LONDONGRAD IN THE UK QUALITY PRESS: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

How do UK newspapers employ the term *Londongrad* and how has this changed over time and between different newspapers?

by

Ben Dukes
s1424181

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in *Russian and Eurasian Studies*

at

Leiden University
(Universiteit Leiden)

June 2015

Abstract

This thesis examines the use of the word *Londongrad* in four British national newspapers and draws extensively upon the approach to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) outlined by Richardson [2007]. The study compares the use of *Londongrad* in a sample of articles from two time periods: 2005-8 and 2011-14, defining how it is used and how its use has changed over time, with reference to wider social, political and cultural contexts.

Results indicate that *Londongrad* is particularly prevalent in the right-wing press, and that its use has become more prominent over time. The thesis puts forward the argument that *Londongrad* lacks concrete definition but carries implicit meaning that allows for the reinforcement of negative stereotypes with regard to Russian activity in the UK. In highlighting this, the intention is to draw attention to the way in which patterns of discourse can encode prejudice.

Contents

i. Introduction

This thesis examines the use of the word *Londongrad* in the British press and attempts to answer the following research question:

How do UK newspapers employ the term Londongrad and how has this changed over time and between different newspapers?

It intends to contribute to a greater body of academic research into the way in which Russia and Russians are portrayed in Western media, a subject that has received remarkably light coverage in previous literature, particularly when compared to the large number of publications dedicated to Russian media representations of the West. Of particular note in this area is Rawlinson (1998), who describes the "Cold War rhetoric and simplistic dichotomy"[1] and penchant for sensationalism in coverage of the growth of Russian organised crime in Western countries. Also of note is Jerman (2004), who examines the representation of Russians in Finnish TV documentaries, noting the reliance on cliché and the power of the media in constructing and reaffirming national and cultural identities.[2]

Londongrad does not seem to have been the subject of analysis in wider literature, despite having become seemingly ubiquitous in discussion of Russian activity in the UK. As such, this thesis attempts to shed light on its usage, and offer an assessment of how it is used, what it represents, and what it tells as about attitudes towards Russia and/or Russians in the UK. I do this by analysing, from a critical perspective, a select body of journalistic articles in national newspapers across two time periods, comparing how *Londongrad* is employed.

[1] Rawlinson, Patricia: "Mafia, Media and Myth: Representations of Russian Organized Crime"
[2] Jerman, Helena: "Russians as Presented in TV Documentaries" in (The Global Review of Ethnopolitics, 3:2, University of Helsinki 01/2004) p. 79

ii. Outline of Chapters

The first Chapter of this thesis outlines the theoretical framework that forms the basis for my textual analysis, notably Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and my reasoning behind taking this approach. In particular I have adopted the model of CDA as outlined by Richardson (2007) but draw upon the literature of other prominent researchers working with discourse theory [Fairclough (1995), Foucault (1977), Jorgensen & Philips (2002), van Dijk (1995)].

The methodology of this thesis can be found in Chapter 2, with reference to the online search tool Factiva that has provided access to a suitable range of texts for analysis.

Chapter 3 offers an overview of the British press, with regard to Fowler (1991) Cole & Harcup (2010) and van Dijk (1998) and an exploration of the literature surrounding representation and stereotyping in journalistic output [Khosravnik (2008)]. I also offer in this chapter an introductory examination of the word *Londongrad* itself, its origins and its potential to take on the characteristics of a buzzword, in accordance with Cornwall's (2010) definition.

Chapter 4 deals with socio-political context, namely the UK-Russia political relationship and the growth of the Russian émigré population in the UK in the 21st century, along with high profile incidents and individuals that are likely to have an influence on media output associated with Russia or Russians.

Finally, Chapter 5 offers the results of my analysis of *Londongrad* in the UK with reference to the literature. In the analysis I offer an assessment of how *Londongrad* tends to be used, a content analysis of broad thematic trends alongside a closer reading of the language. The thesis ends with a conclusion highlighting the results of this analysis and the significance of my findings.

1: Discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

1.1 Discourse and Discourse Analysis

In this thesis I examine the use of *Londongrad* in British newspapers in accordance with the principles of discourse analysis. Firstly it is necessary to establish what we mean by "discourse", a rather abstract term which is used either in a vague sense or in relation to specific contexts.[3] As such, any researcher in *discourse analysis* must declare what is meant by the term in the context of their work. To do this I will examine the ways it has been defined by others. Richardson summarises *discourse* succinctly as "language in use"[4] which is a solid basis but as he himself admits is one that requires elaboration. For Trew, *discourse* is "a field of both ideological processes and linguistic processes [and that there is] a determinate relation between these two kinds of process."[5] This is similar to the definition provided by Jorgensen and Phillips, for whom language is structured and understood according to patterns associated with a particular social domain and which people tend to follow.[6] Consequently discourse is "a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of it)".[7]

If discourse is understood to be a pattern of communication within a particular context, Machin and van Leeuwen draw upon Martin's definition of "discourse" as "socially constructed knowledge"[8] which has the power to "selectively represent and transform" as a result of a given context. When the word discourse is used then, the emphasis is the transformative aspects of communication resulting from the various actors involved, as well as the time and place, and has significant power to determine how the public perceives a given event.

Discourse may also refer to the "verbal dimension"[9] of this act of communication, which I interpret to mean its form and content. It may also refer to genre: "the discourse of news

---

[3] Jorgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise: *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (SAGE, London 2002), p. 1
[4] Richardson, John, E: *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis* (Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire 2007) p. 237
[5] Ramos, Fernando Prieto: *Ethnic Alterity in the News: Discourse on Immigration in the Spanish and Irish Press, 1990-2000* (Dublin City University, 2002) p. 22
[6] Jorgensen, M. and Phillips, L.: op. cit, p. 1
[7] Ibid.
[8] Machin, David & Van Leeuwen, Theo: *Global Media Discourse: A Critical Introduction* (Routledge, London 2007) p. 61.
[9] Richardson, op. cit, p. 237-8

reporting"[10] or "public discourse" in a general sense, to take two examples, and refer to the patterns of language that characterize these particular social domains. Other uses of the term might relate to what Richardson calls "social domains", for examples the "discourse of politics" or the "discourse of espionage," in which a text takes on the rhetorical characteristics or linguistic features of these forms. I take as an example the following headline from the Daily Express:

"Could fallout from the Litvinenko poisoning mean a new Cold War?"[11]

The double meaning of "fallout" as meaning both *consequences* and *nuclear waste* references both the radioactive substance used in Alexander Litvinenko's murder and rhetorically links it to a return the political games of the Soviet era. Set in isolation the headline might indicate a discourse of "war", "espionage" or "danger", and without actually saying as much, frames Russia as an enemy and a threat. As noted by Foucault, however, whose work has had significant influence on the development of discourse analysis, any attempt to categorize or classify discourse is never intrinsic or absolute,[12] and the way in which a text is read can be interpreted in a large number of different ways.

If *discourse* refers to patterns of speech then *discourse analysis* would be the analysis of those patterns. According to Fairclough's definition discourse analysis is "an attempt to show systematic links between texts, discourse practices, and sociocultural practices." [13] Fairclough's definition of "discourse analysis" means that examinations of the discourse of a particular article should be linked as a way of highlighting trends in discourse practices. He argues that this offers the researcher a clear way of connecting linguistic analysis, which focus on micro-analysis of individual texts, with social analysis, which explores the way in which texts are produced and received, and the wider contexts that the individual texts are situated. By employing this method this paper is able to link an examination of language in individual texts, the wider trends of discourse that might be evident across multiple texts, and the historical and ideological contexts that inform them, namely when the article was written, by which newspaper or writer, and for what possible purpose. Fairclough argues that the analysis of texts is gradually returning to prominence after many years in which the analysis of the reception of texts held sway in media studies.

