by the entirety of far-right parties. Based on this principle, the state's funds job opportunities should be used by natives, rather than immigrants, and along with that the state should protect the national economy against 'foreign competition' (Mudde 2002: 175).

Another approach to identifying their ideological content is to examine the slogans used by the groups. A common slogan in EDL's demonstrations, for instance, is 'No Surrender', or NFSE (standing for 'No Fucking Surrender Ever'). This harks back to the use of the phrase in Northern Irish politics (see Wallis et al. 1986) and its appearance in football songs in 1980s England as 'No surrender to the IRA'. This football song has been adapted to 'No surrender to the Taliban', and is sung at EDL demonstrations alongside other football-related songs, including 'England 'til I die'. Another EDL slogan, seen on the back of many EDL shirts, is 'Not racist, not violent, no longer silent'. The first two parts of this are a direct refutation of the accusations made by opponents such as HopeNotHate and Unite Against Fascism, and mainstream commentators (see below). For the EDL, the people of Britain have been silent for too long on the question of the threat of Islam and/or Islamism, targeting the government which 'they perceive as pandering to Jihadis' demands, drowned in political correctness and marred by indefensible double standards' (Bartlett and Littler 2011: 12–13) and demanding direct action.

Similarly, UKIP's 'Believe in Britain' or 'Love Britain' (a slogan that was used also by BNP in 2010) are targeting the voter's sentimental attachment to the country and emphasising the element of nationalism. Defending ethno-nationalism, the representatives of the far right argue for a homogeneous environment in which the nation is consistent with the state (Eatwell 2000). Thus they disregard or belittle any foreign elements that are differentiated from it. This refers back to the idea that the nation, for EDL, UKIP and BNP, is perceived as a unit that shares identical cultural and ethnic origins, and individuals that do not share these features should not be considered as part of it.

What differentiates EDL, however, from both UKIP and BNP is the openness of the group to other issues, specifically to their Jewish, LGBT, Sikh and Hindu divisions (Lane 2012). This promotion has a triple meaning: first, these groups have been the target of Islamist groups globally (the latter two in Indian Gujarat), thus there is an expression of solidarity; second, EDL activists know that the rainbow flag and Israeli flag represent things that the radical Islamists hate, so it acts as a 'wind-up'; and third, it is also an attempt to demonstrate that the group is not fascist or extreme right. Although the genuineness of each motive can be questioned, the interviews showed that it appears to be enough to convince some gay EDL activists.

Tommy and Kev [were] told us, 'We don't care if you're black, if you're gay, if you're lesbian or whatever religious path you follow, if you want to join us to fight against Islamic extremism we'll take you' ... I first met some lesbians and some gays and some bi-sexuals and transgenders, we all met up at London when Geert Wilders came over. And we thought to ourselves, why don't we set up an LGBT division? (EDL2)

Julia Gasper, the Oxford UKIP chairman, made online comments on a private members' forum linking homosexuality and paedophilia and also claiming 'some homosexuals prefer sex with animals' (Moss 2013). However, the party's position on gay marriage is not necessarily homophobic. The party officially supports the civil partnership regime as a way of giving same-sex couples the same rights as all other couples, but fears a change to marriage law would pave the way for EU or UK law to interfere with the operation

of religious bodies (UKIP 2015), an approach that the interviewees seemed to agree with. ‘I mean a man, if two men want to go to the registrar and get married, it’s a doddle, I mean it’s the same with two women doing that, I can’t see it as a problem—that’s entirely up to them’ (UKIP1).

Moreover, BNP also opposes same-sex marriage and wishes to ban what it perceives as the promotion of homosexuality in schools and the media, which it calls ‘homosexual propaganda’. In 2014, the party’s youth released a recruitment video claiming that ‘militant homosexuals’ are part of an ‘unholy alliance’ taking charge of the country in order to destroy families. According to the video, homosexuality is linked to ongoing attempts to eradicate the British cultural identity and therefore poses a threat to the traditional family model and the Christian values of British society (Pink News 2014). Following the referendum in Ireland on same-sex marriage, Jean de Valette (2015) of the BNP wrote an article on the party’s website characterising same-sex marriage as a ‘madness to equality’, while Nick Griffin, in 2014, referring to the issue of same-sex marriage commented that:

