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ABSTRACT

This study critically examined how issues of multiculturalism and Muslim immigration are discursively constructed within the English language European online press. Through the use of a frame analysis as well as a more focused discourse analysis, an examination was undertaken to uncover how “us” versus “them” perspectives were manifest within a public discourse. A total of 132 articles from The Daily Mail, Le Monde Diplomatique, Dutchnews.nl, Spiegel Online and The International Herald Tribune were selected using a systematic sampling method based on the results of a search query for multiculturalism at each news site. The analysis of the data corpus revealed the news media’s depiction of multiculturalism and Muslim immigrants as not wholly negative on the surface but under closer scrutiny revealed discursive and linguistic techniques that consistently marginalized and “othered” them. The themes found in the data corpus also illuminated a trend of the subordinated population as lacking proper representation and always being spoken for by the news media.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Since the conclusion of World War II, neoliberalism has been a fundamental component of Western society and has ushered in an increasingly multicultural and globalized world. With the noble and idealized goal of a liberalized global economy in which pluralism and free trade are the defining tenets, neoliberalism appeared as the ideal antidote to the wartime atrocities rampant throughout the first half of the twentieth century. Melamed (2006) refers to this postwar ideology as an antiracist and anticolonial rejection of the previous domain of white supremacy. However, she also notes that these particular facets eventually became co-opted into capitalist governmentality and were significant in furthering a new type of Western hegemony (p. 4). As such, racial marginalization continued to exist even within the so-called nonracist ideologies. Postcolonial scholars such as Edward Said suggest that neoliberal narratives are self-affirming and primarily work to essentialize non-Western cultures as incompatible with progressive viewpoints.

Heading towards the turn of the century, the end of the Cold War further bolstered Western capitalist hegemony. However, a series of events such as to the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the subsequent War on Terror and the 2008 global financial crisis stalled the progress of Western neoliberalism and ushered in a reexamination of the relatively unquestioned dogma of capitalist hegemony. In October 2010 German Chancellor Angela Merkel deemed that multiculturalism “had utterly failed” (Weaver 2010, para 1)—a statement that garnered a considerable amount of controversy. Despite this, other European leaders voiced their agreement on the damage that multiculturalism had inflicted on Europe’s cultural landscape (Fekete, 2011). Kundnani (2012) offers the view that in the wake of these declarations has been the overwhelming response of
ethnic scapegoating in which minority groups are homogenized and essentialized as having lifestyles or behaviors that are problematic to European identity. A recent example of this came in the 2015 attack on the offices of French satirical newspaper Charlie Hebdo by alleged Muslim extremists. French president François Hollande condemned the attacks as “exceptional barbarism” (“François Hollande Condemns ‘Cowardly’ Attack” 2015, para 2) which was followed by intense scrutiny and even violence against Muslims in France (Ganley, 2015; McDonnell, 2015)

Within a communication context, the crisis of multiculturalism may be traced to deficiencies in intercultural communication effectiveness. The previous cultural relativism of Europe that began in the postwar period viewed culture as an enclosed concept in which divisions are clearly marked and not as a fluid construct that is malleable to its surroundings. Kundnani (2012) summarizes this perspective as being “able to consume culture, but not be consumed by it” (p. 115). As neoliberal agendas have urged the move to a liberal, globalized society they have also been arbiters of determining a “proper” globalized culture and have stratified and essentialized subordinate groups, emphasizing ideas that run contrary to the traits of openness and acceptance of difference, which traits are crucial in the facilitation of authentic intercultural communication.

The following study aims to explore how issues of multiculturalism are reported in European online news publications, operating under the assumption that the news media function as one of the technological arms of a neoliberal hegemony that has the ability to drive particular narratives within public discourse. The literature review begins with a description of Edward Said’s concept of orientalism and how “otherness” narratives are established as the foundation for much of what underpins the crisis of multiculturalism and its relationship with Western
neoliberalism. With an understanding of “otherness” on hand, we are able to see how Muslims in Europe are cast as a backward and static diaspora that is cast as incompatible with a modernized Western European society. This type of “othering” is further contextualized with a brief exploration of how similar narratives existed during the Cold War era to “other” Soviet satellite states, demonstrating how Kundnani’s (2012) abovementioned ethnic scapegoating possesses a historical lineage and how sociocultural boundaries are continuously reassessed. These narratives are then situated within the wider frame of globalization, specifically highlighting how dominant ideologies make intercultural communicative exchange an asymmetric practice. The literature review then explores how public discourse is affected by a neoliberal governmentality and biopower, particularly how the state and organizations that operate in the state’s interest such as the news media have implicit narratives of what their nation’s idealized citizen should resemble. This culminates in Baraldi’s (2006) thesis of the modernist paradox, the contradiction in which the so-called diverse, modern societies can choose from “good” and “bad” diversity. This concept develops based on the aforementioned asymmetry of intercultural communication and is demonstrative of how certain discourses and narratives attain a level of prominence in the public sphere that alternative discourses do not receive. All of these topics work together to form a guiding framework towards understanding the multi-tiered nuances of the tensions surrounding multiculturalism in Europe.

The central research question of this project asks how the uneasy relationship between multiculturalism and neoliberal hegemony is manifest within the online European press, specifically in the cultural dialogue between immigrants and non-immigrants. This is situated within Since Angela Merkel’s critical statements on multiculturalism, articles and editorials discussing multicultural identity have appeared in the news media with greater frequency (Ogan,
I posit that in the wake of these claims, a reassessment of the sociocultural status quo (Kundnani, 2012) of Europe has occurred. Additionally, I operate from the assumption that the news media functions as a governmental apparatus of the state and thus, tends to perpetuate discourses in its favor (Fraser, 1990, p. 58; Hammer, 2007). The research methodology involves a qualitative narrative/discourse analysis of European online newspapers in their coverage of stories related to multiculturalism with particular focus placed on tonality as well as the labeling and overall themes used in describing minority or less dominant groups.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

The Other

Approaching the twenty-fifth anniversary of the publication of his seminal thesis, *Orientalism*, Said (2003) opined with palpable frustration on the political progress and occurrences over the last quarter century:

There has been so massive and calculatedly aggressive an attack on the contemporary societies of the Arab and Muslim for their backwardness, lack of democracy, and abrogation of women’s rights that we simply forget that such notions as modernity, enlightenment and democracy are by no means simple and agreed-upon concepts that one either does or does not find (p. xlv-xv).

Said (2003) voiced his condemnation in no uncertain terms suggesting that imperialist actions ranging from the British occupation of India at the start of the 17th century to the modern American invasion of Iraq resorted to the same reductionist clichés and simplistic dogmas to justify their violence and oppression, “after all, runs the chorus, power is the only language they understand,” (p. xvi). Said’s reflections speak to an irony in how an increasingly globalized world continues to have a sustained encouragement of an “other” by the dominant hegemonies.

The debate surrounding “otherness” has been addressed in many avenues of scholarly research leading Fawcett and Hearn (2004) to conclude that it is “ongoing and probably unfinishable,” (p. 203). Based on Said's statements with regards to the familiar scripts of oppression and marginalization, it would appear, on the surface, that the same standpoints and arguments continually resurface within the epistemological arenas of socially constructed identity narratives. The consistent resurgence of the “otherness” debate calls for us to scrutinize how the “other” is constructed and maintained within a globalized society. Haldrup, Koefoed & Simonsen (2006) refer to Michael Billig’s theory of banal nationalism as one of the more
prominent ways of conceptualizing how otherness is manufactured within European societies. These authors speak of a perpetuation of “banal orientalism” in which subtle linguistic tendencies, such as the use of "us” and “ours” alongside clear demarcations of “them” and “foreign,” become routine (p. 175). Billig’s apparatus shows how a subconscious identity narrative that embraces the familiar while excluding the unfamiliar is constructed.