---

[10] Ibid, p. 238
[11] Stewart, Will: "Could fallout from the Litvinenko poisoning mean a new Cold War?" Daily Express, 23/5/2007
[12] Foucault, Michel: *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans: Sheridan Smith, A.M.: (Pantheon, New York, 1972) p. 22
[13] Fairclough, Norman: *Media Discourse* (Edward Arnold, London, 1995) p. 17

1.2 Foucault: Knowledge/Power & Discourse

Hook notes that the growth popularity of discursive analysis has led to widespread misinterpretation or misapplication of the ideas of philosopher and social theorist Michel Foucault, and any form of discourse analysis, however loosely it is connected with his original theories has often come to be described as "Foucauldian".[14] It is not within the scope of this paper to examine in great detail the intricacies of Foucault's critical theories, (which as Hook concedes were not by any means "unchanging, clear, simple and unproblematic").[15] However it is important to note that his theories have had a great influence on discourse analysis. In particular his work on the knowledge/power relationship, which he describes in the following way:

"Knowledge linked to power, not only assumes the authority of 'the truth' but has the power to make itself true. All knowledge, once applied in the real world, has effects, and in that sense at least, 'becomes true.'"[16]

The concept that power both determines and is determined by knowledge, and when reproduced can enact truth, has been used as the basis for exploring power relations and power effects in texts.[17] Applied to discourse, Foucault writes:

"We must make allowance for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it"[18]

In his work *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Foucault describes discourse as being "constituted by a group of sequences of signs, in so far as they are statements, that is, in so far

[14] Hook, Derek: *Discourse, knowledge, materiality, history: Foucault and discourse analysis* (LSE Research Online, London 2007) p. 1
[15] Ibid, p. 39
[16] Foucault, Michel (1977) in Hall, Stuart (ed): *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (SAGE Publications, London & New York 2003) p. 49
[17] Powers, Penny: "The Philosophical Foundations of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis" in *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines,* 1:2, (Thompson Rivers University, 2007) p. 32
[18] Foucault, M.: *The History of Sexuality: an Introduction,* trans. Hurley, Robert (Penguin, London, 1990) p. 101

as they can be assigned particular modalities of existence" [19] For him, discourse analysis could not remain within the text, but must also take into account factors outside the text itself, possibly political, social, or genealogical, which provide it with relevance beyond the texts themselves,[20] and all of which have an effect on power relations.

Foucault also has much to say about the way in which discourse is presented: "in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality."[21] He describes these limiting factors as "systems of exclusion" which "forge discourse".[22] There are a whole number of practices which enact upon discourse and may give it a semblance of neutrality when in fact they are far from neutral, and it is this active search for bias in a series of texts that forms the basis of Critical Discourse Analysis.

Analysis of discourse therefore can be seen as an interpretation of the effects of power inherent in discourse on a particular social group, and through various methodologies it builds on the philosophical works of Foucault.

1.3 Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and its Function

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is one of many approaches that can be taken in order to analyse discourse, and comes under the wider conceptual term of *social constructivist discourse analysis*.[23] It can be seen as a stance from which to perform a discourse analysis, rather than a method as such. It balances the flexible approach to discourse analysis inspired by Foucault and dealt with in depth by Fairclough, which I mentioned previously, alongside an examination of linguistic and structural features of texts.[24] As a result it is an appropriate form of analysis for my research, allowing a selection of articles based on the keyword *Londongrad* and setting its use in a wider context of production and consumption. In addition, in terms of methodology it is not at all proscriptive, allowing for a method that can be tailored to a particular research topic.

---

[19] Foucault, M.: *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, op. cit, p. 107
[20] Hook, D.: op. cit, p. 38
[21] Foucault, M.: "The Order of Discourse" (Inaugural Lecture at the Collège de France 2/12/1970) in Young, Robert: *Untying The Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston, London & Henley, 1981) p. 52
[22] Ibid, p. 55
[23] Jorgensen, M. & Phillips, L.: op. cit, p. 1
[24] Graham, Linda J.: *Discourse Analysis and the Critical Use of Foucault* (Queensland University, 2005) p. 3

Despite the fact that it is multidisciplinary and there are a variety of methodological ways of performing a CDA, there are also consistencies to the approach that have been identified and used by notable advocators of it, notably van Dijk, van Leeuwen, Wodak and Faircough. CDA begins by identifying a social problem and takes a moral or political stance towards it,[25] and is employed with the aim of highlighting: "ideology and power"[26] in a text or texts. It follows then that practitioners of CDA intend to enact positive change on society by highlighting imbalances of power or ingrained prejudices.[27] Wodak points out that CDA researchers must make explicitly state their own motives and interests up front, thus recognizing that the research itself is part of discursive practice.[28] As such, proponents of the method tend to be very open about their political agenda, which is often informed by Marxist ideologies and has the broad motive of promoting liberal and egalitarian discourses in society, and promote awareness of unbalanced power relations (referred to by Fairclough as *critical language awareness*.)[29]

A CDA might look to reveal what is implicitly coded or not immediately obvious behind the language patterns of a text or series of texts in order to reveal the ways in which dominant ideologies and are propagated through discourse, particularly with regard to groups or social structures which are often victims of inequality, such as those ascribing to a particular "class, gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, language, religion, age, nationality and world-region."[30] This means that in order to perform a CDA it is necessary to place oneself in the position of a marginalised, disempowered or maligned group and argue from that standpoint, an openly critical position that has proved controversial.

Given that there is no strict method I shall be following Richardson's interpretation of CDA, whose 2007 work *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis* is specifically tailored towards analysing newspaper content, as well as being a relatively up-to-date and revised approach to CDA, with a clearly defined structure. As outlined above it opens by declaring the author's political stance with a critique of capitalist structures in maintaining inequality. It forms as its starting point for analysis the following five assumptions about language, all of which draw upon previously outlined discussions of media discourse:

[25] Richardson, J.E.: op cit. p. 2
[26] Wang, Jiayu: "Criticising Images: Critical Discourse Analysis of Visual Semiosis in Picture News" in *Critical Arts: South-North Cultural and Media Studies*, 28:2, April 2014) p. 2
[27] Richardson, J.E.: op. cit, p. 26
[28] Wodak, R. & Meyer, M.: *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis* (Sage, London 2009) p. 3
[29] Jorgensen, M. & Phillips, L.: op. cit, p. 88
[30] van Dijk, T.A.: "Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis" in Japanese Discourse vol. 1 (1995) p. 18

1) "Language is social" (in that it interacts with society, a point related to Fairclough's argument that journalism is both "transformative" and "reproductive.")
2) "Language use enacts identity" by which a text is the projection of the way in which its author wants to be perceived.
3) "Language use is active", meaning that a text is always produced with a purpose in mind, according to Richardson "quality" newspaper articles are primarily designed to *inform, expose* or *argue.*
4) "Language has power": it has the power to inform politics, shape public outlook or determine an agenda.
5) "Language use is political": it is not simply a neutral transmission of fact but comes with its own agenda, which if we accept points 1) to 3) must certainly be true.[31]

In performing a CDA in relation to the word *Londongrad* in articles found in British newspapers I am from the outset identifying its use as problematic, and in accordance with the five assumptions listed above, as having a potentially negative social affect. For reasons which will be examined later in the paper, *Londongrad* has the potential to become a convenient shorthand for channelling anti-Russian sentiment, or helping to reinforce long-standing suspicions of Russia and/or Russians in society, and that such perceptions are unjust and detrimental.