Same-sex marriage isn’t about rights of gay people. It’s fundamentally an attack by a Trotskyite Leftist and capitalist elite which wants the pink pound and the pink dollar. It’s an attack on marriage. It’s an attack on tradition. It’s an attack on the fabric of our society. ... Teach them about homosexuality? That’s not in any way for the rights of homosexuals. That’s some dirty pervert trying to mess with the minds of my kids and I think it’s great that a major European power has stood up and said: Leave our kids alone.¹³

Opponents and Opposition: Anti-bodies Against the Politics of Fear

The past 20 years have seen some consolidation of state and community-sector organisations against the politics of fear spread by the far right. The backlash against Muslims post-2001 prompted responses from ant-racist

¹³Germany: Ukrainian nationalists are being used by the EU—Nick Griffin. Retrieved May 2, 2015 from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q6Ir2rWzkFk>.

organisations and the government, notably with the 'community cohesion' agenda as a framework for addressing conflict.

While the asylum seekers issue, resulting in multiple pieces of legislation (Fletcher 2008), and the beginning of the debate over the treatment of Muslims and Islam (Khan 2000) were important aspects of the British experience of the 1990s, both were overshadowed by the enquiry into the racist murder of a 19-year-old black British man, Stephen Lawrence, which laid more blame at the door of public bodies than had previously been allowed, concluding that the Metropolitan Police was 'institutionally racist' and resulting in legislation which aimed to reform the public sector.

Previously, the government inquiry into the 1981 Brixton riots (the Scarman Report) had blamed the deprivation in the area (characterised by high unemployment, crime and poor housing) on some unwittingly racist police officers. An overly restrictive definition of 'institutional racism' as consciously set up to be racist cleared the Metropolitan Police. However, the 1999 Macpherson Report (which resulted from the public enquiry into the Stephen Lawrence murder) reassessed this judgement in the light of the failed police investigation into the murder (see Lea 2000 for a critical discussion). Bell argues that the state response to this was, in part, the 'mainstreaming' of 'ethnic equality issues' in the Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 which placed ... public authorities under a legally enforceable duty to have due regard to the need (a) to eliminate unlawful discrimination and (b) to promote equal opportunity and good relations between persons of different racial groups. (Bell 2008: 47) A decade later, the 2010 Equality Act aimed to tidy up a number of pieces of legislation which did similar work for other sets of people with 'protected characteristics'.

After riots in various Northern towns and 9/11, 'race relations' more broadly was in effect reconfigured and rebadged as 'community cohesion' (Worley 2005). Of concern were both the state's relationship with the Muslim minority (mainly those with a sub-continental background) and the revitalised far right, which was focused on the same minority. The Cantle Report (Cantle 2001) cemented the notion of 'community cohesion' as the framework for addressing conflict, and an Institute of Community Cohesion was launched in 2005. As with the equalities

work associated with equalities legislation, local bodies in the public and voluntary sectors have staff working in a variety of community cohesion interventions, including counter-extremism and counter-terrorism work which aims to reach those at risk of moving to violence. While this work has sometimes been characterised as Islamophobic and as stigmatising particular places and communities, recent years have seen attempts to conduct and demonstrate a balanced approach. In this vein, the state has also funded Muslim-led groups, such as TellMAMA, which monitor hate speech.

While hate speech and other hate crimes are dealt with in separate pieces of legislation for each characteristic, new laws have attempted to put different types of hate on a par, with laws made in 2006 and 2008 creating new offences of ‘stirring up religious hatred’ and ‘inciting hatred on the grounds of sexual orientation’. Fella and Bozzini found that most respondents in the UK believe that EU anti-racist policy has had little impact on the UK as its ‘legislation was clearly the most advanced in Europe’ (Fella and Bozzini 2013: 72), with EU policy playing catch-up.

