

Title: Rants against multiculturalism caught on camera in Britain: racism without races?

By Fred Dervin, Professor of Multicultural Education, University of Helsinki, Finland
(dervin@helsinki.fi)

Abstract (200-300 words): In 1995 philosopher Etienne Balibar predicted that a new form of racism, which he named *racism without races*, would spread in most societies. With the current acceleration of multiculturalism in Britain and Europe, discourses of hate, in relation to the ‘Other’, based on many and varied identity markers such as geography, language, religion, gender, etc. can be identified in many societal contexts. In 2011/2012 several rants against multiculturalism (which were reported as “racist rants” by the media), caught on camera, were mediatized in Britain. Appearing in newspapers and on Youtube day after day, these rants marked a new level of public aggression towards the ‘Other’ (migrants, speakers of other languages, British people of (foreign) origins, Muslims, etc.). After describing the contexts of four rants, I will be examining two sets of questions: 1. What do these rants tell us about how multiculturalism is perceived today? What misconceptions about multiculturalism can be identified in these rants (confusion: colour of the skin vs. nationality)? 2. How did people react to the rants, i.e. onlookers in the videos but also the journalists reporting the rants, the newspaper readers, and politicians? How is multiculturalism defended and/or criticized? My analysis of the videos, newspaper articles and comments left by readers is based on linguistic discourse analysis and on a constructivist approach to the Self and the Other.

Rants against multiculturalism caught on camera in Britain: racism without races?

Fred Dervin

Introduction

This is how Indian Nobel Prize winner Amartya Sen (2006: 152) describes his arrival in Britain in 1953: “I recollect (with some fondness, I must admit) how worried my first landlady at Cambridge was about the possibility that my skin color might come off in the bath (I had to assure her that my hue was agreeably sturdy and durable), and also the care with which she explained to me that writing was a special invention of Western civilization (“the Bible did it”)”. In the early 2000s such recollection, exemplifying a strongly ideological *us vs. them* discourse, would probably puzzle and upset most people – especially the reference to skin colour. Multiculturalism, as a political, educational and scientific approach to *diversities*, has generalized since the 1950s, in Britain and elsewhere, and brought about changes to the way the ‘Other’ is perceived and treated.

In the 1990s the French philosopher Etienne Balibar (1995) foretold an alternative form of differentialist and negative discourses in relation to multiculturalism - *racism without races*. This paper reflects on this prediction by examining a series of rants against multiculturalism in Britain in 2011/2012. Caught on camera, these rants were mediatized and circulated via the Internet (YouTube). Appearing day after day in autumn 2011 in the media, especially around one of the culprits, Emma West, these rants seem to have marked a new level of public aggression towards the ‘Other’.

In this article, I am interested in two sets of questions:

1. What do these rants tell us about how multiculturalism is perceived today? What misconceptions about multiculturalism can be identified in these rants?
2. How did people react to the rants, i.e. onlookers in the videos but also the journalists reporting the rants, the newspaper readers, and politicians? How is multiculturalism defended and/or criticized?

Following Eric Fassin’s suggestion as to how social scientists can tackle racism, I am trying to describe and explain rather than claim to find a clear-cut answer to what causes racism or rather than merely denounce the rants (2006: 27).

1. Reassessing multiculturalism and the old and tired concept of culture

“Does the existence of a diversity of cultures, which might pass each other like ships in the night, count as a successful case of multiculturalism?”
Sen (2006: 156)

In recent years, the idea of *clash of civilisations*, which was presented by political scientist Samuel P. Huntington (1996), has received a considerable amount of criticisms worldwide, especially in research milieus. For A. Appadurai (2006: 115-116), its main default is that it gives an image of multiculturalism where “The world appears as a large series of slowly moving cultural glaciers, with sharp contrasts at their boundaries and little variety within”. He adds that by doing so, thinkers like Huntington remove “history” and “culture” to the analytical box and leave geography as the only “walking stick” to rely on (2006: 164). Appadurai’s critique seems to be

shared by many thinkers and researchers who are interested in multiculturalism. Yet there seems to remain many “misunderstandings” and “misconceptions” about the notion.