Richardson advocates what he refers to as a "materialist" rather than "idealist" approach to CDA,[32] by which he intends to link discourse to the sociocultural background that informs it, relating directly to "real historical actors, their interests, their alliance, their practices…"[33] His framework proposes a three stage analysis of journalistic discourse, drawing upon definitions put forward by Fairclough:

1. *Textual analysis*: An examination of texts from a linguistic perspective,[34] which may include an analysis of sentence construction, rhetorical devices, narrative sequence or other linguistic tools and techniques.
2. *Discursive practices*: "the processes that journalists use to construct news texts for an identified (or imagined) target audience,"[35] and the way in which these texts are

[31] Richardson J.E.: op. cit, pp. 10-13
[32] Ibid, p. 147
[33] Ibid
[34] Ibid, p. 46
[35] Ibid, p. 112

understood by an audience. They refer specifically to the way in which texts are produced and understood according to already available patterns of discourse.[36]

3. *Social practices*: "the relationship between journalism and the wider social world"[37] in relation to economics, politics and ideology. The term *Social practices* refers to the relationship of journalists with external institutions and values, and so can be viewed as an examination of society in relation to discourse.

There might be significant overlap between these three categories and they do not necessarily need to be clearly delineated. It is, however, a useful model to refer to and will allow both macro- and micro-analysis of a text and texts, within the context of their production.

1.4 Problems associated with CDA

The first limitation associated with CDA is finding a balance between in depth textual analysis and intertextual analysis. While it might be useful to explore in depth a small pool of articles, with a close examination of grammatical and structural features, it reduces the ability of the researcher to link textual analysis to discursive and social practices (a small pool of material provides much weaker evidence of bias or prejudice in wider society.) Similarly, examination of a wide pool of articles might necessitate a less thorough textual analysis in favour of broad intertextual trends and practices. A researcher needs to be able to find a balance that works for their particular research question.

The second limitation refers specifically to textual analysis, for which there is a vast array of grammatical, syntactical and linguistic features that one could choose to examine. How should a researcher begin to select the textual features, and prioritise some over others?

The third problem is that although it is assumed that there is a relationship between discourse and society, it is difficult to prove where this relationship begins and ends. CDA involves a great amount of assumption as to the relationship between the reproduction of texts and society. How can one state with absolute confidence that a text has power and influence, or prove that the readership will respond to discourse in a particular way? Where can a line between discursive and societal practices be drawn, if at all? Jorgensen and Phillips concede that there is a significant lack of research into consumption of texts,[38] and that the limitations of Fairclough's (and Richardson's) CDA approach must be recognised. This being said,

[36] Ibid, p. 75
[37] Ibid, p. 147
[38] Jorgensen, M. & Phillips, L.: op. cit, p. 90

researchers in including van Dijk have conducted some empirical research into the influence of print journalism on the formation of public opinion, which I will expand upon in Chapter 3.

1.5 Concluding Remarks

In this Chapter I offer an overview of CDA and determine why it is suitable for analysing *Londongrad* in the British press. It could be argued that some of the weaknesses of CDA are also its strengths, as it isn't overly prescriptive and there are a variety of different approaches that could be taken by a researcher. The way in which this paper proceeds to use CDA is outlined in Chapter 2.

2: Methodology

2.1 Research question:

How do UK newspapers employ the term 'Londongrad' and how has this changed over time and between different newspapers?

2.2 Research Tool: *Factiva*

Both Richardson and Fairclough emphasise the importance of intertextuality in discourse analysis: that is to say, texts shouldn't be discussed in isolation.[39] The relationship between different texts and the context that informed their creation, whether institutional, chronological or social, are also very important. To source the texts for my analysis I have selected the online media-analytics programme Factiva, which compiles news articles into a database from a wide range of newspapers from across the globe and allows filters to be applied so that patterns and trends can be identified by the user.

I selected for this thesis the four most widely read "quality" papers in the UK: *The Guardian, The Independent, The Telegraph,* and *The Times*. They were selected according to their total readership rather than their total circulation, as online content accounts for a large share of their modern news distribution. This allows me to include articles that have been published exclusively online as well as in printed copies (with the possible exception of the Times which runs a paid-for subscription service for online content.) I have included both weekly and weekend editions of the publications in question, so for example, articles from both The Times and The Sunday Times are included in my analysis. These four newspapers can be seen as representative of the mainstream press and are therefore also representative of prevalent media discourses on Russia.

In using this resource, it was possible to identify two four-year time periods where there was evident growth in how frequently *Londongrad* featured in published newspaper articles in the UK. The articles selected were all those which features the word *Londongrad*. I excluded only articles which mentioned *Londongrad* in reference to the title of another work, for example in reference to Hollingworth's journalistic book of the same name. The reason for this is that the use of the word as part of a book title offers less opportunity for contextual analysis.

[39] Richardson: J.E.: op. cit, p. 100

Determinate rather than random sampling: all articles featuring *Londongrad* on Factiva included, within time framework.

> **Period 1: 2005-2008:** Guardian – 0 articles; Independent - 7 articles; Telegraph – 6 articles; Times – 4 articles
>
> **Period 2: 2011-2014:** Guardian – 5 articles; Independent – 2 articles; Telegraph – 9 articles; Times – 11 articles.

2.3 Limitations of Factiva

While it remains a convenient sampling tool, there are certain limitations to the use of Factiva for a CDA. The most significant is that while the source text is provided in its entirety, the original forms of the texts are no longer visible. We cannot see, for example, what images might have accompanied the article in question, where it was positioned on a page, on what page of the newspaper it was first published, or any parts that might have been made more prominent through use of typographic style (font). Although it is fairly uncommon, CDA can also be employed to analyse non-verbal forms,[40] In the case of this paper it will not be possible, so I will be limiting my analysis to verbal forms, which will still offer plenty of scope for investigation.

The second limitation might derive from the Factiva database itself. While it contains a sufficiently large body of texts, it is impossible to be entirely certain that all articles published in these four newspapers within the concerned timeframe have been compiled, and it is also impossible to tell how many, if any, omissions there are. Nonetheless, within my framework, Factiva provides on its database 47 articles to be analysed, which is a sufficient body of texts to work from. It also means I will avoid the need to personally select articles for analysis, thus evading criticism sometimes levelled at CDA that it can lead to biased sampling methods that support a particular hypothesis.[41]

2.4 Structure of Analysis

In advance of providing the results of the Critical Discourse Analysis it useful to demonstrate how these results have been constructed. The analysis is divided chronologically into two

[40] van Dijk, T.A.: *Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis,* op. cit, p. 18
[41] Breeze, Ruth: "Critical Discourse Analysis and its Critics" in (*Pragmatics* 21:4, International Pragmatics Association, 2011) p. 503

sections: Period 1 and Period 2, with each described separately and points of comparison and difference drawn. I have listed five areas that have been considered, with the intention of including enough detail to draw satisfactory conclusions. While *Londongrad* forms the focus point of my sampling method and investigation, it cannot be understood without an examination of the wider context. The analysis is primarily textual but also draws where appropriate upon discursive and social practices that inevitably have a bearing on the language: this will help to explain the reason behind any trends that can be spotted.

1) My first aim will be to look at the word *Londongrad* itself, to investigate who is using it, and whether its use can be considered positive or negative. I will also suggest whether *Londongrad*'s meaning is implicit or explicit, and if clearly defined, what exactly it represents within the context of the article. It is also worth noting whether the word is prominent in a particular article or mentioned fleetingly, as well as the frequency of its appearance between newspapers and time periods.

2) Examining a single word's usage necessarily leads to an examination of the wider context. As such I will explore the subject matter of the articles: who or what do they focus on, what topical trends can be seen, what sources and statistics are drawn upon and again is this representation of the subject matter broadly positive or negative? In doing this I will offer points of comparison and difference between newspapers and time periods.