This, of course, begs the question of the impact of such laws. Seemingly part of the response to EU initiatives, in 2007 the Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) was merged with other equalities bodies to create the Equalities and Human Rights Commission (Fella and Bozzini 2013: 73). Similarly, many of the Racial Equality Councils—local versions of the CRE with links to local government—have been reconfigured to cover a range of discriminations, being renamed [locality] Rights and Equality Council or Equality Council. These bodies continue to provide legal and social support to those discriminated against in the workplace or elsewhere, and to the victims of harassment and crime. These changes, and the post-2001 focus on religious divides and discrimination, have led some activists to see race as sliding down the priority list.

The brief success of the BNP in the mid-2000s, and later the emergence of the EDL (see previous sections), also revitalised the anti-fascist movement. This includes the campaigning and research work of organisations such as HopeNotHate (HnH¹⁴), and campaigning and counter-

¹⁴This is an advocacy group, created in 2004, that campaigns to counter racism and fascism.

demonstrations by Unite Against Fascism (UAF). The end of the 2000s also saw a number of Love Music Hate Racism events, continuing in the tradition of the Rock Against Racism events of the 1970s. However, the failure of the BNP to achieve long-lasting success has led UAF to focus on opposing the EDL, with the 'None Shall Pass' approach of the 1930s and 1970s, while HnH have broadened their work to oppose UKIP in Project Purple Rain; by combining research with community organisation, HnH aims to raise the profile of extremism and work against hate groups.

In parallel to these developments, the 1990s onwards saw the increasing demonisation of asylum seekers and refugees by mainstream media, together with 'pro-othering' activism anti-deportation campaigns, campaigns against the detention of asylum seekers, and promotion of the rights of migrants. National and local/grass roots organisations have continued to be founded for the purposes of one-off or longer-lasting campaigns, as in the work of the National Coalition of Anti-Deportation Campaigns.

Meanwhile, the diverse range of actors and actions that could be considered 'anti-bodies' to far-right 'othering' can be seen to be rooted in different histories, with differing motivations, rationales and tactics. Some of the anti-fascist activism is not based on a desire to defend people from 'othering' discrimination, but more rooted in the belief that fighting fascism defends working-class unions or is fighting for the soul of the working class or is defending democracy. Conversely, some justify anti-immigration legislation on the basis that 'it was for the good of race relations within the UK that the white population had to be assured that no large number of blacks would be coming in.' (Moore and Wallace 1975: 2). Other motivations may be less honourable, especially where electoral calculations mean that attacking racism or other 'isms', populism and extremism is designed to appeal to a population in the short term, or to undermine political opponents. The argument over the relative legitimacy and efficacy of 'liberal anti-fascism' and 'militant anti-fascism' (Olechnowicz 2005), also seems to include participants' feelings of moral superiority, as each side feels their approach is what will stop fascism.

Indeed, many commentators (and the state itself) see militant anti-fascist activity as more problematic than that of the BNP and EDL. ‘Some strategies implemented by civil-society actors with good intentions against the far right, have ultimately caused more harm than good. Examples of this include combative or militant anti-fascist movements that go to extremes to prevent activity by far-right movements.’ (Ramalingam 2012). These movements’ activities in opposing the far-right both inflame passions on the day, increasing the risk of violence, while also—due to the connection to mainstream politicians—giving far-right activists the impression of a government-sponsored opposition.

Similar arguments can be made about the activities of the state and associated public bodies and charities, for if they are active against ‘othering’ by the far right, while ignoring the same ‘othering’ elsewhere, they appear to be politically motivated. ‘From a government perspective, inconsistent implementation of the legislation has in some cases led to counter-productive results. For example, some experts argue that the ongoing “quarrel” about the ban of the NPD in Germany has lent legitimacy to the party.’ (Ramalingam 2012). Just as the currents of far-right and populist ‘othering’ and the currents of political argument are in conflict with each other, so are the forces against them—sometimes along the same lines. Thus, some activists in the anti-fascist scene argue that Unite Against Fascism’s politics are problematic due to its accommodations with Islamist activists (see Readings 2011). The inability of any one political force to capture an issue means that policy moves slowly: in the UK we are unlikely to see either a strong ‘othering’ nationalism, or a radical anti-‘othering’. In the UK there is a palpable fear amongst campaigning groups/anti-bodies that their gains are fragile, notwithstanding that many of them have been inscribed into law and practice. While the evidence for this in terms of direct counter-demonstrations and anything but periodic violence is slim, activists we interviewed elaborated and events embodied a clear sense that an underlying but often unspoken culture needs to be challenged with direct action and a continuing campaign of mixed education and confrontation. There was a distinct sense in these engagements that racist and discriminatory discourse should not be isolated but rather confronted

and engineered out of the social system through education, emblematic prosecution and the creation of a wider programme of support for the (often poor white, black and Muslim) communities that are the direct focus of extremist attention.