The first aspect is related to “variety within”. Anthropologist N.-P. Pieterse reminds us that well before the accelerated multiculturalism of the last decades, European countries, amongst others, combined “people that have been conventionally amalgamated under a political heading (such as Celts, Franks, and others in “France”)” (2004: 33). He concludes therefore that “national identities are *mélange* identities”. For Laplantine and Nouss (1977: 21) national “purity” has no anthropological value and is contradictory to the *mélange* history of Europe – and beyond!

In relation to how multiculturalism is conceptualized, one of the remaining problematic concepts – which composes the word – is culture. According to many scholars in different fields, the concept is “introverted” (Pieterse, 2004: 82), potentially dangerous and it easily leads to “infinite blunders” (Debray, 2007: 27). Following the bomb attacks in London in 2005, political and gender theorist Anne Phillips proposed to consider multiculturalism “without culture” (2007). She claims that “we should be far more wary about promoting the notion of people as products of their culture” (2007: 67) as it makes the concept too stable and fixed. In a later publication, *Culture and Gender* (2010), Phillips argues that this ‘flawed’ use and understanding of culture “misrepresents what is frequently a contested activity” (ibid: 5). Another important point that she makes is that culture can serve as a way of “walling” certain people and groups and thus discriminating against them and not allowing them to take part in societal interactions. Finally culture is often called upon before non- and/or misunderstandings (Phillips, 2007: 65).

It also appears that the notion of hybridity (or *mélange*) hasn’t been taken seriously in research on multiculturalism. Pieterse (2001: 221) asserts that the only occasion during which the notion is used is to highlight “superficial confetti culture and glosses over deep cleavages that exist on the ground”. Hybridity from inside and from outside is often ignored in multiculturalism most probably because of “the fetishism of boundaries that has marked much of history”, Pieterse argues (ibid.). For R. Brubaker (2004: 9) this all leads to a “multichrome mosaic of monochrome ethnic, racial, or cultural blocks”.

The hybridity argument is also shared by Amartya Sen (amongst others) in his book *Identity and Violence* (2006), who criticizes “high theory” for contributing to the ‘boxing’ of individuals. The economist and philosopher reminds us that individuals are influenced by many different elements in their “reasoning” and that “we need not lose our ability to consider other ways of reasoning just because we identify with, and have been influenced by membership in a particular group” (ibid. 34-35). What Sen worries about is the reduction of “many-sided human beings into one dimension” (ibid.: 12), which has been a tendency in many strands of research on multiculturalism (cf. Dervin, 2011). If we go back to Anne Phillips, this sole dimension is often equated to people’s “culture”: “national culture” for “Westerners”, something else for the rest (Amselle, 2010).

2. Racism without races?

In their recent book entitled *The Crises of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age*, Lentin & Titley (2011) assert that we are now witnessing post-racial multiculturalism. By doing so, they agree entirely with what Balibar in the 1990s had

envisioned (cf. introduction). For Lentin and Titley (ibid.), the notion of culture, used in a solid and fixed manner (cf. culturism/culturalism, Dervin, 2012), is increasingly used in attacks on multiculturalism and thus could be substituting the concept of race – which has been central in anti-racist language – in some parts of the world. They also maintain that the concept of race could be ‘hidden’ behind these discourses of culture (ibid.), and the “boundary maintenance” that goes with them (Barth, 1969). As such many studies – starting in anthropology – have showed how culture is used to create, strengthen and maintain boundaries and borders “through the enactment of contrasts with others” (Eriksen, 1995: 435).

Going back to Phillips’ book *Culture and Gender* (2010), the scholar demonstrates clearly how cultural difference is used as a way of establishing hierarchies between people: “There are said to be ‘better’ and ‘worse’, ‘more advanced’ and ‘more backward’ cultures” (2010: 20). In her earlier book (2007: 82), the case of cultural defense in legal matters according to which a person’s cultural background can provide an important explanation as to why they committed a crime is used to show how so-called “cultural traditions” can justify crimes against women. This is ‘practiced’ in the USA, Canada and the UK. The French anthropologist Amselle (2010: 79) also notes that in many countries decision-makers often determine which culture or language suits “minorities” and wonders if this doesn’t represent a way of controlling them and making sure that they do not find an ‘important place’ in society.