3) I have discussed the imprecise and variable usage of *discourse*, but to take Richardson's offering of discourse as "social domain" I will examine the thematic characteristics of the language. As an example, in articles discussing the murder of Alexander Litvinenko we might be unsurprised to encounter a discourse of espionage and Cold War intelligence. I suggest what modes discourse, then, are being used in relation to *Londongrad*. It is possible that this will tie in with *representation* and *stereotypes*.

4) Where noteworthy, in addition to the articles' content is a discussion of form. Determining whether an article is written in the style of a formal opinion piece or commentary, a factual news report or an informal, conversational tabloid style, to take some examples, enhances the scope of the results as further evidence of the way *Londongrad* is reported.

5) Patterns of language: in the final section of the analysis, I focus on a closer reading of some selected sentences, comparing similar rhetorical characteristics that can be found in both Period 1 and Period 2. These sentences are not representative of the whole body of articles, but have been chosen with the aim of highlighting the way in which discourse can be repeated and also encode prejudice.

As I am performing a CDA, I will address these five points intending to highlight misleading or prejudiced content. Within the scope of this thesis it is not possible to examine each article in great detail, so the focus has been on identifying broad trends that satisfactorily answer the research question.

3: The British Press and Origins of *Londongrad*

3.1 The British Press

Monthly readership of the 4 most read "quality" national newspapers among adults 15+, according to most recently available statistics (as of January 2015), Oct 2013 – Sept 2014.[42]

Publication	Print (000s)	Online (000s)	Print + Online (000s)
The Daily Telegraph/The Sunday Telegraph	4780	9052	12361
The Guardian/The Observer	4343	9981	12481
The Independent/The Independent on Sunday	4181	5390	8680
The Times/The Sunday Times	6280	393	6559

I have chosen to examine the British press, and in doing so believe it is necessary to state what is unique about newspapers in the UK and their influence.

I have focused on the national press only, which Cole and Harcup describe as "those newspapers published in London and readily available across the UK", although recognizing that this London-centric definition might be controversial.[43] The centralized nature of London marks the UK press out from the USA and the majority of other European countries where a tradition of regional and provincial city-based journalism emerged. Cole and Harcup describe the UK national press as "highly stratified" and organise them into three broad groups: "tabloids" or "redtops" (the *Sun, Mirror* and *Star*) the "middle-market" (*Mail* and *Express*) and the "broadsheets", now better defined as the quality press given that most are no longer produced in broadsheet format (*Telegraph, Times, Guardian, Independent* and *Financial Times*).

Baker, Gabrielatos and McEnery discuss the difficulty in classifying newspapers as according to their print quality is problematic, as is classification according to political leanings. They write that "the political terms 'left' and 'right' are relative, multifaceted and therefore problematic"[44] and that broadsheet publications often include sections written in a more tabloid style, and vice versa. They instead choose to define the UK national press by dividing

[42] National Readership Survey (2014) "NRS Readership Estimates - Newspapers and Supplements AIR - Latest 12 Months: October 2013 - September 2014" retrieved from http://www.nrs.co.uk/latest-results/nrs-print-results/newspapers-nrsprintresults/
[43] Cole, Peter & Harcup, Tony: *Newspaper Journalism*, (SAGE, London 2010) p. 19
[44] Baker, Paul; Gabrielatos, Costas & McEnery, Tony: *Analysis and Media Attitudes: the Representation of Islam in the British Press* (Cambridge University Press, New York 2013) p. 8

publications into two categories: *popular* or *quality*, and among those categories either *left-leaning*, or *right-leaning* in the broadest sense possible. They define *popular* as being "populist", rather than necessarily best-selling, with a tendency towards "soft news" and "human interest" stories, while the *quality* press is defined as those publications that tend to put forward a more serious tone and analytical approach to international current affairs.[45]

While print circulation across most publications continues to see decline or stagnation, online media is flourishing. Since the beginning of the 21st the national newspapers began to publish free online versions (although some, such as the Times, now offer paid-for subscription-based services instead). As of statistics released by media analytics service comscore.com in late 2012, 42.6% of the total internet population (or unique internet users) were accessing online newspaper sites.[46] Among the top 10 most popular of these sites, three UK national newspapers featured (Mail Online, The Guardian/Observer and Telegraph media group), with the Mail overtaking the New York Times as the most popular newspaper website by number of individual visitors in that year (over 50 million individuals as opposed to the New York Times' 48.5 million.) Of solely English-language online newspapers, the same three UK-based publications made it into the top five most popular (with the US-based Tribune Newspaper Group completing the list).[47] Such statistics reflect the success that British based newspapers have had in attracting a readership beyond the UK, in part by offering free online access to content.

The potential of UK newspapers to reach a wide audience can also be linked to the prevalence of English-language comprehension worldwide and linguistic globalisation: English is the mother tongue of 400 million people, second language of another 430 million people, 750 million speak it reasonably well as a foreign language and a billion are learning it.[48] It has been argued that this gives light to a certain "linguistic imperialism"[49] in which the prominence of English language news means that it is overly influential in forming attitudes. Machin and van Leeuwen note that not all commentators ascribe to this view due to the rise of other global languages such as Spanish and Arabic, but English is nonetheless hugely prevalent and UK culture in a general sense remains influential in world affairs, and its output is likely to have a transformative effect on opinion beyond its borders.

---

[45] Ibid, p. 7
[46] Radwanick, Sarah: 'Most Read Online Newspapers in the World: Mail Online, New York Times and The Guardian' (Comscore, 12/12/2012) retrieved from http://www.comscore.com/Insights/Data-Mine/Most-Read-Online-Newspapers-in-the-World-Mail-Online-New-York-Times-and-The-Guardian
[47] Ibid
[48] Machin, D. & Van Leeuwen, T.: op. cit p. 125
[49] Ibid

It is also noteworthy that UK newspapers do not receive government funding, meaning that they are driven by sales, highly competitive by nature[50] and ideologically motivated. Baker, Gabrielatos and McEnery note the function of the UK press both in pushing and arguing for change from a particular ideological standpoint, while at the same time "reflecting the views of audiences", and maintaining their readership.[51] They are, in the words of Fairclough: "transformative as well as reproductive"[52] - shaped by and shaping society and culture. Media output is influenced by a large number of "complex and often contradictory processes."[53] While it must operate within the framework of the ideological agenda of a particular institution, it must also aim to keep its readership informed of on-going domestic and international affairs and provide said information in a way that is entertaining,[54] and profitable.[55] A newspaper may also publish texts from contributors with contradictory opinions or attitudes towards a particular issue, or promote contributors who actively antagonise the core readership with an angle that deviates from the norm. Any analysis should keep in mind the possibility of articles that come from a deliberately antithetical standpoint by comparison with the newspaper's prevailing ideology.

Since the late 1970s, the majority of such national publications have seen stagnation or declines in sales of print copies, the most serious decline in popularity has been experienced among the so-called "popular press."[56] At the same time, much has been noted about the "tabloidization" of the quality press, in which the values of tabloid news are increasingly visible in typically more analytical and serious publications. This amounts to a shift in the balance between hard news and soft news, with increasing space devoted to "sleaze, scandal, sensation and entertainment."[57] The various concerns associated with this have been much debated, but are overall linked to the creeping presence of rhetoric and sensationalism in a newspaper format that holds associations in the public eye of being fact-based and informative.