This exclusionary metanarrative is the byproduct of orientalism—the concept which encapsulates the essentialization of the “East” as a static, forever backwards entity that requires continuous intervention from the hand of a rational, modern “West” (Said, 2003). Consequently, these essentialist views and behaviors have gradually become established as part of the conventional wisdom of what it means to be European (Haldrup et al., 2006). Additionally, Haldrup et al. assert that orientalism goes beyond simple linguistic markers but in fact, is something that is tacitly practiced throughout all elements of European society. Dubbed practical orientalism, it is summarized as “a translation of hegemonic discourses into everyday practices so that they enter into the habitual spaces of ordinary experience” (p. 177). Furthermore, practical orientalism may be traced around elements such as the smells associated with certain foods, visual cues, and mannerisms with regards to spatial awareness. Citing a case in which a small Danish town hosted a Muslim refugee camp, Haldrup et al. show how the residents voiced their frustrations at the behavior of Muslim immigrants in public spaces, their resistance towards pork, and the supposed objectification of white women by Muslim males (pp. 179-182).

**Practical versus Nesting Orientalism**

The encouragement of a manufactured “other” through practical orientalism is preserved in contexts beyond Muslims in European society. Hirose & Pih (2011) showcase another
perspective on practical orientalism in their study of the exoticization of Asian cuisine in America where in their study they state that the “oriental other” of East Asian culture has effectively been commoditized into an accessible and familiar item for Western consumption (p. 1486). Additionally, they state “the representations of the cultural uniqueness of the East and its exotic incompatibly with the West are a way to legitimize the claims of the 'neutral' quality of the Western self,” (p. 1487). Hirose & Pih (2011) assert that even though East Asian cultures are generally deemed as acceptable by Western neutrality, they continue to suffer varying levels of practiced orientalism.

Scholars have also indicated that orientalism is practiced even within intracontinental contexts. Kuss' (2004) uses Bakic-Hayden's (1995) concept of nesting orientalism, with orientalism defined as “a pattern of representation which reproduces the dichotomy of Europe and the East but introduces a gradation between the two poles,” (p. 479), to demonstrate how identity narratives drive forth the idea of the East as a malleable construct that is flexible to the whims of the West. Western Europe is marked as the neutral foundation, Central Europe as being on the fringe of European identity, and Eastern Europe as the clearly demarcated “other”. Following the end of the Cold War, the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) offered the Central European designation to the former Soviet satellite states to indicate that they had distanced themselves from the Oriental East (Kuus 2004, p. 474). The author summarizes this division by identifying those states with the Central European moniker as inclusionary, not granted the status of Western European identity but as being of similar interests. Consequently, the Eastern European label is reserved for the exclusionary states that are seen as having motivations divorced from the West.
These nesting orientalisms are pliable ideas that can be applied in areas beyond Europe. An example of this is Hirose and Pih's (2011) work on the desensitization of East Asian culture to suit the interests of Western neutrality is comparable to the Central European identity construction; accepted but still ultimately marginalized and hence, unequal. When refocusing this context on Muslims in Europe, we notice that their current situation parallels that of the states framed under the Eastern Europe identity mold on the basis that they have been largely classed as too incompatible with Western society. Thobani (2011) speaks of fluctuating identity narratives as a way to keep reassessing societal-cultural boundaries in the wake of increasing plurality. Since the cultural categories associated with these identity narratives have been removed from their original contexts, they may be shaped to fit a particular configuration by the host culture. The resultant effect has states wavering between being for or against a pluralistic society as demographics continue to fluctuate (pp. 533-534). The politicking involved in this diversity management (Thobani, 2011) has forced a reassessment of traditional national identity models. Scholars point to how these normative frames-of-reference were built upon outdated conventions of nation building which trace their origins to nineteenth century perspectives of nationalism. As such, it was not until the end of the Cold War and the parallel advent of globalization did these archaic models become reexamined (Camia, 2010; Catterall, 2011). Catterall (2011) further explicates that identities for both traditional nation-states and newly birthed diasporas had to be redefined in order for them to fit the newfound terms of a globalized world (p. 330).

Camia (2010) explores three reassertions of normative European identity, a traditional heritage-based identity model, cosmopolitan-centered identity and an identity-based model that utilizes a constitutional-patriotism framework. The heritage-based model opts for the definition
of nationhood as dictated by the nineteenth-century based nationalism; Catterall (2011) summarizes this approach “as a paradoxical effect of globalisation, a defensive reaction against its impact” (p. 330). The cosmopolitan-driven model seeks a more pluralistic identity that favors a culturally relativistic approach with the most ideal example being a completely post-national Europe. The constitutional-patriotic model, rooted in Jürgen Habermas’ apparatus for collective European identification favoring shared values over shared history, opts for a more reconciliatory conceptualization by co-opting from both the cosmopolitan and heritage-based models.

With these models at hand we may see that the cosmopolitanism and the heritage-based approach referenced above are analogous to the aforementioned nesting orientalism with key similarity in their comparable use of two disparate positions as poles and including gradations between them. On the surface these three models offered by Camia (2011) would appear to function as a tidy synopsis of the nuances of European identity; however a contrapuntal perspective may posit that the standpoint of Western neutrality has effectively poisoned the well of discussion by not placing all involved groups on equal footing. Several academics point to this modernist baseline as a significant barrier in the discourse of “other.” For example, Phoenix (1998) criticizes the conventional wisdom of identity politics as being overly reductionist and one that ultimately sterilizes nuanced issues into essentialist terms. According to this author, “the assertion of homogeneity can lead to absolutism, whether of gender, sexuality, ‘race’ or ethnicity,” (p. 872). Thobani (2011) corroborates much of Phoenix’s (1998) arguments in his essay on Muslim pedagogic discourses. Citing Benedict Anderson’s theory of the imagined community, he asserts that the identity narrative of the “other” is “diluted, condensed and made superficial through the process of cultural recontextualization and the exercise of the national imagination” Using Islam’s cultural genesis within Britain as an example, Thobani (2011) points
to how the Muslim diaspora has become essentialized into a “skeletal and uniformized” concept instead of a multifaceted entity with an array of voices (p. 541).

**Intercultural Stratification and Communication**

Parallel to the discourse of the “other” is that of trends in intercultural communication in an increasingly globalized society. Researchers such as Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkov (2010) observe how the label of culture may be applied to many differing layers such as national identity, ideological identity and all the way down to personal identity. Regardless of layer, an individual will ally him or herself culturally through some form of identity, therefore suggesting that the element of culture is an inescapable construct. Baraldi (2006) uses Niklass Luhmann’s systems theory to posit that it is impossible for one to avoid stratifying oneself into a social group of some kind while Jelen (2011) describes how the concept of identity fulfills the “cultural need for belonging” that works towards fostering solidarity of a wider group (p. 379). In essence, culture externalizes itself via these natural stratifications. Shaw (2012) provides an illuminating perspective on intercultural communication’s relationship with globalization, framing the process as being linked to either constructive or destructive boundaries. Fluid communication is only possible under a constructive boundary by which both parties share a mutual identity confirmation and are empathetic to difference. Accordingly, the destructive boundary acts inversely as difference is rejected and the line between parties becomes clearly marked (p. 513).

As intercultural communication may be viewed as a natural product of globalization, being cognizant of how globalization frames notions of identity is necessary in order to properly assess the complexities of intercultural dialogue. Referring to the aforementioned supposition by Baraldi (2006) on the natural stratification of individuals into social groups, a subsequent result
of these demarcations is the fostering of a group that asserts dominance through sheer numbers. Zayani (2011) argues that while globalization is heralded as a positive, it comes with the side effect of marginalizing certain groups and seeking to bolster the chosen ideologies of the dominant “globalized” cultures.