So there seems to be a strong agreement amongst many researchers that culture is a “contemporary avatar” of race and racism (Fassin, 2006: 37). Yet this is not the only element of post-racial multiculturalism. As such other forms of essentialization can serve the same purpose: language (Kumaravadivelu, 2008), localism (Pieterse, 2004), attitudes to education (Abdallah-Preteille, 1986) and dichotomies such as East-West. A strong reaction to methodological nationalism (i.e. the nation as the sole explanation to individual’s behaviours, thoughts, values, etc.) is felt in the social sciences, instead, a division of the world in two clear-cut regions (the West and the East) seems to be taking over in some research contexts. However as Sen (2006: 129) puts it: “given the cultural and intellectual interconnections in world history, the question of what is “western” and what is not would be hard to decide”.

3. Data and Methodology

In this paper, I am interested in testing the ideas developed in the previous sections in relation to rants against multiculturalism in British public transport in 2011/2012. I am analyzing four videos but also newspapers articles and comments left by viewers on YouTube. All of the videos were secretly or openly filmed by onlookers (other passengers). The rants analysed here (4) were reported for the first time in the British newspaper *The Daily Mail* on these dates:

- * 29th Nov. 2011 - a woman sitting on a tram between Croydon and Wimbledon.
- * 30th Nov. 2011 - a woman sitting on a train between London and Manchester.
- * 1st Dec. 2011 – a woman sitting on a London underground tube carriage.
- * 6th February 2012 – a woman sitting on a London underground tube carriage.

All the articles on *the Daily Mail* website contain the videos of the rants. These videos show exclusively female ranters. A quick search in YouTube retrieved several other rants against multiculturalism featuring men but also ‘minorities’ (e.g. an “Asian” vs. a “Black” lady). It is impossible to give the actual dates of the rants except for the 6.2. rant which is believed to have been filmed on January 23 2012 according to the Daily Mail. The video of the first rant on the underground was uploaded on YouTube by a friend of the victim in June 2011 (*Daily Mail* 1.12.2011). The duration of the videos varies between 2 to nearly 10 minutes. We need to bear in mind that parts of the rants are missing as e.g. “my friend only realised this was worth filming after about 10 minutes of her rant” (a victim’s friend).

In order to analyze the data, I use a linguistic form of discourse analysis which derives directly from linguistic approaches: utterance theory (inspired by philosophy of language) and dialogism (inspired by Bakhtin’s work). Utterance theory is interested in how language relates to context and its users but also how discourse is constructed through intersubjectivity (Marnette, 2005: 19). By analyzing the use of various pronouns, adjectives, adverbs but also verbs, one can examine how one individual constructs ideas with and through others. Dialogism works hand in hand with utterance theory as it allows researchers to identify the various explicit or implicit voices that compose discourse (Hermans, 2004). These voices are represented by so-called “in/direct speech” (a quote, words borrowed from other people, etc.). It is through the analysis of utterances and dialogism that one can look below the surface level of discourse and make contradictions, identifications and instabilities emerge. According to Lakoff (1990: 1), “language is politics, politics assigns power, power governs how people talk and how they are understood”. The data I propose to analyze represents archetypes of unbalanced situations: all the female ranters are white and they are addressing people who are presented as ‘minorities’.

4. Racist rants and/or rants against multiculturalism?

4.1. Media treatment of the rants: constructing reactions against multiculturalism

Let us start with the articles reporting the rants. My first interest is in the titles of the articles:

- 'You're not British because you're black': Woman charged with racially aggravated harassment after vile rant aboard tram (29.11)
- 'You're in my country now, talk my language': Second woman filmed 'hurling vile racist abuse' (30.11)
- 'BNP, that's me, now f*** off': Vile race rant No.3 caught on camera as ANOTHER woman hurls abuse on a train (1.12)
- Woman filmed hurling racist abuse at Tube passengers in yet ANOTHER video of a vile rant on London transport (6.2.)