[50] Baker, Gabrielatos & McEnery: op, cit, p. 5
[51] Ibid, p. 3
[52] Fairclough, op cit, p. 34
[53] Ibid p. 47
[54] Ibid
[55] Richardson, op. cit, p. 7
[56] Cole and Harcup, op. cit, p. 20
[57] Esser, Frank: "'Tabloidization' of News: A Comparative Analysis of Anglo-American and German Press Journalism" (European Journal of Communication 43:3, London 1999), p. 293

3.2 The Role of Print Journalism and its Importance

The news is a form of "public communication", in which selected topical information is transferred through a particular medium, for the most part either through written language or verbal communication, from one party to another. Fowler describes news as "a representation of the world in language" and emphasizes that it can never be "a value-free reflection of facts."[58] He writes that language in any form is made up of a "semiotic code"[59] which means that texts are consequently infused with a system of economic, political and social values. To take van Dijk's example, a white, male newspaper journalist in the UK will inevitably write from both his own perspective as a white, Western male, and also from the perspective of the media institution that employs him and whose value system he will be expected to conform to.[60] In and of itself this is not something worthy of criticism, but it emphasizes the point that all forms of communication are essentially biased and often unconsciously so.

Research suggests that print media is widely considered to be of a superior quality to televisual news output, and possibly as a result it can be better recalled.[61] Interviews conducted among the general public in Amsterdam also suggest that newspaper content is often held in support of prejudiced views, particular towards minority ethnic groups,[62] quite possibly as a result of it being considered trustworthy and qualitatively strong. As a result, any assumption of neutrality and absolute fact in newspapers can be "dangerous"[63] and should be contested.

If newspapers offer a "structured mediation of the world"[64] as Fowler suggests then this is done both in a quantitative and qualitative sense: quantitative in its ability to reach large numbers of people and provide them all with the same perspective on a particular event, and qualitative in that the newspaper's economic and political standpoint will determine its perspective, and the way in which this mediation occurs. The quantitative element has arguably becoming even more important in the years since Fowler's 1991 work was first published in that the internet has provided a platform for newspapers to more easily reach a much larger, transnational readership.

---

[58] Fowler, Roger: *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press* (Routledge, London 1991) p. 4
[59] Ibid.
[60] van Dijk, Teun A.: *Discourse and Power* (Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, 1998) p. 60
[61] Ibid, p. 55
[62] Ibid, p. 60
[63] Richardson, op. cit, p. 13
[64] Fowler, op. cit, p. 120

Van Dijk argues that the importance of the so-called "power holders"[65] in society is reinforced by their repeated coverage in news media, and so can to an extent be seen as self-fulfilling: if a particular "power holder" gets repeated attention, then their importance and power is confirmed in the public mind. As such, the selection of particular actors and stories for news coverage and the marginalisation of others is as important to bear in mind as the "semiotic code" of the language itself. If we take van Dijk's model there are three important areas that should be considered when analysing media: what topics are being selected for coverage, what is being said about them, and how it is being said.

3.3 *Londongrad* as a 'buzzword'

Examining the use of a particular word in media, in this case *Londongrad,* is potentially revealing, and I will be searching for evidence that it has become what might be termed a "buzzword", which is defined by the Oxford English dictionary as: "a keyword; a catchword or expression currently fashionable; a term used more to impress than to inform, esp. a technical or jargon term."[66] According to this definition buzzwords are fashionable shorthand for a particular topic and are largely rhetorical devices rather than a factual precise pieces of information. Previous explorations of the use of buzzwords have built upon this, noting their tendency to be grounded in speculation or with only vague allusions as to their precise meaning, which substitute analytical thinking on the part of a reader with more generalised assumptions. As Cornwall writes: "buzzwords get their 'buzz' from being in-words, words that define what is in vogue"[67] but at the same time they "serve to numb the critical faculties of those who end up using them."[68] This suggests that the use of buzzwords in the media can be highly persuasive and has the potential to rely on prejudice or presuppositions about the subject in question in order to make a particular point or convey a particular image.

Rist writes that "a buzzword [has] an absence of real definition, and a strong belief in what the notion is supposed to bring about"[69], again reflecting the idea that they are strongly suggestive and persuasive but are based on assumption as opposed to evidence. It might be linked to Gallie's work on *Essentially Contested Concepts* that "combine general agreement on the abstract notion that they represent with endless disagreement about what they might

[65] van Dijk, T.A.: *Discourse and Power,* op. cit. p. 55
[66] Citation [Def. 1] in *Oxford English Dictionary* oed.com, retrieved 13/1/2015
[67] Cornwall Andrea: "Introductory overview – buzzwords and fuzzwords: deconstructing development discourse" in *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*, eds Cornwall, Andrea & Eade, Deborah, (Practical Action Publishing, Great Britain, 2010), p. 3
[68] Eade, D.: 'Preface', in Cornwall, A. and Eade, D.: op. cit, p. ix
[69] Rist, Gilbert: "Development as a Buzzword" in *Development in Practice 17:4*, (IUED Geneva 2010) p. 486

mean in practice."[70] Gallie himself defines *Essentially Contested Concepts* as those "the proper use of which inevitably involves endless disputes about their proper uses on the part of their users".[71]

As a result of this, an important aspect of this paper will be to examine whether *Londongrad* has the modish and rhetorical qualities of a buzzword, and whether as a concept it is by its very nature "essentially contested" and lacking the required precision to bring about a consensus over its proper usage. If this turns out to be the case, what is the fashionable topic or point of view that it represents, and why is it being employed as short-hand.

It is easy to regard use of the term *Londongrad* with suspicion, but to quote Sornig: "never the words themselves should be dubbed evil and poisonous."[72] Context is imperative in the comprehension of language, and Marko points out that we should not consider the public as passive receptors of media output:[73] they are free to choose what to think and how to interpret the text in question. However, what is equally important is Fairclough's concept of the "naturalization of ideologies":[74] that when a particular media-driven discourse refers to general themes and accepted values and habits, the chance increases that the public will be manipulated into unconditionally accepting what is being said. Sauer indicates that a mode of discourse might become a "linguistic form" which carries meaning, and is "socio-historically determined."[75] It could reasonably follow that if *Londongrad* were to be used repeatedly in a particular context, it might begin to carry implicit meaning by itself. In performing a CDA I hope to be able demonstrate whether use of *Londongrad* has reached this point.

3.4 Representations of Immigrants and Minorities

In assuming that *Londongrad* can at least in part relate to the idea of a Russian community in London or the UK in general, it is useful to reflect upon relevant literature concerning media representation of immigrants.

---

[70] Cornwall, A. & Eade D.: op cit, p. 2
[71] Gallie, W.B: 'Essentially Contested Concepts' in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series* (Vol. 56 1955 - 1956) p. 169
[72] Sornig, Karl "Some remarks on linguistic strategies of persuasion" in Wodak, Ruth (ed): *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse,* (John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1989) p. 96
[73] Marko, Davor, "Fear Control in Media Discourse" in *Southeastern Europe 37:2* (University of Belgrade and Centre for Social Research ANALITIKA Sarajevo, 2013) p. 201
[74] Fairclough, Norman: *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (Longman, London and New York, 1995) p. 36
[75] Sauer, Christoph, "Structures of consensus-making and intervention: the concept of Nazi language policy in occupied Holland", in Wodak (1989), op. cit, p. 6

Khosravnik's work on the representation of refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants (RASIM) in the UK since the mid-1990s indicates a marked increased in media discourses relating to these groups from the beginning of the 21st century. He attributes this increase at least in part to both domestic changes, with an increasingly multinational population and concerns over "British-ness" and "national identity"[76] as well as international power shifts that have challenged long-standing Euro-Atlantic cultural and political hegemony. He notes that this has led to the increased prevalence of a discourse that divides "home" (in-group) communities form "other" (out-group) communities, and which has polarised and sensationalised debate.[77]

Van Dijk has written extensively on representations of power that has revealed a somewhat polarized relationship between the representation of in-groups and out-groups in the media. Although not specifically focused on British media his examination of discourses relating to "minorities, refugees, squatters and Third-World countries", revealed among other things that these groups are often perceived to be a "problem" a "burden" or a "threat"[78] to the societal norms of the home country, less well as being less credible as sources of factual information.