Concluding Remarks

In the UK, the far-right populist scene has struggled to maintain its support despite circumstances that created a fertile environment that could have contributed to their sustenance. As Eatwell (2004) notes, studies from the 1960s to the 1970s underlined the growth of nationalism in combination with anti-immigration sentiments. In the case of the UK, however, these sentiments did not necessarily lead to the support of the far right. By engaging hatred rhetoric, provocation and violence, far-right movements and parties in Britain failed to forge a respectable representation in the 1970s. Despite attempts at infiltration in the years that followed, this political family has yet to become electorally successful at national level. The strong bonds of loyalty that the established political parties have created with the electorate, along with the structure of the electoral system, makes it difficult for new parties to emerge; furthermore, the fact that the mainstream parties have managed to respond to the growing issues of immigration, scepticism over European integration and the adopted rhetoric of far-right representatives that are still associated with extremism and elements of hate speech, violence and discrimination against the 'other', are the major factors contributing to the low performance of the far right in the UK.

'Anti-body' activism can embrace a wide range of activity, come from multiple sources and have differing motivations and strategies. Opposition to far-right extremism and populism can be divided into three strands. The first is the more militant anti-fascist activity, which focuses on organised far-right politics and disrupts this activity, but at the risk of exacerbating problems. Second is the activity of the state itself, and the related mainstream political actors, which are both against racism and other discriminatory activities, but at the same time accept and contribute to some

discrimination. This may be for electoral reasons and can also be justified on the grounds that, for example, restrictions on immigration are necessary to reduce racism. The third strand is the broad-based activity of civil-society organisations, some closely aligned to the state, which, at least some of the time, aims to address problems of ‘othering’ in society more widely, including that of populist and mainstream politics and the state.

References

- Abedi, A. (2004). *Anti-political establishment parties: A comparative analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Albertazzi, D., & McDonnell, D. (2008). Introduction: The sceptre and the spectre. In D. Albertazzi & D. McDonnell (Eds.), *Twenty-first century populism: The spectre of Western European democracy*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, England, 1–11.
- Anastasakis, O. (2000). *Extreme right in Europe: A comparative study of recent trends* (Discussion paper no. 3). London: The Hellenic Observatory, The European Institute London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Barker, M. (1981). *The New Racism: Conservatives and the Ideology of the Tribe*. London: Junction Books.
- Bale, T., Hampshire, J., & Partos, R. (2011). Having one’s cake and eating it too: Cameron’s conservatives and immigration. *Political Quarterly*, 82(3), 398–406.
- Bartlett, J., & Littler, M. (2011). *Inside the EDL*. London: Demos.
- BBC. (2013). UKIP is not a racist party, Lord Heseltine told. Retrieved October 3, 2013, from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-24385139>
- BBC News. (2006). Farage elected new UKIP leader. Retrieved May 4, 2015, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/uk_news/politics/5336126.stm
- BBC News. (2010b). EDL founder charged with Muslim poppy protest assault. Retrieved October 1, 2013, from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-11744811>
- BBC News. (2013). EDL leader Tommy Robinson quits group. Retrieved October 15, 2013, from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-24442953>
- Bell, M. (2008). *Racism and Equality in the European Union*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Betz, H. G. (1994). *Radical Right Wing Populism in Western Europe* (pp. 69–106). New York: St. Martin’s Press.