As cultural communities assert solidarity they run the risk of not being deemed acceptable by the standards set by the dominant “internationalized” culture. In a study about discrimination in intercultural communication contexts by Japanese ESL (English as a second language) students, Kobayashi (2009) observed a trend in which white Europeans were generally viewed as more favorable symbols of the status-quo global citizen compared to African or fellow Asian individuals. Additionally, she references a study by Fujita (2004) on the Westward cultural migration of young Japanese students and posits that while there is an allure and desire to attain the “internationalized” label of becoming fluent in English and being exposed to a variety of outgroups, these students still showcased an overriding inclination to reach for familiar cultural surroundings. The results outlined in Kobayashi (2009) and Fujita’s (2004) studies referenced above point to the idea of cultural “fixes”, which are templates of what culture within a so-called proper globalized society should follow. These self-appointed cultural brokers are the arbiters of examples that allude to an acceptance of the aforementioned dominant, internationalized cultures (Archer, Bosman, Amen & Schmidt, 2007).

Neoliberal Biopolitics and the Modernist Paradox

There appear to be two distinct courses that globalization can follow: one that errs towards a decidedly post-nationalist era in which cultural hybridization is encouraged as the norm and another in which increased cultural proliferation occurs in part as a rejection of the
dominant, “globalized” cultures. We are able to trace the birth of this post-nationalist view to the idea of cultural plurality becoming vogue following the end of World War II; independent states and diasporic communities gained traction as a denunciation against the previous calls for cultural homogeneity that unraveled into warfare (Zayani, 2011).

As touched on by Francis Fukayama (1992) in his seminal work, *The End of History and the Last Man*, the end of the Cold War and the subsequent demise of the Soviet Union was a victory for the neoliberal Western state as the prime form of governance in the Western world. The symbolic defeat of communism was thought to have established a new paradigm for intercultural growth into the 21st century; making this period one in which the post-nationalist ideology seemed the most favorable going forward. This newfound optimism was shattered following the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the U.S. and eventually called for a reassessment of previously established ideological and cultural boundaries as under the guidance of a neoliberal West. Harvey (2007) describes neoliberalism’s underlining tenets of private markets, deregulation as well as individual freedom and responsibility as being a key cog in the mobilization of nationalism, specifically citing the rise of anti-immigration sentiments and right-wing views within Europe (p. 85). This neoliberal cultural nationalism instills the abovementioned traits with a heavy-hand of moral righteousness which subsequently disenfranchises and marginalizes countering views and philosophies.

Another key component to consider is Michel Foucault’s concepts of biopolitics and governmentality. The origination of these concepts starts in Foucault’s seminal text *The History of Sexuality Volume 1* in which he describes sovereign power is built on the state’s ability to grant access to certain tangible and intangible products; “things, time, bodies and ultimately life itself” (p. 136) while also possessing the ability to seize that access. Further, this formulation
helps demonstrate how hegemony subordinates not by law but through ideology or the ever-present threat of privilege suspension acts as a lever of control. Foucault traces the development of this power dynamic towards the end of the nineteenth century when the subject of populations became matters of economic and political concern. By linking these two fields together, the concept of biopower was formed. Building on his concept of biopower in his series of lectures, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault introduces governmentality as a lens through which to observe the collective rational considerations that undergird the modern state. The political justifications that direct the legislative actions of the State are not created from a neutral concern but instead are founded under a methodology in which an anticipated “societal product” is the desired outcome (p. 193). Kelly (2010) adds, “biopolitics/biopower is a technology of power” that is controlled by “encompassing governmentality” (p. 4) while Macmillan (2011) suggests that communication is the primary vehicle by which this governmentality connects its subordinate cells (p. 358). Medovoi (2007) provides an incisive examination of the relationship between globalization and biopower, advocating a standpoint that the resultant collateral damage of globalization such as Orientalist narratives and the increased disenfranchisement of minorities are ultimately justifiable within the goals of a neoliberal Western society. Pointing to the George W. Bush administration’s insistence that the War on Terror was a global one; Medovoi (2007) suggests that the quelling of incompatible views in favor of worldwide market integration is one of the necessary components of globalization and that classical liberal and neoliberalism are not dissimilar. According to the author, “both guarantee the peacefulness of their civil order by conducting a perpetual internal war against wayward and resistant forms of life,” (p. 55).

Following the end of the Cold War the conventional wisdom was that welcoming globalization would lead to economic growth which, in turn, would eventually give way to
democratization. Using this perspective, globalization effectively functioned as a synonym for modernization with resistant groups being cast as hindrances to modern progress. This sentiment is explored by Reid (2005) who argues in his essay that a new form of imperialism emerged following the 9/11 attacks as the biopolitical nature of modern Western sovereignty was “challenged by another, radically hostile account of what life is and what life is for,” (p. 250). Additionally, Reid (2005) offers a standpoint that corresponds with Fukuyama’s (1992) treatise, stating that the lack of a symmetrical threat in the post-Cold War era served to affirm the neoliberal capitalist blueprint for biopower with the United States as its vanguard. The consequence was that the American reaction to the 9/11 attacks was designated as representative of a singular, worldwide response in favor of neoliberal imperialism.

A useful nuance in understanding neoliberal governmentality is Baraldi’s (2006) apparatus of the modernist paradox. Specifically, the modernist paradox is how the pluralist viewpoint does not accept non-pluralist ideas; diversity is celebrated except when ideals that may threaten diversity enter the fold. The Western ethnocentric views of modernism have coaxed “uncivilized” cultures into reductionist adopt or reject scenarios by hegemonic cultural brokers. In a vacuum, proper intercultural dialogue is when diversity is not denied and there is an equal distribution of ideas and opportunities for both participants (p. 58-62). The modernist paradox may be furthered understood as a series of contradictions that lie within the neoliberal stance of unhindered market fetishism, “intervention in the name of non-intervention, hailing freedom as a natural basis for life that could only function with the heavy hand of policing by government,” (Miller 2010, p. 56). In other words, the continued neoliberal push towards globalized market societies further contributes to the impression that globalization has morphed into an analog of modernization. Zayani (2011) offers an additional distinction by describing how globalization
has failed to yield equal opportunities for all and that diversity has not evolved into a cherished trait but only something that is just reluctantly tolerated. With this barrier intact, it may be argued that the fruition of a harmonious multicultural society is an impossibility. The inequality acknowledged in Zayani’s observation may be linked to the suggestion by Archer et al. (2007) that the residual effects of neoliberalism being victorious in the Cold War can be felt in pedagogical arenas as well as massively influential regulatory organizations such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization (p. 128).

The essentialism of the “uncivilized” is a supplementary result of the influence that neoliberal ideology has had within the globalization process. While postmodern views on cultural identity have been well noted within academia, popular culture still observes culture through an essentialized lens (Archer et al., 2007). Further, the rise in Islamic fundamentalism that following the September 11th terrorist attacks may be viewed as an affirmation of a rejection of a neoliberal global ideology (Khondker, 2006). The resultant essentializing of Islam is facilitated by critics who conflate Islamic fundamentalist movement with general Islam without acknowledging more liberal interpretations of Islam such as within Southeast Asia and Turkey (Kersten, 2009). Additionally, Kersten (2009) offers context within which the disenfranchisement of Islam and neoliberal compatible secular ideologies has occurred, by alluding to events such as the 1967 Arab-Israeli War and the 1965 military coup of Indonesia (p. 90).

The Critical Tradition and the Media

When considering the guiding principle of this study, we may look to Craig’s (1999) essay on the dimensions of communication theory as a helpful resource. In his deconstruction he offers a summary of the critical tradition, a form of inquiry that challenges the conventional
wisdoms and truths of society under the assumption that there is an inherent inequality within communication. As such, this framework appeals to analyses of conflict within the social order as well as to inquiries of ideology and how it may distort the baselines of objectivity and rationality within a society (p. 147). Louis Althusser (2001) offers a conceptualization of ideology that defines it as the presentation of a type of reality that is materially processed through the social order with such conceptions as “rules of morality, civic and professional conscience” (p. 88). Cook (2000) adds that ideology functions simply the existence and maintenance of the current status quo to the point where it is accepted as a universal truth (p. 69). Based on Craig’s outline, the critical tradition suggests that even the most minute communication practice cannot be taken at face value but must be viewed with an acknowledgement of how ideology may alter predispositions of neutrality (p. 148). In order to deconstruct and decode the “consciousness” of these ideologies, the critical approach is a useful apparatus (Carr 2000, p. 209).