This might also be linked to what Fowler refers to as a "preoccupation with sorting people into categories, and placing discriminatory values on them,"[79] which may seem contextually natural but in fact "encode prejudice."[80] He puts forward examples to suggest that while terms of outright abuse which engender discriminatory values are common only in the popular [tabloid] press, the tendency to categorise groups and assign them discriminatory values exists in the quality press as well, and lists groups which might be affected, among them: "spies" and "foreigners coming from countries which are perceived as culturally very alien from Western Europe (Arabs, Africans, Russians)."[81] It is this "unobtrusive" and "subliminal" form of encoding of prejudice that allows such categorisation to be accepted unquestioningly by a reader.

Stuart Hall has also written about representations, or the production of meaning through a text. This leads to a discussion of stereotyping that again refers to the relationship between "insiders" and "outsiders", or "us and them". He describes the process of stereotyping as "part of the maintenance of social and symbolic order", and a barrier between what is considered

[76] Khosravinik, Majid, *British Newspapers and the Representation of Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Immigrants between 1996 and 2006,* (Lancaster University, Lancaster, 2008) p. 3
[77] Ibid.
[78] van Dijk, *Discourse and Power,* op. cit, p. 56
[79] Fowler, R.: op. cit, p. 110
[80] Ibid, p. 110
[81] Ibid, p. 111

normal and what is not. While a *type* might be a "simple, vivid, memorable, easily grasped and widely recognized characterization" of a person or group, a *stereotype* takes these characterizations, exaggerates, simplifies and fixes them, so that difference is seen as innate and unchanging.[82] As a result, any group or individual that does not fit into the established boundaries of difference are subsequently excluded or ignored.[83] He also points out that stereotyping tends to exist when there is an imbalance of power, with stereotyping more often than not at the non-dominant, or "other" group,[84] and also tends to unify the "in group" by consolidating an identity of togetherness based around a set of established norms. This can be described as a "naturalization of ideologies" in which "official viewpoints" are translated "into a public idiom" often through fear-mongering rhetoric targeting the out-group. Marko notes that the use of fear to naturalize difference between different societal groups was characteristic of the Serbian state-controlled media output in the 1990s, and can also be seen in Western media representations of Muslims and Islam today.[85]

3.5 Origins and Implications of *Londongrad*

Noted earlier in this paper is the need for a researcher in CDA to state his standpoint and initial perspectives in advance of conducting an analysis. As such, it should be mentioned at this stage my suspicions that *Londongrad* will be prominent in negative representations of Russia or Russians. Previous research into representation of Russians (Rawlinson, Jerman) and out-groups (Marko, Khosravnik), as outlined in previous chapters, would seem to justify this assumption.

The term is also reminiscent of the sobriquet *Londonistan*, which has been used in reference to the perceived tolerance of Muslim religious extremism in London, as well as being the title of a 2006 journalistic book by the British journalist Melanie Philips (Londonistan: How Britain is Creating a Terror State Within). This particular term held negative connotations and played into the fears of those who perceived a growing Islamist threat from within Europe, although interestingly, is not used in reference to the large numbers of wealthy individuals from Arab states who have made London their base. In light of the work of Khosravnik on the way in which immigrants and minority groups are represented, it might follow that *Londongrad* panders to similar fears about these groups. It could also be reasonably presumed

[82] Dyer, Richard: (1977) in Hall, S. op. cit, p. 257.
[83] Ibid, p. 258
[84] Ibid, p. 258
[85] Marko, D., op. cit, p. 204-5

that the suffix "–grad" is, from a British perspective reminiscent of bleak Stalinist cityscapes, or the destruction wreaked at the Battle of Stalingrad.

It should be noted that *Londongrad* is not a term for some years before this, however, in political circles and can even be traced back to a BBC comedy satire from the 1980s called "Comrade Dad", in which the British capital is renamed *Londongrad* following a Soviet invasion and the establishment of the "USSR-GB". It was the title of a 2008 British short film about intrigue within a powerful Russian family in London (tagline: "Russian oligarchy expands"),[86] and is the working title of a Hollywood production currently in development about the murder of Alexander Litvinenko.[87]

Londongrad, then, is a neologism, a word that has been recently coined in response to a particular context, at least in part informed by historical perceptions of Russia, and in part by the way in which similar groups are sometimes represented in the media. Given its associations, it is reasonable to suspect that *Londongrad* represents negative perceptions or suspicions, and it is from this standpoint that the CDA is undertaken.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

The aim of this chapter has been firstly to offer an overview of the British press, in accordance with *discursive and social practices* as described by Fairclough. In examining the word *Londongrad* it is important to understand and describe how the press operates, why journalists might choose to use the word *Londongrad* in a particular way, and their potential scope of influence. Given that *Londongrad* describes Russia or Russians, I have also examined some of the relevant literature with regard to immigrants and minorities and their representation in the press. The second aim has been to identify a point, or points, of origin for the word *Londongrad:* to establish the contexts that have inspired it and the implications it might have as a "buzzword" on how such migrant groups are portrayed.

[86] Internet Movie Database, retrieved from http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1289813/?ref_=fn_al_tt_1
[87] Internet Movie Database, retrieved from http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0942386/

CHAPTER 4: The UK-Russia Relationship

4.1 Overview of UK Russia Relations in the 21st century

I have established, in accordance with the practices of critical discourse analysis, that any textual analysis should be situated within the context of its production, which includes the time period in question. As an examination of representations of Russia and Russians in the UK press it is therefore essential to include within the research framework some information about the Russo-British social and political relationships that are likely to have a contextual bearing on newspaper output.

This Chapter outlines trends in the 21st century relationship between the UK and Russia. It also is important to note that, in accordance with Foucauld's genealogical principles, the way in which Russians are written about in the UK press will also be influenced by inherited perceptions formed and reproduced over a much longer period of time.

The textual analysis of this paper examines two period: the first from 2005-8 and the second from 2011-14. Political relations between Russia and the UK have, in broad terms, remained cold. Early successes by Prime Minister Tony Blair to garner favour with incoming President Putin have been slowly dissipating since 2003 when a series of disagreements over extradition erupted. With occasional thaws in relations, such as the UK's efforts to rescue a stricken Russian submarine in Russia's far east in 2005, relations have remained strained. A succession of intelligence scandals from 2006 onwards, notably the murder of Alexander Litvinenko but also the "spy-rock"[88] incident that embarrassed the British intelligence services and the arrest of Elizaveta Zatuliveter on espionage charges in London in 2010 meant that the period from 2006-2010 was one where political relations between the UK and Russia were notably strained.[89]

The UK has been open in criticizing human rights abuses and differing foreign policy strategies have brought the two countries, while Russia has complained of British hypocrisy, and anti-Russian bias over international affairs.[90] Due to the unwillingness to make any

[88] Bacon, Edwin: "UK-Russia Political Relations" in ed. Monaghan, Andrew.: *The UK and Russia: A Troubled Relationship part. 1* (Defence Academy of the United Kingdom, 05/2007) p. 13
[89] Monaghan, A.: "The United Kingdom and Russia: A Divergent Relationship" in Monaghan, A.: ibid, p. 5
[90] Monaghan, A.: *The UK and Russia – Towards a Renewed Relationship?* (Russian Analytical Digest 130, 07/2013) p. 10

political concessions, the political relationship is likely to remain unstable, particularly in light of on-going mistrust over the conflict in Ukraine.