- Betz, H. G. (2007). 'Against the 'Green Totalitarianism': Anti-Islamic Nativism in Contemporary Radical Right-Wing Populism in Western Europe'. In Christina Schori Liang (Ed.), *Europe for the Europeans: The Foreign and Security Policy of the Populist Radical Right*. London: Ashgate.
- BNP. (2005). Rebuilding British democracy. Retrieved March 13, 2015, from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/BNP_uk_manifesto.pdf
- BNP. (2015). 'Securing our British Future'. Retrieved July 3, 2015 from https://www.bnp.org.uk/sites/default/files/bnp_manifesto-2015.pdf.
- Cameron, D. (2011). *Speech at Munich Security Conference*. Retrieved April 11, 2015, from <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference>
- Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the people! Populism and the two faces of democracy. *Political Studies*, 47, 2–16.
- Cantle, T. (2001). *Community cohesion : A report of the independent review team* (p. 79). London: Home Office. Retrieved June 1, 2015, from <http://image.guardian.co.uk/sys-files/Guardian/documents/2001/12/11/community-cohesionreport.pdf>
- Carter, E. L. (2005). *The extreme right in Western Europe: Success or failure?* (p. xiv, 271). Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.
- Clark, A., Bottom, K., & Copus, C. (2008). More similar than they'd like to admit? Ideology, policy and populism in the trajectories of the British National Party and Respect. *British Politics*, 3(4), 511–534.
- Coleman, D. (2010). When Britain becomes 'majority minority'. Retrieved May 2, 2015, from <http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/features/when-britain-becomes-majority-minority>
- Cutts, D., Ford, R., & Goodwin, M. J. (2011). Anti-immigrant, politically disaffected or still racist after all? Examining the attitudinal drivers of extreme right support in Britain in the 2009 European elections. *European Journal of Political Research*, 50(3), 418–440.
- Daniel, M. (2005). *Cranks and Gadflies: The story of UKIP*. London: Timewell Press.
- de Beauvoir, S. (1971). *The Second Sex*. Random House. Alfred A. Knopf.
- de Valette, J. (2015). The madness of equality: Same sex 'Marriage'. Retrieved May 3, 2015, from <http://www.bnp.org.uk/news/national/madness-equality-same-sex-marriage>
- Demman, J., & McDonald, P. (1996). Unemployment statistics from 1881 to the present day. Retrieved April 3, 2015, from <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/lms/labour-market-trends--discontinued-/january-1996/unemployment-since-1881.pdf>

- Eatwell, R. (2000). 'The rebirth of the Extreme Right in Western Europe?', *Parliamentary affairs*, 53.
- Eatwell, R., (2004). 'The Extreme Right in Britain: The Long Road to 'Modernization''. In Eatwell & Mudde, (Eds.), *Western Democracies and the New Extreme Right Challenge* (pp. 62–81). London: Routledge.
- Eatwell, R., & Goodwin, M. J. (2010). Introduction: The "new" extremism in twenty-first-century Britain. In R. Eatwell & M. J. Goodwin (Eds.), *The new extremism in 21st century Britain* (pp. 1–20). London: Routledge.
- EDL's Mission Statement . Retrieved May 11, 2015, from https://www.english-defenceleague.org/?page_id=9
- European Election Results for UK. Retrieved May 12, 2015, from http://www.europarl.org.uk/en/your-meps/european_elections.html
- Farage, N. (2009). Nigel Farage, Ukip: 'Other party leaders live in a PC world'. Retrieved May 11, 2015, from <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2009/jun/05/nigel-farage-ukip-interview>
- Fella, S., & Bozzini, E. (2013). Fighting racism in the UK. In S. Fella & C. Ruzza (Eds.), *Anti-Racist movements in the EU* (pp. 53–81). Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke, England.
- Fella, S., & Ruzza, C. (2009). *Reinventing the Italian right: Territorial politics, populism and 'Post-Fascism'*. London: Routledge.
- Fletcher, E. (2008). *Changing support for asylum seekers : An analysis of legislation and parliamentary debates* (Working paper No. 49). Sussex, England: University of Sussex.
- Ford, R. (2010). Who might vote for the BNP? In R. Eatwell & M. J. Goodwin (Eds.), *The new extremism in 21st century Britain*. London: Routledge.
- Ford, R., & Goodwin, M. J. (2014). *Revolt on the right: Explaining support for the radical right in Britain*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Ford, R., Goodwin, M. J., & Cutts, D. (2012). Strategic Eurosceptics and polite xenophobes: Support for the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) in the 2009 European Parliament elections. *European Journal of Political Research*, 51, 204–234.
- Fryer, P. (2010). *Staying Power: The history of black people in Britain*. London. Pluto Press.
- Gilroy, P. (2012). "My Britain is fuck all": Zombie multiculturalism and the race politics of citizenship. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 19(4), 380–397.
- Gillespie, A. (2006). *Becoming other: from social interaction to self-reflection*. New York: IAP -Information Age Publishing.