Having established a foundation steeped in the critical tradition we may then consider venues in which domineering social orders may be enacted and maintained. Kelly’s (2010) observation of biopower as the technological arm by which a dominant group affirms its authority on a subordinate group holds particular salience as we may assume that the news media fall under this umbrella of technology. There is a wealth of literature on the role that the media play in guiding public discourse (Altheide, 1984; Lithgow, 2012; Luengo, 2012; McMahon & Chow-White, 2011). One manner in which the media alter public narrative is through the practice of framing. According to Entman (2007), framing is the active concept of selecting potential news items and processing them so that they “assemble a narrative that highlights connections among them to promote a particular interpretation,” (p. 164). Semetko and
Valkenburg (2000) further explicate the effects of framing stating that the manner by which news organizations select content and how they are thematically presented can have a profound impact on how the public perceives a certain issue (p. 94). In addition to framing, some scholars suggest that there is a natural inclination to provide “otherness” narratives within the practice of journalism. The professional “just the facts” narrative that most news outlets operate from is almost always stylized and distilled to fit the tastes of a localized audience. Moreover, these authors posit that the concept of “good” journalism is to follow a pre-determined set of guidelines that work to reify existing identity narratives as rigid and immutable (Nossek and Berkowitz 2006, pp. 692-693). Tehranian (2002) corroborates these views in his examination of global media ethics, arguing that transnational media oligopolies have a vested interest in maintaining the neoliberal status-quos of domestic order and national security and that there exists an ethical imperative to present familiar “us” against “them” dichotomies to their audiences.

In recalling the outline of this study of examining the European online press as a biopolitical component of a greater neoliberal framework, the critical tradition perspective offers a useful apparatus in which to investigate practices of framing and “othering” by the news media. More specifically, the critical tradition perspective allows us to track how the media plays an active role in distorting suppositions of objectivity within society. Shaw’s (2012) perspectives on intercultural communication suggest that fluid communication is only achievable if there is an open and constructive boundary between the parties and that difference is understood and empathized. The path to fluid and open communication is stymied by the marginalizing practices inherent to Orientalist discourses.
Within the European context, Kundnani’s (2012) views on the ethnic scapegoating and essentialization of minority groups in the wake of multiculturalism being deemed a failure speak to a trend that inhibits any potential development of a constructive boundary between these disparate groups. Accordingly, this variable of ineffective communication plays a central role in the ongoing discourse of European multiculturalism. Taking Shaw and Kundnani’s positions under consideration we may assume that the news media generally work against creating an environment conducive to fluid intercultural communication by virtue of their need for maintaining familiar cultural narratives as well as their inherent underpinnings of neoliberal ideology.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Methodological Framework

Altheide (1987) points to the interactive and reflexive nature of a qualitative methodology as opposed to a quantitative analysis as a distinct advantage in the examination of theoretical relationships and discourse analyses. This study bases its research design on Kim’s (2012) examination on the portrayal of migrant workers by the Korean press as her study is useful in several ways. First, it observes a theoretical background of the critical tradition, acknowledging that while neoliberal globalization projects a post-racial ideal it actually works to obfuscate social inequalities and has practices such as racism externalized in subtler, more nuanced ways. Complementing the previously stated assumption that the news media uphold familiar cultural narratives, Kim suggests that they generally reinforces negative stereotypes of ethnic minorities and that they ―tend to play the role of a servant – not a watchdog – of the dominant ideologies of elite groups‖ (pp. 659-660).

Second, Kim’s (2012) research design is valuable for its two-pronged approach in using both critical discourse analysis (CDA) as well as frame analysis to qualitatively analyze a particular case of how a minority group can be marginalized through the news media. Kim’s frame analysis involves examining news stories for their tonality which she defines as the overall connotation or undertone that a particular news item conveys. The four levels that Kim uses to measure tonality are “positive,” “negative,” “mixed” or “neutral.” Kim’s inclusion of a “mixed” category, which is for news stories that feature both positive and negative attitudes, adds further gradation to the level of tonal analysis. In addition to these elements, a note on whether the
framing of each story was diagnostic or prognostic was also tallied. Diagnostic framing has a more negative implication, typically identifying a problem and then citing the responsible party. Conversely, prognostic framing also identifies an issue but instead offers a solution to the problem at hand and offers a more positive connotation (Kim 2012, p. 662).

While a frame analysis allows us to observe patterns in the news, Kim (2012) also employs CDA under the guiding assumption that discourse acts to construct and maintain reality. Jørgenson and Phillips (2002) define discourse as the cumulative process that written and spoken language as well as visual images have in constructing dimensions of social and cultural phenomena (p. 61). According to van Dijk (2001), CDA features no universal tradition or concrete direction but instead functions as an inclusive, multidisciplinary approach to analyzing discourse while being cognizant of the intrinsic role that power and social dominance play in affecting discourse structures such as the news media (pp. 353-354). In her study, Kim (2012) sources key CDA scholars such as Fairclough and van Dijk suggesting that their perspectives “attempt to unpack the ideological underpinnings of discourse” that have become ingrained and taken-for-granted elements in society (p. 663).

While there are other studies with methodologies that use similar foundations of CDA in examining news items (e.g., Jahedi & Abdullah, 2012; Joye 2010), Kim’s (2012) offers a four-dimension model that expedites the CDA process by pre-determining a series of media narratives to look for in the sample. For the research design of this study, two of Kim’s four dimensions are used in the analysis of the text: avoidance of language that empowers the subordinate, and use of positive terms (such as diversity or multiculturalism) to advance a nationalist agenda (p. 670). In addition to Kim’s two aforementioned dimensions, another looks for instances by which a
subordinate group is distinctly “othered” and placed in an “us” versus “them” binary within a news story.

With the use of Kim’s (2012) research methods, a substantial macro-level analysis of the sample was obtained. However, a detailed analysis of every article selected in the sample would not be feasible in a study of this scope. As such, while general trends and characteristics of the corpus as a whole are elucidated, paragraphs of the sample that specifically illuminate the above mentioned themes were chosen and further clarified on with a more focused discourse analysis. This focused discourse analysis utilized elements of Wodak’s (2001) discourse-historical approach which seeks to outline the discursive strategies used in marginalizing, nationalist, discriminatory texts specifically through techniques such evaluative attributions and membership categorization.

**Procedure**

The procedure for this study consists of a total of five steps. First, a dataset was constructed from a sampling of five English language news sites from the online European press: France’s *Le Monde Diplomatique*, Germany’s *Spiegel Online*, the Netherlands’ *dutchnews.nl*, the United Kingdom’s *Daily Mail* and the pan-European focused *International Herald Tribune* based out of France. This provided a mix of publication styles from the denser articles found in *Le Monde Diplomatique* to the more tabloid-like delivery of the *Daily Mail*. The papers from the non-Anglophone countries of France, Germany and the Netherlands were selected based on the availability of English news items and the depths of their archives.

The sampling frame accounted for news stories starting from the time of Chancellor Merkel’s declaration that multiculturalism had failed in October of 2010 through April of 2013.
The month of Merkel’s declaration was chosen as a starting point because her statements stirred considerable controversy at the time and acted as a catalyst in placing multiculturalism back into the forefront of the news cycle. In order to prevent the sample of articles from growing unmanageably large, a systematic sampling method was adopted in which only every third article from the results at each website was selected and analyzed.