We notice that the four articles use the words “racist” and “racially” to describe the contents of the videos. Also the fact that the ranter is a woman in each case is mentioned (note the capitalization of *another* in articles 3 & 4). In three of the articles the direct voices of the ranters are heard: “you’re not British because you’re black”, “you’re in my country, now talk my language” and “BNP (British National Party), that’s me, now f*** off”. The first quote refers to skin colour, the second one to

language while the third one refers to a far-right British party, known for its anti-immigration ideas.

What did the women do and who are the victims? It is interesting to see that, in the way the rants are reported, the same actions took place across the rants: “hurling racist abuse”, “making xenophobic insults” and “jabbing fingers at the victims”. Note that *racist abuse* and *xenophobic insults* seem to be used interchangeably by the journalists. In terms of who is verbally attacked, it is also interesting to notice that all the victims are men. Besides some of them appear to be “foreigners” (Russians, “Middle eastern men” and Asian passengers). In the Emma West video the target is a group of passengers but no mention of nationality is made. The problem with these classifications is that we are not sure if the victims are all foreigners or British. At least in two of the videos some of the attacked people insist that they are themselves “British”.

While reading the articles, it often appears unclear who posted the rants on YouTube (use of the passive voice: “has been posted online”), except for two of the videos (29.11 and 1.12). For the 1.12 video the newspaper lets “a friend of the victim” nicknamed OptimessPrime talk: “I am posting this video to show how this woman **racially** abused my friend on the London Underground during a busy period (...) the reason as to why she became agitated is because my friend was having a quiet conversation with his friend in Russian and she was sitting in front of them”. The event is also labeled “racial” by the friend and he gives the reason why she started ranting: the use of a foreign language.

Now let’s turn to the direct voices that are reported by the newspaper in the four articles. Few direct voices are heard from the other passengers (“Keep your mouth shut”) and the victims (“Welcome to London!”). One journalist includes the voice of one YouTube viewer who says: “As a white British male, I feel disgusted to even be associated with this woman by my race and nationality”. In the four articles around 20 direct quotes from the ranters are inserted or repeated. The following table classifies these quotes in terms of what difference(s) they claim between the ranter and the ‘Other’ and in terms of argument(s) against multiculturalism:

Difference	Quote
Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Learn the lingo and then think about coming back you ***** p*****” - “You’re in my country now, talk my language. Don’t f***** talk your *****, talk my language. You *****, *****”
Nationality/origins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “None of you are ****ting English. Get back to your own country. Sort your own countries, don’t come and do mine” - “where do you come from? F***** like, f***** all over the world”
Skin colour	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - (At one point she claims passengers in the carriage are) “****ting burnt people” - “You’re not British because you’re black”
Argument against	Quote
Illegality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “I’d like to know if any of you are f***** illegal, I’m sure 30 per cent of you are. It’s taking the f***** p*****” - “I hope they f***** catch up with you and shove you off” - “This is what we’ve got to put up with... that’s what we don’t like about you people. I’ll show you what kind of

	<p>government lets people like you in”</p> <p>- “I shall punch you in the f***** face. Ninety per cent of you are f***** illegal. I wouldn't mind if you loved our country”</p>
Economy	<p>- “We have got enough of you ***** muppets in our country, stealing out jobs, ***** taking the English jobs”</p> <p>- “Yeah, welcome to London, get all the benefits, get everything free. Yeah loser, that’s the only reason you are here”</p> <p>- “As long as you're f***** working, and not claiming benefits”</p>

Three ‘canonical’ differences are mentioned by the ranters: language, nationality and skin colour. Apart from the two references to skin colour, no mention of specific countries, languages or religions was identified in the reported voices. The targets thus appear to include people from “all over the world”. Interestingly, although the concept of culture has been much discussed in scholarship on multiculturalism, the word doesn’t appear a single time. The arguments against multiculturalism are rather classical (*stealing our jobs, claiming benefits*).

The article published on 29.11 reproduces a transcript of Emma West’s rants. After having compared what the journalist calls “the horrific transcript” with the video, it is interesting to see that the ranters’ interlocutors are absent from the transcription. Let me take two excerpts that do not appear in the article. In the first one, while the ranter is arguing with a woman (“You ain't ****ing British. **** off. You’re black You ain't British, you're black”), another woman intervenes and says:

Will you calm down because you’re ****ing waking up my baby up! So do you wanna shut your mouth? Look shhhh. And now you’re waking my baby up and I am English what have you got to say to me? **** all! Now shut your mouth!