- Goodwin, M. (2011). *New British fascism*. London: Routledge.
- Hage, G. (2010). 'The affective politics of racial mis-interpellation'. *Theory, Culture & Society* December 2010, 27 (7–8), 112–129.
- Hainsworth, P. (2008). *The extreme right in Western Europe*. New York: Routledge.
- Halikiopoulou, D., & Vasilopoulou, S. (2010). Towards a “civic” narrative: British national identity and the transformation of the British National Party. *The Political Quarterly*, 81(4), 583–592.
- Heitmeyer W (2003). 'Right-Wing Extremist Violence' in *International Handbook of Violence Research*. Hagan J, Heitmeyer W (Eds); Dordrecht,Boston,London: Kluwer Academic Publishers: 399–436.
- Hinsliff, G. (2004). It feels like the BNP - only in blazers. *Guardian*. Retrieved October 1, 2013, from <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2004/may/30/otherparties.immigrationandpublicservices>
- Hope Not Hate. (2013). Overwhelming response. Retrieved March 1, 2013, from <http://www.hopenothate.org.uk/blog/article/2549/overwhelming-response>
- Jackson, P. (2011). 'The EDL: Britain's 'New Far Right Social Movement'' Radicalism and New Media group: Northampton. Retrieved March 2, 2015 from <http://nectar.northampton.ac.uk/6015/>.
- Jackson, P., & Gable, G. (2011). *Far-Right.com: Nationalist Extremism on the Internet*. London: Searchlight Magazine.
- Jefferies, J. (2005). 'The UK population: Past, present, future' in focus on people and migration. Retrieved May 2, 2015, from <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/fertility-analysis/focus-on-people-and-migration/december-2005/focus-on-people-and-migration---focus-on-people-and-migration---chapter-1.pdf>
- John, P., Margetts, H., Rowland, D., & Weir, S. (2006). *The BNP: The roots of its appeal*. Colchester, England: Democratic Audit, Human Rights Centre.
- Johnson, C. A., Patten, S., & Betz, H-G. (2005). Identitarian politics and populism in Canada and the antipodes. In J. Rydgren (Ed.) , *Movements of Exclusion: Radical Right-Wing Populism in the Western World* (pp. 85–100). Adelaide: Nova Science Publishers.
- Khan, Z. (2000). Muslim presence in Europe: The British dimension—Identity, integration and community activism. *Current Sociology*, 48(4), 29–43.
- Koopmans, R. (1996). Explaining the rise of racist and extreme right violence in Western Europe: Grievances or opportunities? *European Journal of Political Research*, 30(2), 185–216.
- Laclau, E. (2005). *On populist reason*. London: Verso.

- Lane, H. S. (2012). A study of the English Defence League: What draws people of faith to right-wing organisations and what effects does the EDL have on community cohesion and interfaith relations? Retrieved May 12, 2015, from <http://faith-matters.org/images/stories/edl%20report.pdf>
- Lea, J. (2000). The Macpherson Report and the question of institutional racism. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(3), 219–233.
- May, S., Moddod, T., & Squires, J. (2004). *Ethnicity, nationalism and minority rights*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Migration Observatory. (2015). Retrieved April 21, 2015, from <http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/>
- Minkenberg, M. (2002). 'The Radical Right in Post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe: Comparative Observations and Interpretations'. *East European Politics and Society*, 335–362.
- Moore, R., & Wallace, T. (1975). *Slamming the door: Administration of immigration control*. London: Wiley.
- Moss, V. (2013). Ugly face of UKIP: Sunday Mirror exposes racist and homophobic views of party members. *Mirror*. Retrieved October 1, 2013, from <http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/ugly-face-ukip-sunday-mirror-1531879>
- Moufahim, M. (2007). Interpreting Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Marketing of an Extreme Right Party. The Vlaams Blok/Vlaams Belang. Thesis submitted to the University of Nottingham for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.
- Mudde, C. (2002). *The Ideology of Extreme Right*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Mudde, C. (2004). The populist Zeitgeist. *Governance and Opposition*, 39(3), 541–563.
- Mudde, C. (Ed.). (2005). *Racist extremism in Central and Eastern Europe*. Milton Park, England: Routledge.
- National Front. (2015). National Front policy. Retrieved March 13, 2015, from <http://www.britishnationalfront.net/policy.html>
- Norris, P. (2005). *Radical Right: Voters and Parties in the Electoral Market*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oakley, R. (2005). *Policing racist crime and violence: A comparative analysis*. Vienna, Austria: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.
- Olechnowicz, A. (2005). Liberal anti-fascism in the 1930s the case of Sir Ernest Barker. *Albion*, 36, 636–660.
- Painter, A. (2013). *Democratic stress, the populist signal and extremist threat*. London: Policy Network.