The second step was a keyword search of “multiculturalism” at each selected news site’s archive. With the unit of analysis being whole articles with topics centered on the discourse of multiculturalism, this included, but was not limited to, subjects of diversity, immigration, integration, etc. Third, every third article was read closely and considered as either diagnostic or prognostic in its framing of multiculturalism and be graded on its tonality as either “positive,” “negative,” “neutral” or “mixed.”

For the fourth step, the discourse was evaluated for three narratives: 1) if a subordinate was essentialized or “othered” and placed in an “us” versus “them” binary. 2) If the article avoided language that empowers the subordinate, including language which described a minority group as “helpless” or “needing to be embraced.” 3) Whether positive rhetoric was used to support an assimilationist nationalist agenda. An example of this would be when language advocating minority rights and multiculturalism was used but with the exception that the said minority groups integrate or conform to the host country’s standardized form of national identity.

For the fifth and final step, excerpts representative of the common themes found in the data corpus were extracted and analyzed using a more focused discourse analysis using Wodak’s (2001) discourse historical approach which provided a closer examination and clarification of the evaluations done in the previous step. The results of this study presented a surface layer examination through the use of the frame analysis and expedited CDA as well as a second layer
of deeper, more nuanced inquiry spearheaded by the further clarified extracts examined with a focused discourse analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Summary of Results

A total of 132 articles were sampled and categorized based on their framing and tonality. The *Daily Mail* (DM) featured the most robust archive and produced a total of 64 articles. The *International Herald Tribune* (IHT) followed with 31 articles and then *Spiegel Online* (SO) with 17. *Le Monde Diplomatique* (LMD) and *Dutchnews.nl* (DN) each yielded only 10 articles within the sampling frame. Given that none of these archives made a distinction between standard news columns and editorial or opinion pieces during a keyword search, both variations of articles were included in the sample. Additionally, IHT being the European edition of the *New York Times* generated several articles with topics related to multiculturalism in Asia, the Middle East, or North America within the sample. As the focus for this study is centered on multiculturalism within a European context, these articles were excised. Table 1 offers a summary of the initial, surface level frame analysis of the sampled texts:

*Table 1: Summary of Frame Analysis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Diagnostic</th>
<th>Prognostic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LMD</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LMD - Le Monde Diplomatique, SO - Spiegel Online, DM - The Daily Mail, DN - Dutchnews.nl, IHT - The International Herald Tribune
With the exception of DM, most of the sampled news articles did not feature outwardly negative reporting on issues of multiculturalism. A total of 65 articles were framed in either a positive or neutral fashion while 67 were negative or mixed. In spite of the relatively even frequency between positive/neutral and negative/mixed framing, the split between diagnostic and prognostic framing was vast. A total of 104 articles reported issues of multiculturalism in a diagnostic tone compared to only 28 in a prognostic tone. Table 2 summarizes the results of the expedited narrative analysis:

**Table 2: Narrative Analysis Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate</th>
<th>Subordinate Not</th>
<th>Positive Rhetoric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essentialized</td>
<td>Empowered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LMD - Le Monde Diplomatique, SO - Spiegel Online, DM - The Daily Mail, DN - Dutchnews.nl, IHT - The International Herald Tribune

The essentialization or “othering” of a subordinate was the most common narrative trend within the sample with a total of 41 instances while the other two did not appear quite as often. Common within the sample were news stories that “othered” a subordinate and then followed with not using empowering language and the use of positive rhetoric to advance an assimilationist agenda.
Only three articles out of the entire corpus, two in IHT and one in SO, featured positive language on multiculturalism and a prognostic tonality that did not also possess essentializing, disempowering, or misappropriated positive rhetoric alongside it. Effectually, these three articles were the only ones discussing multiculturalism in a wholly positive light. The two IHT articles were clearly demarcated as op-ed pieces, signifying that they were not necessarily the views of the paper itself. Both op-eds were also authored by public figures, one by critical theory sociologist/philosopher Jürgen Habermas and the other by Margot Wallström, special representative of the United Nations Secretary General and leftist Swedish politician. The SO article was filed under its regular news section and was a report focused on a satirical campaign aimed at mocking Germany’s far-right wing party. It is noteworthy to highlight that this article featured little commentary specifically about immigrants or multiculturalism but instead was a general anti-racism, anti-xenophobia piece. The following sections highlights the common themes identified in the corpus via a discourse analysis.

The General Stereotyping Of Muslims

With DM having 47% of its 64 articles negatively framing multiculturalism, it was by far the most common of the five sampled newspapers to feature blatantly negative stereotyping of a subordinate. A recurring trend within DM articles was diagnostically framing a problem and essentializing a subordinate by first credentialing it with a disclaimer (Hewitt & Stokes, 1975). For example:

We’ve all watched elderly white passengers being put through the third degree, while young Asian men wearing backpacks waft past unchallenged. Now I’m not suggesting these young Asian men were planning to blow up the plane, or that the women in burkas were a security risk. Like it or not, though, the fact is that potential suicide bombers do tend to come from that particular demographic. And Al Qaeda suspects have been known to shield their identities behind a burka (DM, 11 May 2012)
I have long suspected that this island will be more or less Muslim within a century, and it will be the fault of this generation. It would be perfectly legitimate for a respectable, law-abiding and civilised political party to act now to prevent this. As a Christian who is grieved by many features of modern Britain I often find myself allied with British Muslims. I have yet to meet a Muslim I don’t like. But that doesn’t stop me saying that I do not want this to be a Muslim society, which is the likely long-term result of the liberal elite’s twin policies – of open borders and multiculturalism (DM, 21 April 2012)

In the first excerpt, the author frames the issue of randomized airport security checks as a nuisance for white passengers while essentializing Asians as being the more likely demographic to produce suicide bombers. The author first grounds their statement by asserting that he or she is not making a generalization about a group of people, yet the generalization is made anyway. We see a similar process followed in the second excerpt; where it is implicitly suggested that political groups in favor of Muslim immigration are not “respectable” or “civilized”. This comes despite the author’s claim that he is an ally to British Muslims. Embedded in this statement is recognition by the author that public views and declarations that may be perceived as racist or prejudiced must be qualified or attached with a disclaimer. This is demonstrative of a consensus that openly racist/prejudiced discourse is frowned upon. Effectively, this lexical approach functions as a face-saving method and that such judgments are intended to not be universal but exclusively situational (van Dijk, 1992, pp.89-90). Jackson (2007) adds that this technique is a popular approach in texts that are critical of Islam. The intention of such qualifiers is to soften the blow of terms that some may consider pejorative; however, these qualifiers are almost always consequently followed by incendiary or hostile language that continues to maintain prejudices against aspects of Islam (p. 402). This type of languaging was also employed in articles that appropriated positive rhetoric on minorities to advance a nationalist agenda:

To be proud of one’s Britishness and proud of one’s skin colour are thankfully no longer mutually exclusive. I am very proud of my Coloured Cape Townian heritage and my light brown skin, but am equally proud of the fact that I am British. But as much of a fan of
tolerance as I am, I cannot help but think that our munificent tolerance as a nation will soon (if it hasn’t already) contribute to our undoing and subsequent downfall. Would I for one wish to live in a country where minarets threatened to dominate Oxford’s Dreaming Spires skyline? Probably not (DM, 2 March 2012).

In this example we see the irony of the author using his skin color and him being a “fan” for tolerance as a qualifier against tolerance. This is subsequently followed with the hypothetical minarets “threatening” the desired, ideal image of the Oxford skyline. Additionally, this demonstrates a method of how positive rhetoric on minorities may be appropriated to advance a nationalist agenda. This tactic operationalizes Baraldi’s aforementioned modernist paradox in that it appeals to humanitarian values such as tolerance while simultaneously denouncing it. Effectively, diversity may only be accepted if it is framed in terms appropriate for the dominant national ideology.