Interestingly, the white woman intervenes for herself (“I am English what have you got to say to me?”) but not to defend the passengers who are being abused.

In the next excerpt, which was deleted from the transcription, the ranter interacts aggressively with another passenger. She has just asked the people around her to “Go back to where you come from, go back to ****ing Nicaragua or where ever you come from”. The other passenger says:

If we don’t come here you guys don’t want to work
You guys don’t want to work. We have to do the work for you. Go and work!

The use of the pronoun “we” here serves the same purpose as in the ranter’s use of *we/our*: to place a boundary between in-groups and out-groups. Interestingly, the same woman repeats several times that she is British when the ranter questions who she is (“you’re not British! You’re black!”), thus including herself in the “we” that she claims doesn’t want to work.

4.2. Transcriptions of the rants and comments left by viewers: unstable and multifaceted racism

This section concentrates on the rants as they appear in the videos posted on Youtube. Most of the videos start with an aggressive tone: two about language (“You’re in my country now talk my language talk my language ****”; “Learn the linguo and think about coming back you ****ing retard don’t ****ing wind me up”); one about origins (“What has this country come to? A load of black people and a load of ****ing Polish. A load of ****ing in”). The fourth one begins with a justification as to why the woman is ranting: “She pushed me she ****ing pushed me”. Based on the video it is impossible to say who pushed who and how the argument started.

In terms of interaction, the videos differ amply. Two of them contain violent arguments between the ranter and the man who is filming her and the ranter and a large group of passengers. In the remaining videos the ranters hurl insults at a small group of passengers (Russians and Middle eastern men) but none of them really respond to them. The argument between the ranter and the man who is filming on the underground is based on origins. The ranter is surrounded by two “Asian” men (according to the *Daily Mail*) and we assume that the person who is filming is acquainted with them. The ranter says that she is British but that she lives in the “United Nations”. Following this revelation, they have the following discussion about origins:

Man: You know you have no right to ask me if I am British none of your business

Ranter: But you’re asking me but I am not allowed to ask you

Man: It’s not your country anyway

Ranter: Yeah we’ve been overtaken by people like you.

As we shall see later on, the ranter’s last argument was identified in most rants. In the video about the Middle eastern men being harassed because they speak Arabic, a few passengers try to intervene. They are met with the following: “I don’t even want to hear you **** off lady you don’t even know what you are talking about **** off”.

As asserted earlier on, what is surprising about the rants is the similarities in terms of settings but also arguments used against multiculturalism. The question of origins is found in all the rants: “Where do you come from?”; “You ain't English. No, you ain't English either. You ain't English. None of you's ****ing English”; “Go back to where you come from, go back to ****ing Nicaragua or where ever you come from”. Another argument is that of the number of immigrants in Britain is overwhelming for her: “Yeah we’ve been overtaken by people like you”; “this is my British country until they/we let you lot come over” (note the interesting use of “my” in this quote). Finally, the aspect of language was found in all the rants: “You’re in my country now talk my language talk my language”. Again the use of the first person possessive pronoun says a lot about the *us vs. them* game taking place in the rants (Eriksen, 1995).

To finish with, I would like to examine a few comments that were left on YouTube with the videos. Of course we need to be careful with such comments as they are anonymous and often quite playful. Yet I believe that they can provide us with interesting features of discourses on multiculturalism. Based on a discourse analysis of the comments, I retain five types of comments: racist, anti-racist, (neo-)colonizing, comments about language and meta-analysis of the rants. Let us

start with the racist comments. Many of the racist comments defend the ranters (e.g. “luv this lady cause she is standing up and speaking her mind”). These comments range from a mere “White power” to a long racist comment about the Blacks, Muslims and Jews. Interestingly the author of the latter claims that his comment is not racist: “Return them back to their native country, and everyone is happy! Well this is not a racist comment, it's only not acceptable, letting other people coming to your country, for what? So they can destroy it, stealing your stuff? Etc.”.