- Pilkington, H. (2014) *'Loud and proud': Youth Activists in the English Defence League*. XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology. Facing an Unequal World: Challenges for Global Sociology. Yokohama, 13–19 July 2014. Retrieved May 30, 2015, from <https://isaconf.confex.com/isaconf/wc2014/webprogram/Paper42549.html>
- Pink News. (2014). BNP Youth recruitment video: Militant homosexuals want gay marriage to destroy families. Retrieved May 2, 2015, from <http://www.pinknews.co.uk/2014/05/13/bnp-youth-recruitment-video-militant-homosexuals-want-gay-marriage-to-destroy-families/>
- Powell, E. (1968). Rivers of blood speech. Retrieved April 16, 2015, from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3643823/Enoch-Powells-Rivers-of-Blood-speech.html>
- Ramalingam, V. (2012). *Countering far-right extremism*. London.
- Readings, G. (2011). Too many on the Left are continuing to promote Islamist extremists. *Left Foot Forward*. Retrieved February 20, 2014, from <http://www.leftfootforward.org/2011/05/too-many-on-the-left-are-continuing-to-promote-islamist-extremists/>
- Richardson, J. E. (2011). Race and racial difference: The surface and depth of BNP ideology. In N. Copey & G. Macklin (Eds.), *British National Party: Contemporary perspectives* (pp. 38–61). Abingdon, England: Routledge.
- Rydgren, J. (2003). 'Meso-level Reasons for Racism and Xenophobia: Some Converging and Diverging Effects of Radical Right Populism in France and Sweden'. *European Journal of Social Theory* 6(1):45–68.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon.
- Smith, J. (2008). *Home Secretary's speech at the Conference on Preventing Violent Extremism* (H. Office, Ed.). Retrieved April 20, 2015, from <http://tna.europarchive.org/20090120164241/http://press.homeoffice.gov.uk/Speeches/hs-speech-violent-extremism>
- Stanley, B. (2008). The thin ideology of populism. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 13(1), 95–110.
- Taggart, P. A. (2000). *Populism*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
- UKIP. (2010). Manifesto. Retrieved May 15, 2015 from <http://www.politicsresources.net/area/uk/ge10/man/parties/UKIPManifesto2010.pdf>.
- UKIP. (2012). The constitution. Retrieved May 4, 2015, from http://www.ukip.org/the_constitution
- UKIP. (2013). What we stand for. Retrieved October 1, 2013, from <http://www.ukip.org/issues/policy-pages/what-we-stand-for>
- UKIP. (2015). Believe in Britain: UKIP manifesto 2015. Retrieved May 4, 2015, from <http://www.ukip.org/manifesto2015#>

- Wallis, R., Bruce, S., & Taylor, D. (1986). *No surrender: Paisleyism and the politics of ethnic identity in Northern Ireland*. Belfast, Northern Ireland: Department of Social Studies, Queen's University of Belfast.
- Worley, C. (2005), 'It's not about Race, it's about the community': New Labour and 'Community Cohesion'. *Critical Social Policy* 25(4), 483–496.
- Zaslove, A. (2008). 'Here to Stay? Populism as a New Party Type'. *European Review*, 16, 319–336.