While the abovementioned extracts offer insights into the more readily apparent forms of negative stereotyping within the sample, subtler methods of essentialization were also significant. With only a total of four articles categorized as negative between LMD, DN, SO and IHT combined, a majority of the corpus did not feature outwardly negative articles on multiculturalism. On the surface, this may appear to rebut the assumption that the news media generally convey negative stereotypes about minorities (Kundnani, 2012; Shaw, 2012). However, even articles that featured positive tonalities towards minorities still featured marginalizing language. Kim (2012) labels this process as discourse “beneath the surface” (pg. 668). The following excerpts highlight some of the key examples of this practice, primarily how, at first glance, these news articles may appear to establish sympathetic or encouraging dialogue towards a subordinate culture:

She defies all stereotypes. She is as Eastern and refined as the Durbar Court, yet as down-to-earth and homely as Yorkshire pudding. She calls herself a working-class Northern
mum, yet sends her children to private school. Her accent is half Pakistani and half Yorkshire, and she is fiercely proud of both. When I started our interview at the India Office by admiring Durbar Court, Sayeeda Warsi winced at my clunking Estuary English ‘der-baah’ pronunciation of the word. ‘It is drrr-ba,’ she said, lending an exotic musical flourish to the prolonged ‘drrr’ and clipped ‘ba’. I could almost hear sitars in the background (DM, 10 November 2012).

The extract is from a report on Sayeeda Warsi, a British politician of Pakistani descent. In attempting to summarize Warsi, a minority, to their readership, DM took to using language that exoticized her cultural origins. Within Orientalist discourses, Western hegemony bestows itself with a privilege to continuously render the East as a fixed and static entity that is forever exoticized as a mystical “other” (Said, 2003). In this instance, the author, perhaps unintentionally, exoticizes Warsi’s pronunciation of the term “Durbar” by labeling it as being reminiscent of the sound of sitars. This comes despite the article previously establishing that Warsi was in fact, born and raised in Britain.

**Denying Agency to Muslim Immigrants**

One of the most prominent trends in the data corpus was the authors speaking on behalf of Muslim immigrants. This was most common within the diagnostically framed articles which offered a view on how to fix the “problem” of multicultural integration. The following example is excerpted from IHT and is sourced from an article headlined” How To Integrate Europe’s Muslims”:

> Europeans should not be afraid to allow Muslim students to take classes on Islam in state-financed schools and universities. The recognition and accommodation of Islamic religious practices, from clothing to language to education, does not mean capitulation to fundamentalism. On the contrary, only by strengthening the democratic rights of Muslim citizens to form associations, join political parties and engage in other aspects of civic life can Europe integrate immigrants and give full meaning to the abstract promise of religious liberty (IHT, 23 January 2012).
Unlike many of the DM articles cited thus far, IHT generally avoids using any transparently “othering” language. Despite this, the IHT extract features a markedly paternalistic tone in outlining why Europeans should not fear Muslim immigrants. Using the turn-of-phrase “capitulation to fundamentalism” in regards to fears of Islamic religiousness and immediately following with an encouragement of democratic rights and civic activism, the author couches a good-intentioned idea in a negative subtext. This excerpt recalls the Orientalist narrative of the domineering West as developed and flexible that maintains control of its own destiny while the static East does not possess the same recourse (Said, 1989; Said, 2003). The narrative of subordinates as a helpless group that has little to no agency or social mobility was present in several other articles in the sample as well:

It doesn’t stop there. Over the last decades immigrants have also been ‘downgraded’, i.e. they have been told that they are from non democratic[sic] cultures, that women and gays are discriminated against in their countries and that their culture is backward (DN, 1 July 2011)

The most remarkable thing is the lack of response from the side of the immigrants. Their political and moral marginalisation has not lead to fury or letters to newspapers. Have they lost their faith in power of the vote? Or are they unable to cross swords with the powers that be? Time will tell (DN, 1 July 2011)

In this extract from DN, the author offers an outwardly sympathetic plea to the marginalization that immigrants have had to endure. Even in supportive language, traces of Orientalist discourses are present. Due to the unequal avenues for discourse between the dominant and subordinate, immigrants have not had an opportunity to develop an identity on their own terms. As such, the author’s confusion about a supposed lack of a response is indicative of an understanding of resistance (writing to newspapers, voting) that appeals to a decidedly Western epistemological structure. Those who attempt to seek representation in ways divergent from the recognized
methods of doing so are often categorized as “uncivilized and ignorant” (Buchowski, 2006, p. 467).

The following extracts are from an article on Swedish citizens’ questioning of their previously liberal attitudes towards immigrant migration:

Six months later, many Swedes are still in shock. The country — proud of its reputation for tolerance — can no longer say it stands apart from the growing anti-immigrant sentiment that has changed European parliaments elsewhere, leading to the banning of burqas in France and minarets in Switzerland (IHT, 26 February 2011)

In some of those apartment blocks, the unemployment rate among immigrants stands at 80 percent. Still, their children need schooling, and they have elderly parents who need health care. Some are damaged by the violence they have lived through. They suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder and drug and alcohol addictions (IHT, 26 February 2011)

Like the previous IHT extract, the author does not use the hostile “othering” rhetoric that is found in the DM articles. However, there is still a tenor within the language that pathologizes the issue of immigrant reform. The clear distinction between Swedes and immigrants is symptomatic of this more subtle “othering” rhetoric and one that is implicative of the belief that immigrants are locked in this subordinate category and do not possess the social mobility to become part of the mainstream national identity. These strategies work together to create an infantalizing narrative of the subordinate group that is common in Orientalist discourses (Sastry & Dutta, 2011). Further, this article also features perspectives from immigrants in Sweden:

Even older immigrants who have made lives here say they have little contact with Swedes. A refugee from Bosnia, Ask Gasi, says he can understand that Swedes are reluctant to embrace the diverse and needy refugee population. He wonders himself whether the government made a mistake in letting so many come in.

Mr. Gasi was able to earn a doctorate degree here, and he has a job as a teaching assistant. But he still does not feel welcome. He points to the swastikas and the Serbian crosses etched in the hall outside the mosque he attends (IHT, 26 February 2011)
The testimony of Mr. Gasi supplements the concerns mentioned in previous extracts from this article. The first point of interest within this excerpt is how the author initially categorizes Gasi as a refugee and not as someone who holds a doctorate degree. According to Reisigl and Wodak (2001), this type of linguistic approach is known as a predicational strategy which is used to place social actors in membership categories that come equipped with an evaluative attribution that may be either positive or negative (p. 45). Essentially, this move pre-empts a certain type of attribution to be made based on the label. From the above referenced excerpt, immigrants in Sweden were designated as a deprived group mired in poverty, Mr. Gasi’s label of refugee categorizes him within this marginal group. Moreover, this label gives him agency to speak on behalf of the group as he sympathizes with Swedish frustration of the “needy” refugee population. Gasi’s statements are further credentialed with the declaration that he possesses a doctorate degree and has a teaching job. This is demonstrative of Bakic-Hayden’s (1995) nesting orientalism, mentioned earlier, in that Gasi’s possession of a doctoral degree has moved him closer to a status that is palatable to Western knowledge structures. However, his refugee label still works to “other” him in spite of his support of Swedish criticism of immigrants. A similar strategy was employed by DM in their report about Sayeeda Warsi as well. Immigrants that possess a Western education and have assimilated into the mainstream national identity are still subject to a categorization as an “other.” Furthermore, the final sentence of the extract mentions racially suggestive symbols such as the Nazi swastika being used in an attempt to alienate immigrants. This is another recognition that blatant racism is universally condemned within public discourse. Despite the article calling attention to this obvious display of racial bigotry, there still exists a more subtle “othering” tactic and method within these texts that assert an asymmetry between an ingroup (mainstream discourse) and outgroup (“othered” discourse).
Most articles in the sample discussed multiculturalism within the context of Muslim immigrants however a small number did focus on non-Muslim immigrants.