The second element found in the comments counterbalance these comments – even though they are less frequent. Two of these comments stand out. The first one is a reply to the viewer who claims that his racist comment is not racist: “well it kind of is a racist comment, when you say " black people" you make out that all black people aren't English in which case some have family trees that date back to 200 years ago you're also making out that all black people steal and destroy other people's property for argument's sake, what if a black man has a family and has a paying career of 35 thousand pounds per year, what do they do, just get up and leave? black are just like all other people”. The latter part of the comment illustrates well a constructionist approach to multiculturalism (cf. section 1). The other comment, which opposes the ranter's arguments, seems to have been posted by a foreigner who works in the UK (s/he writes: “IM MOVING BACK TO ****ING POLAND”). The argument s/he uses is very close to that of the passenger on the tram whose words were not reproduced in the Daily Mail: “If she wanna do something about the benefits then she should tell all the British **** to get their asses to work and educate themselves so that they get the qualification they like”. By doing so s/he also essentialises British people. Besides racist and anti-racist comments, many viewers include references to British (neo)colonization in what they have to say. References to history are many: “The Brits were not upset when they took over half the world and made people work for them, now were they?”; “The reason we are here lady is because you guys were in my country for 200 years. I am just helping return the favour!”. Other comments link history and today's situation: “Didn't U.K. robbed countless wealth from them in colonial age? The world's largest bloodsucker left south asia extrem under-developed, and then they can play hypocritical high class and moral in front of the world”. This viewer ends her/his comment with “Yeah, perfect Olympic Ads...”.

As we have seen throughout the article, language is an omnipresent argument against multiculturalism. This is also reflected in the comments with people, on the one hand, supporting the idea that one should learn the local language (“I don't like her way of talking but I think also that if I decided to move to another country I HAVE TO RESPECT THIS NEW COUNTRY and at least try to learn there LANGUAGE...”) and, on the other, people “throwing back” at British people the fact that they don't speak any other language than English (“we go to Spain and Italy on holidays we don't speak Italian or Spanish when we are there do we?”). Another discussion in relation to language revolves around the right to speak a foreign language in private circumstance: “People have the right to speak whatever language they want in private conversations, which is what it was when they were on the train”. Yet this viewer argues that “It's a different matter if they're at work, there they should speak the native language with co-workers, customers, etc.”.

I have labeled the final type of comments “meta-analysis of the rants”. In a way what some of the viewers do is that they analyse the rants by identifying the contradictions, the ideology behind the arguments used by the ranters, and the situations. The first meta-analysis concerns contradictions in the ranter's line of

argument: “funny how they are taking all the English jobs yet they are only here for the benefits can’t have it both ways stupid ****”. The next one touches upon typical aspects of anti-multiculturalism: “love how she throws in the benefit argument at the end”. Finally one viewer wonders about the sociolinguistic similarities between the ranters: “why do these woman all sound the same?! they all come from the same council estate or something?”.

Conclusion

This article was an attempt to describe and explain violent rants against multiculturalism in Britain that had been discussed heavily in the media. My starting point was the claim that many societies are now experiencing post-racial multiculturalism and that this has an influence on discourses on racism (Balibar, 1995; Lentin & Titley, 2011). In reviewing and reassessing multiculturalism it became clear that the concept of *culture* was central in this new phenomenon – rather than *race*.

The data that I have analysed seem to corroborate the idea of post-racial racism. I could identify only one reference to “race” in the videos but many references to language skills, nationality and the legal status of immigrants. This reference derives from a confusion between nationality (“You ain’t British!”) and skin colour (“you’re black!”). Of course, we need to bear in mind that many “racist with race” thoughts might also be hiding behind the omnipresent question “where are you from?” in the rants. The newspaper articles and the comments left on YouTube tended to brand the rants as *racist* – even though race was rarely mentioned in the criticisms of the ranters. As we saw, another ‘hidden’ confusion was contained in the remark made several times by one of the attacked persons in one of the videos about immigrants having come to Britain to do the work that “English people” do not want to do – even though she kept repeating that she was British herself.