With the arrival of a new British government in 2010 governed by a Conservative-Liberal coalition, attempts were made at a "reset" in relations, although as Monaghan points out, that term has been avoided in official discourse. Prime Minster David Cameron visited Moscow in September 2011 and since then has met both Medvedev and Putin on a number of occasions. In March 2013, defence and security relations were somewhat bolstered by a meeting between the British and Russian Foreign and Defence Ministers in London. Nonetheless the Britain-Russia political relationship is largely based on avoiding areas of hostility and disagreement with a focus instead on areas where mutual cooperation is possible. As such, business cooperation has been relatively strong: there are over 1000 British companies active in Russia and many large-scale Russian companies have operations within the UK.[91] Similarly, an increasingly friendly foreign investment climate in Russia, particularly in energy, the UK's technical experience, and the possibility of asset-swap deals, are potential areas of cooperation.[92]

4.2 21st Century Russian migration to the UK

If *Londongrad* represents an aspect of the Russian presence in the UK, then it is useful to examine the statistics concerning Russians as a migrant community in the UK. The articles examined in this paper stretch back to 2005, a time in which research suggests the Russian community in the UK was undergoing a period of quite large-scale growth.

Census data reveals that in 2001 there were 15,644 Russian citizens (or those holding a passport from the Russian Federation). The Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) put the figure at 18,900 individuals.[93] The difficulty in mapping Russian migration was at the time compounded by, the collapse of the Soviet Union, where ethnic Russians and native Russian speakers often found themselves outside the borders of the newly formed Russian Federation, and as such a discrepancy emerged between those officially considered Russian migrants and those who considered themselves as such.

---

[91] Ibid, p. 9

[92] Stratfor briefing email to employees: "Russia, U.K.: Lavrov and Miliband Play the 'Great Game" (2/11/2009) retrieved from https://wikileaks.org/gifiles/docs/13/1350487_russia-u-k-lavrov-and-miliband-play-the-great-game-.html

[93] IOM: "Russia Mapping Exercise, London" (07/2007) p. 6 retrieved from http://unitedkingdom.iom.int/sites/default/files/doc/mapping/IOM_RUSSIA.pdf

By 2006, according to some estimates, the Russian or wider Soviet Union-born population in the UK was 300,000, an increase of 100,000 on two years before.[94] Official data from the 2011 census puts the figure considerably lower at 35,000,[95] possibly reflecting the confusion over Russian national identity as much as difficulties in measuring immigration data (the official census data records refer to native Russian speakers, rather than just those arriving from the Russian Federation.) Indeed, the 2004 EU expansion into the Baltic allowed many Russians holding Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian citizenship free access to the UK.

It is evident that there has been a greater increase in the UK's Russian-born population over the last decade and a half. But by comparison with other minority groups resident in the country, the influx of Russians into the UK has been rather low profile. Where others migrant communities have formed ties with particular towns and neighbourhoods (taking as an example, the association of Russians in New York with the Brighton Beach neighbourhood of Brooklyn), Russians have not formed a visible cluster in any town or city in the UK. According to the unofficial embassy estimates in 2007, 70% of Russians resided in London, with a broad spread across the whole Greater London area. Four London boroughs held a particular association (Hackney, Hammersmith and Fulham, Kensington and Chelsea, Tower Hamlets),[96] all of which might be considered part of Inner London, yet occupy areas on both the east and west of the city centre and encompass a broad socio-economic spread. There were also relatively large numbers of Russians in Manchester (10% of UK-based Russians) and Scotland (8%), yet clearly Russian migration is centred heavily on the capital.[97]

One might add to that list another crucial factor that drives the modern UK-Russia relationship and that is London's financial centre, the square mile of the City. By providing an attractive, secure environment for foreign investors and a solid legal system, the UK has become home to numerous wealthy, well-connected individuals, many of them the Russians who gained fortunes as a result of Yeltsin's privatization initiatives. UK courts by extension have become adept in dealing with financial and business disputes. Among those whose profile has grown are many who might be considered *new Russians* «новые русские», and who have chosen to base themselves in the UK.

---

[94] Ibid
[95] Office of National Statistics: "Nationality and country of birth by age, sex and qualifications" (11-12/2013) retrieved from http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=Population+by+Nationality+and+Country+of+Birth
[96] IOM: "Russia Mapping Exercise, London", op. cit, p. 7
[97] Ibid.

Among this distinctly wealthy elite of Russians currently residing in the UK, or those holding British citizenship, are indeed the high-profile oligarchs Alisher Usmanov and Roman Abramovich, stakeholder and owner of Arsenal and Chelsea Football Clubs respectively and London-based Russian-American businessman Len Blavatnik, alongside the less well-known oligarchs German Khan and Eugene Schvidler (the latter a close friend of Abramovich). But counted among the UK's wealthiest people are also Vladimir Makhlai (former CEO of ammonia manufacturer Togliattiazot), Andrey Andreev (internet entrepreneur) and Yevgeny Chichvarkin (founder of telecoms giant Yevroset). Most high profile of all, perhaps, were the outspoken Kremlin critics and political refugees Alexander Litvinenko and Boris Berezovsky, although Litvinenko was a far from wealthy individual, and financially reliant on Berezovsky.

The influx of Russian wealth is important in that the aim of a CDA is to highlight inequality. As such, the way in which notions of Russian economic and political elite are represented in the articles, if at all, is worthy of attention.

4.3 Attitudes towards Russia in the UK and EU

Statistics compiled by PewGlobal suggest that suspicion towards Russia amongst the general public is not unusual and such feelings are becoming increasingly prevalent. They are also not exclusive to the UK, as the Europe-wide data would indicate. Even before the possibility of Russian military involvement in Ukraine had materialized, European opinion polls should at best an ambivalent attitude towards Russia. The research, conducted in 2013, show that negative perceptions are generally more common than positive ones, with 64% of people in France and 60% in Germany reporting negative attitudes towards the Russian Federation.[98] In Britain, almost equal numbers of those responding positively and negatively (39% and 38% respectively).

A year later in 2014 after Putin's announcement of the Russian annexation of Crimea, recent polls have seen a hardening of attitudes towards Russia with unfavourable views in Britain climbing to 63%, in France to 73% and Germany soaring to 79%. In Poland, where 54% of respondents claimed unfavourable views of Russia in 2013, this year 81% declared a negative opinion,[99] leaving Europe the region with the highest median unfavourable opinion of Russia.

[98] Anon: "Global Opinion of Russia Mixed, Negative Views Widespread in Mideast and Europe Survey Report" (Pew Global, 3/9/13) retrieved from http://www.pewglobal.org/2013/09/03/global-opinion-of-russia-mixed/

[99] Anon: "Russia's Global Image Negative amid Crisis in Ukraine, Americans' and Europeans' Views Sour Dramatically" (Pew Global, 9/7/14) retrieved from http://www.pewglobal.org/2014/07/09/russias-global-image-negative-amid-crisis-in-ukraine/

Confidence in Putin's ability "to do the right thing in world affairs" in the most recent poll was also low, with the exception of Greece not rising above 22% (20% of Britons have confidence in Putin).[100] While it would be useful to assess other avenues of research, the results from this particular survey indicate that negative attitudes towards Russia and Putin in Britain are prevalent and reflective of European trends, although perhaps milder than elsewhere, and since 2007 there has been a gradual decline of favourable views towards Russia.[101]

4.4 Concluding Remarks

The aim of this Chapter has been to provide context to the likely content of articles featuring *Londongrad*, which given the nature of the word is likely to draw heavily upon topics relating to UK-Russia relations or Russian activity in the UK. The overview is deliberately broad so as to provide an overview of the political and social contexts that are likely to bear on journalistic output.