An article from SO titled “The New Guest Workers” focusing on Germany’s influx of Spanish, Greek and Italian immigrants featured markedly different language than what was used to describe Muslims through the sample:

This time, members of the new wave of immigrants are working in university laboratories rather than on assembly lines. Instead of doing the work that others won’t, they are moving into corner offices, becoming senior physicians and designing products for others to assemble. They have better educations and are more self-confident than previous immigrant generations, and for this reason see themselves as neither guests nor workers. Instead, they feel that they are European citizens and take it for granted that they belong anywhere in Europe, and that they will leave again if they find that they like it better someplace else. They constitute an elite that is now immigrating and changing society's image of immigrants (SO, 28 February 2013)

Juxtaposed against the IHT article with Gasi’s testimony, this extract features more affirmative terms to describe this group of immigrants: “self-confident,” “elite,” better educated, possessing agency to define themselves as “neither guests nor workers.” This extract serves as another example of Baraldi’s modernist paradox being employed in discourse on multiculturalism with the author drawing a clear distinction between traditional immigrants (less desirable) and the new “elite” immigrants (more desirable). Following the conclusion of World War II, the vast majority of immigrants into Europe were poor and uneducated Muslims from either North Africa or the Middle East who were invited as migrant workers (Franz 2007, pp. 92-93). Additionally, the author describes these “elite” immigrants as European citizens who retain the mobility to go elsewhere if their needs are not met. This implies how individuals/groups with the label of “European” are malleable and able to negotiate sociocultural boundaries. These high value immigrants are showcased as possessing the necessary attributes to fit into mainstream German
society. The “concern” in this excerpt is whether Germany can meet the needs of this group instead of the commonly diagnostic or paternalistic tone used to describe matters involving Muslim immigrants.

On the issue of immigrant representation it is worthwhile to specify that a small number of articles in the sample featured language critical of the dominant discourses regarding European multiculturalism. For example:

The conversation often stumbled on to the only thing the public got excited about: the influence of the Other, immigration. This concern is an important but unacknowledged reason why global citizenship matters; there is no way to understand why they want to come here if you have no interest in experiencing there, and cannot understand what might happen when you do so (LMD, March 2011)

Global citizenship also matters because it helps us understand why the un-travelled political candidate (George Bush who had not left America before running for office) can never make informed decisions about the limits and limitations of his own authority, and why he and his appointees spend so much time demonising outsiders (LMD, March 2011)

This extract is from an LMD article written by David Napier, a medical anthropology professor at University College London. While Napier still uses non-inclusive terms that do not break from “us” versus “them” binaries, he only does so in order to voice disapproval at the tactics employed by privileged discourses to marginalize and subordinate the other. This reflexive approach corresponds with Shaw’s (2012) thesis of the contrast between constructive and destructive boundaries within intercultural communication. Napier’s statements function as recognition of a destructive boundary as the status-quo; he highlights the lack of global understanding on the part of legislative authorities as a cause for the demonization of immigrants. This plea for a reconciliatory understanding also connects with Baraldi’s (2006) assumptions underlining the need for a mutual coordination in understanding intercultural dialogue that subverts traditional hierarchical structures (p. 59). This type of critical examination
was rare within the sample; however it is necessary to highlight that whenever they did appear it
was almost always presented as an editorial written by an academic intellectual.

**Islamic Culture as Backwards, Barbaric and Uncivilized**

Another trend in the sample was articles that outright demonized Islamic culture. These
arguments were generally premised on the diagnosis of why Muslim immigrants tended to be
poor and lacking education compared to non-immigrants. The following is an opinion piece from
SO about the matter of Muslim integration in Germany:

Educational studies show that Muslim immigrants apparently have a more difficult time
than other immigrant groups keeping up in the educational system -- much more difficult.
This has nothing to do with "genetics," nor does Sarrazin think it does. Rather, he asserts
explicitly "that human genetic endowment among all peoples is very similar" and sees the
same as applying to "intelligence." He believes -- as do many social scientists -- that the
cultural environment of the Islamic world is one source of these problems (SO, 6 May
2011)

We see that the extract begins with a specious claim about education and Muslim immigrants
that ignores the host of socio-economic variables and other barriers that Muslims face in Europe
that have an effect on education (Adida, Laitin & Valfort 2010; Savage 2004). As a result of
these very real social inequalities, Muslim immigrants have taken a resistive approach in order to
maintain solidarity against the marginalizing prejudices of the mainstream European identity
narratives (Savage 2004). The author then skirts around the blatantly racist idea of the other as
genetically inferior only to then make a claim that the struggle of Muslim immigrants is due to a
culture at odds with education. This author provides credibility to his claim with the assertion
that many social scientists agree, even though no studies or scholarly articles are referenced in
the article. The irrationality of Islamic culture is a popular trope within these marginalizing
discourses (Kumar, 2010) and came in large part due to increased coverage of the Middle East
following the September 11th 2001 terrorist attacks and the consequent War on Terror. With the Western news media’s heavy coverage on matters such as suicide bombings and the misogyny of fundamentalist interpretations of Islam, the orientalist logic of the deviant and barbaric Muslim has gained a foothold and maintained a presence within public discourse (Khalid, 2011). This perspective is further manifested within more contentious issues as demonstrated in the following extract:

Given that the vast majority of Germany's 4 million Muslims are moderate -- and that several Muslim organization urged their followers to ignore Beisicht's cartoon campaign - - the claim might not be quite as naïve as it sounds. Still, it doesn't require a prodigious memory to recall the massive violence triggered across the Muslim world in early 2006 once news of the Jyllands-Posten caricatures got out. Ultimately, some 100 people lost their lives (SO, 1 June 2012)

This is excerpted from an article reporting on a campaign stunt by the right-wing Pro-NRW political party in Germany. In an effort to draw attention to themselves before a state election, the Pro-NRW party held a cartoon contest inviting artists to submit drawings that were critical of Islam.

In response, Muslim groups held demonstrations against the provocative nature of the contest of which the protests became violent. In orientalist discourses, one of the most common frames is to characterize Islam as an inherently violent religion (Kumar, 2010). The author specifically highlights the tendency of this argument in recent times to focus on the violent backlash from Muslims against Danish newspaper Jyllands-Posten for publishing a negative caricature drawing of the Prophet Mohammed (p. 267). The SO author uses the now familiar credentialing strategy seen in previous excerpts by making note of the sizeable population of moderate Muslims within Germany before making a generalized assumption on the believers of Islam. The author’s use of the phrase “the Muslim world” also deserves scrutiny. The
indiscriminate categorization of Islam as a whole is a recurring trend within the sample in that Muslims are repeatedly placed in an asymmetric, marginal space in which they must answer for their actions. Moreover, any type of individual Muslim transgression in Europe raises either explicit or implicit concerns on whether or not Muslims as a group are a fit for European society. Under an orientalist perspective, there is no consideration that there are different approaches to Islam. Another article from SO about Islamic arbitrators appeals to these types of concerns:

People like arbitrator Demir are not aggressively fighting the constitutional state or the constitution. But is their parallel system of justice compatible with the German constitution? The Muslim shadow judges are mainly protecting the patriarchal structures of a culture whose proponents are not truly interested in becoming integrated in Germany. Most arbitrators tolerate restrictions of the basic rights of women, and they urge women to accept these constraints (SO, 20 June 2012)