It thus appears that the concept of racism has taken on a different meaning in our times of accelerated multiculturalism. Yet the 2011/2012 rants do not confirm the idea that culture is central in discourses on multiculturalism. Neither was the argument of non-/mis-understanding across “cultures” present. Boundaries and borders between the ranters and their victims rely on such aspects as nationality, origins and language. In a way all these elements represent archetypical components of the Modern Era as Michel Maffesoli (2010) or Zygmunt Bauman (2004) have described them in opposition to Postmodernity or Liquid Modernity. These rants appear to be remnants of these eras; a seemingly apparent inability to cope with multiple identities, hybridity and confusion as to who is “within” and “outside”. They also symbolize strong power relations between the so-called “native” and the “minorities”. Interestingly too is the fact that religion was not mentioned as single time, even though it has been used heavily as a counter-argument against multiculturalism, especially in relation to the Muslim faith.

To conclude I would like to comment on the difficulties faced by researchers when they work on such events. As such it was very challenging to describe and analyse the ‘actors’ in the videos. The discourses or images contained do not allow identifying them and I feared that I might fall into the same trap as the ranters as a white scholar if I put a label on who they are. For example, some passengers spoke in a strong accent in English but this can’t allow us to classify them as foreigners (they might have a British passport, they might have been born in Britain). The same goes for the ‘Asian looking’ passengers. It was in fact easier to examine how the

newspapers qualified them and to deconstruct their discourses. This is an important message about the ethics contained in researching racism and multiculturalism (Fassin, 2006).

References

- Abdallah-Preteuille, M. 1986. *Vers une pédagogie interculturelle*. Paris: PUF.
- Amselle, J.-L. 2010. *Rétrovolution*. Paris: Stock.
- Appadurai, A. 2006. *Fear of Small Numbers: An Essay on the Geography of Anger*. Duke University Press.
- Balibar, E. 1991. "Is there a neo-racism?". In Balibar, E. & Wallerstein, I. (eds.). *Race, Nation, Class*. London: Verso.
- Barth, F. 1969. "Introduction". In Barth, F. (ed.). *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 9-38.
- Bauman, Z. 2004. *Identity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Brubaker, R. 2004. *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Harvard University Press.
- Debray, R. 2007. *Un mythe contemporain: le dialogue des civilisations*. Paris: CNRS.
- Dervin, F. 2011. "A plea for change in research on intercultural discourses: A 'liquid' approach to the study of the acculturation of Chinese students". *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*. Vol. 6, No. 1, 37-52.
- Dervin, F. 2012. *Impostures interculturelles*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Eriksen, T. H. 1995. "We and Us: two modes of group identification". *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 32, No. 4, 427-436.
- Fassin, D. 2006. "Nommer, interpréter. Le sens commun de la question raciale". In Fassin, D. & Fassin, E. (eds.). *De la question sociale à la question raciale*. Paris: La Découverte, 27-43.
- Hermans, H. J. M. 2004. "Introduction: the dialogical self in a global and digital age". *Identity*, Vol. 4, No. 4, 297-320.
- Huntington, S. P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kumaravadivelu, K. 2008. *Cultural Globalization and Language Education*. Yale University Press.
- Lakoff, R. 1990. *Talking Power*. NY: Basic Books.
- Laplantine, F. & Nouss, A. 1977. *Le métissage*. Paris: Flammarion.
- Lentin, A. & Titley, G. 2011 *The Crises of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age*. NY: Zed Books.
- Maffesoli, M. 2010. *Le temps revient, forms élémentaires de la postmodernité*. Paris: DDB.
- Marnette, S. 2005. *Speech and Thought Presentation in French: Concept and Strategies*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Phillips, A. 2007. *Multiculturalism without Culture*. Oxford: OUP.
- Phillips, A. 2010. *Culture and Gender*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Pieterse, N. P. 2001. "Hybridity, So What? The Anti-Hybridity Backlash and the Riddles of Recognition". *Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 18, No. 2-3, 219-245.
- Pieterse, N. P. 2004. *Globalization and culture: Global mélange*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Sen, A. 2006. *Violence and Identity*. New Delhi: Penguins.