This author makes a claim that the generalized culture of Islam precludes itself from integration and invokes the idea of a “parallel system” which is another rhetorical device common in multicultural discourses; immigrant societies wish to “keep to themselves” and refuse to abide by any sort of national identity. Additionally, the author operationalizes the frame of sexism within Islam which is another common strategy in texts critical of Muslims (Kumar, 2010; Navarro, 2010). By doing both of these things, the author enacts a foundational strategy of orientalist discourse by speaking for the subordinated group. One of the tenets of postcolonial critiques is to recognize how those in power refuse to allow the marginalized to have a voice and represent themselves (Spivak, 1999). An example of this erasure may be seen in the discussions of Muslim women in contexts of the West. Navarro (2010) points out the tendency of women in Islam to be characterized as passive actors who must be spoken for. Additionally, the Muslim women who do speak out normally have been appropriately “Westernized” in that they tend to possess a Western education and do not wear a veil (pp. 100-101). Muslim women who do not fit
the Western logical orientation towards women are characterized as helpless and are denied agency (Kumar, 2010; Ruitenberg, 2008). The emancipatory discourse of the SO article is couched in this subtext. The essentialization of Islamic culture is justified on the grounds that it may “liberate” its oppressed women as demonstrated in the following extracts:

The burqa is in no way a religious obligation that thus demands our consideration and respect. On the contrary it is a deliberate political statement whose meanings any free democratic society, least of all one that pretends to believe in women’s freedom, should consistently and unapologetically challenge. (DM, 20 December 2011)

Never has toleration been so one-sided. Though it may be erroneously viewed as tolerating the intolerant, it smacks of a want of natural justice. For what society, nation or culture- let alone a host to a party, would want to put up with such naked intolerance of its guest? (DM, 20 December 2011)

Here we see the author articulate a yearning for a free democratic society that paradoxically wishes to stigmatize certain behaviors. Effectively, political subjectivities that run counter to an accepted hegemonic model are cast with suspicion and doubt. Much of the discourse critical of the burqa is representative of a newfound acceptance of colonialist discourses following the September 11th 2001 attacks and a desire by the West to “unveil” the oppression of women at the hands of an exaggerated Muslim “other” (Macdonald 2006, pp. 19-20).

In the second extract, the author’s use of the phrase “natural justice” is implicative of an idea that Western narratives of tolerance and acceptance are so airtight that they have achieved status as a conventional wisdom. Additionally, reducing the burqa debate to the metaphor of a guest acting out of order at a party ignores the complex and interrelated cultural, religious and political factors involved. This type of reductionist language is another facet of orientalist discourse, with the West often presenting itself as facilitator that is reaching out to the Eastern cultures by extending a hand in a reconciliatory fashion. If the offer is met with uncertainty or
outright rejection, the West may then categorize the Eastern culture as uncivilized or barbaric for not adhering to their terms. The narrative of the West as a moral superior has been a key component in discourses surrounding gender and orientalism. Khalid (2011) refers to this as a construction of the Muslim ‘everywoman’ that symbolically acts as a representation of the misogyny and deviance of the Muslim other while also providing license for a paternalistic approach in “democratizing” the other that is guided by that strand of moral superiority (p. 23). This is yet another mechanization type of social inequality that is again representative of the asymmetry of discourse between the dominant West and the subordinate East/immigrant population, the dominant tenders a chance for the subordinate to move closer to the dominant; but only on terms that fit within an accepted standard of knowledge.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

The original research question of this thesis asks how the tensions between immigrants and non-immigrants are manifested through the European online press, situated in a wider context of multiculturalism and neoliberal hegemony. Through the use of Kim’s (2012) methodological apparatus alongside a careful discourse analysis, the analysis of the data draws attention to a variety of factors. Said’s (2003) criticism of the West for its unabated continuation of othering discourses over a quarter century after the publication of *Orientalism* proved to be all the more striking and salient after an examination of the data corpus. The analyzed texts demonstrated the numerous ways in which Muslim immigrants and minorities were negatively constructed through the public discourses of the news media. These ranged from categorizations in traditional “us” versus “them” binaries with claims disparaging a universalized “Muslim world” to observations of Muslim immigrants as a hapless, irrational group that required paternalistic intervention at the hands of Western logical structures.

I contend that these constructions are discursive strategies by the European news media in an attempt to answer the problem of multiculturalism’s failure as set out by Merkel, Cameron and other political leaders defining it as such. The rationalization of discrimination and the credentialing of othering rhetoric were couched in this diagnostic framework: if multiculturalism is a problem then the proper steps to solve the problem must be taken. The themes and narratives found in the data corpus operationalize this attempt to solve the problem. With the “crisis” of multiculturalism being first set within political discourse, the media discourse soon follows and further legitimizes it as a matter of concern (Fekete, 2004).
The issue of immigrant representation was a particularly significant undercurrent in the analysis. If European state leaders have declared multiculturalism a problem then why are immigrants not offered their proverbial seat at the table? The persistent trend of immigrants being spoken for, even in supportive or encouraging language, draws into focus one of the subtler strategies of marginalizing discourse. These “beneath the surface” discourses (Kim, 2012) were often embedded alongside positive rhetoric or contrasted against blatantly racist or stereotypical views on immigrants which obfuscate the more understated language. These findings shed light on the privileging of Western epistemological discourses and how alternative discourses are shut-out and not given a chance to even be heard. It is here where this study finds purchase within matters of intercultural communication. Shaw’s (2012) model of the constructive and destructive boundaries towards intercultural understanding achieves a useful salience in understanding the breach of communication between the subordinated immigrants and the dominant non-immigrants. A constructive attitude toward the facilitation of smooth and productive intercultural dialogue requires all parties to share a mutual understanding (pp. 512-513).

The themes found in this study demonstrated an approach to discussing multiculturalism that was functionally missing half of the equation: the voices of the subordinate group. The analysis also demonstrated the news media’s tendency to present essentialized and reductionist viewpoints on complex, multifaceted issues that are by no means set in stone. Calls for reflexive debate and discussion were rare throughout the data corpus. Within the discursive space of the European online press, Muslims being spoken for propels an Orientalist rationality that allows for these public narratives to homogenize Islam to fit whatever criticism they may present. The homogenization of an essentialized other fits with Sastry and Dutta’s (2011) formulation that this
comes as a reframing of a colonialist logic that molds itself to fit a master narrative of globalization and modernization (p. 447). In light of this asymmetric divide in representation, what are the opportunities for narrowing this gap? I believe that Baraldi’s (2006) comments on social systems are significant in answering this question, namely how the culturally pluralistic spaces of a multicultural Europe are part of an “ongoing constructive process” (p. 67). As such, an open and positive dialogue as well as a reflexive acknowledgement of the disproportionate communicative spaces is necessary going forward. As apparent as it may seem, the findings of this study indicate that simply listening and giving voice to the silenced and underrepresented could be the positive first step towards engaging the reality of multiculturalism in Europe in a fruitful and useful way.

In considering the areas of improvements as well as opportunities for extended analyses linked to this study, the most evident would be a more robust project involving an exploration of non-English European online news outlets. This would build on the groundwork laid out in this study while also allowing for investigations into other variables; such as how discourses on immigrants and multiculturalism fluctuate between languages. This would be a more multi-tiered approach that would necessitate multiple scholars to coordinate their efforts. Additionally, a longitudinal study over a number of years offers another opportunity for continuing this project’s basic framework. As Thobani (2011) mentions, there is a continuous reassessment of sociocultural boundaries within spaces of cultural plurality. Tracking how these boundaries fluctuate in a temporal context would allow for an examination into trends on what type of events and occurrences push the reporting interests of the online European news media. As news reporting on Muslims in general increased after major events such as the September 11th terrorist
attacks and the War on Terror (Macdonald, 2006; Khalid, 2011), a more specific look into how certain events shape public discourse would be a worthwhile endeavor.

Despite these limitations, the findings of this study illuminated a variety of salient details on the tripartite relationship between the state, the news media and public discourse on European multiculturalism. These include the self-perpetuating relationship between the European news media and the state in constructing diagnostic frames, the deeply embedded lexical strategies employed in othering rhetoric, and the lack of recognition for Muslims as individuals possessing agency. These findings all work together to demonstrate how multi-tiered European multiculturalism is. As the reaction to the 2015 attacks on the Charlie Hebdo offices in France have demonstrated, the abovementioned relationships are demonstrative of the complications that impede the facilitation of effective and productive intercultural communication.
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