According to Fairclough's aforementioned definition of *social practice*, the relationship between a particular publication, the opinions of its core readership and the political environment that it finds itself in, are of great importance to understanding reproduction of language and imagery in texts. It is therefore hugely significant to the results of this analysis to understand the complex and often strained political relationship between Russia and the UK.

[100] Ibid
[101] Anon: 'Global Opinion of Russia Mixed, Negative Views Widespread in Mideast and Europe Survey Report' op. cit.

CHAPTER 5. Article Analysis: Results of a Critical Discourse Analysis

5.1 Period 1 (2005-8) includes 17 articles across three of the four newspapers, as no article from the Guardian in this period featured the word *Londongrad*.

This table indicates a breakdown of article themes, and their frequency in Period 1

Topic	Independent	Telegraph	Times
Wealth/Elites	6	4	2
Espionage/Murder	0	2	2
Business	1	0	0

5.2 Use of *Londongrad*

Results from Period 1 reveal that there is no consensus over who uses *Londongrad* or what it describes. In the Telegraph alone it's definition is far from clearly defined, described variably as being a "mix [of] mafia, spies and oligarchs", arising from London's "swollen" Russian population,[102] as "a melting pot of dissidents, defectors and billionaire oligarchs",[103] as a result of the "ovskis" and "oviches of high society"[104] or as a city "affectionately known as Londongrad" by "Russian admirers."[105] In the final Telegraph article it is defined not as the whole city but as "parts of West London" resulting form "an influx of mega rich [Russians]" [106]. As such it refers both to a perceived Russian community, particular one that is specifically sinister or wealthy by nature, or to the city of London itself (or certain neighbourhoods) in reference to Russian activity or a growing Russian community.

In all six articles from The Telegraph, the definitions are different from each other but crucially they are clearly defined. In the Times, *Londongrad* is clearly defined in only one of the four articles (a city so-called because of "Russian affluence",[107] while in the other three it is strongly alluded to without a clear definition being made. Thus we have "expatriate

[102] Pindar, Peter: "Rhyme and Reason: From Russia with Death" (Telegraph, 3/12/2006)
[103] Wansell, Geoffrey: "RED ALERT: The sinister death of Alexander Litvinenko has unveiled the shadowy world of 'Londongrad' - a melting pot of dissidents, defectors and billionaire oligarchs" (Telegraph, 25/11/2006)
[104] Walden, Celia: "To Russia with Goss" (Telegraph, 9/6/2007)
[105] Egerton, Lulu: "Fear not, the rich are still happy to spend squillions on the very best" (Telegraph, 1/12/2007)
[106] Woods, Judith: "When silence is golden Irina Abramovich has hit the jackpot due to her very discreet divorce. But the dent in husband Roman's bank accounts is nothing compared to the blow to his ego, says Judith Woods" (Telegraph, 15/3/2007)
[107] Toomey, Christine: "The Tsars Come Out to Play" (Times, 23/4/2006)

Russians of Londongrad"[108], "Londongrad is home to a host of billionaires"[109] and "oligarch billionaires….carving out a distinctive niche in what is dubbed Londongrad".[110] These articles clearly suggest why the *Londongrad* moniker has come about, as a result of Russians in London or wealthy Russians in London, without a precise causal link being made.

The Independent offers a causal link in four articles and a vague association between *Londongrad* and its origins in the other three. In two articles the *Londongrad* title has arisen because of London's large Russian community ("burgeoning Russian population"[111]) and in the other two it is specifically wealthy Russians ("super wealthy expatriates"[112]). In the three articles where there is no causal link there are vague allusions to Russian money ("the billionaires of 'Londongrad'")[113] or Russian power ("Russians are making 'Londongrad' the centre of a new worldwide empire")[114] or both ("welcome to Londongrad and Kalashnikov capitalism"[115]). In these three examples, *Londongrad* simply substitutes for *London*, with the assumption that whenever Russian money or power comes to London, the city can be termed *Londongrad* in passing and without great explanation.

Few articles across any of the three papers make any attempt to define where the *Londongrad* label has come from or who uses it. In the Independent one article suggests that it has been coined by Forbes magazine,[116] while another suggests that it is a nickname given by "wags"[117] (wives of the Russian rich and famous). Another provides the vague suggestion that London is referred to as *Londongrad* "in some circles"[118] (Independent), presumably either Russian circles or moneyed circles, while one other suggests London is named as such by "Russian admirers"[119] (Telegraph). With these few exceptions, precise reference to its origin is notably absent.

[108] Woods, Richard; Leppard, David & Walsh, Gareth: "Buried in Lead in Londongrad" (Times, 10/12/2006)
[109] Hames, Tim: "Never say never, but Putin is no Ernst Blofeld" (Times, 4/12/2006)
[110] Grimston, Jack: "Making themselves at home: Russian elite bring their 'stealth wealth' to Londongrad" (Times, 10/6/2007)
[111] Frith, Maxine: "Russian oligarchs flock to Britain with billions to spend and a taste for luxury" (Independent, 17/10/2005)
[112] Milmo, Cahal: "Russian community faces schism as Patriarch Alexis sacks London bishop" (Independent, 19/5/2006)
[113] Adams, Guy & Harris, Sarah: "The super rich" (Independent, 17/12/2006)
[114] Moreton, Cole: "RUSSIAN POWER - (Invasion!)" (Independent, 8/1/2006)
[115] Baker Martin: "The Russians are coming, so pour yourself a Kalashnikov" (Independent, 3/6/2007)
[116] Frith, M.: op. cit
[117] Anon: "From Russia with Cash" (Independent, 17/10/2005)
[118] Jones, Alice: "Arts previews: Intoxicating new spirit from Russia" (Independent, 7/11/2005)
[119] Egerton, L.: op. cit.

In all the other articles its use is a term that is assumed to have been used, but without any reference to exactly who uses it. We are supposed to assume that the city, or the Russian community in some form, has been dubbed *Londongrad* by somebody. This has the effect of naturalising the term: there is little sense that the word is dubious. Where it is not defined, there must be an assumption that the readership will understand what is meant by the term, despite the fact that it quite clearly lacks concrete definition.

5.3 Intertextual Analysis: Prominent Discourse Topics and Features

With the exception of one article on Russian espionage in the UK, dismissing the Litvinenko affair as "brouhaha"[120] the other six articles from the Independent focus on the New Russians in London and their wealth. Prominent in these articles, however, is a discourse of the Cold War and/or of espionage and Russian danger. An article reviewing a Russian arts festival describes with double meaning as an "intoxicating new spirit", so "pour yourself a Kalashnikov".[121] Russian drinking habits, then, and possibly also a perceived penchant for poison, are being invoked. There are also references which hint at bygone political relations and espionage: "The Russians are coming"[122] and "the Russians are not coming"[123] are both used in the Independent in reference to the 1966 film *The Russians are Coming, the Russians are Coming*, and "From Russia with Cash"[124] in one, invoking *From Russia with Love* and connotations of Russian Cold War villains.

We also find knowing nods to the past, framing the experience of Russians today in relation to images of Communism and the Cold War, perhaps drawing upon images already familiar to the readership. We have a sly juxtaposition of wealth with Communism: ("Clearly, the presence of Karl Marx's tomb in Highgate is no longer a draw"[125]): this capitalist/Communist "dichotomy" was one that Rawlinson (1998) describes in her work on the representation of Russian organised crime in Western media.[126] We also find reference to political scandal ("Remember the Russian naval attaché who slept with Christine Keeler who slept with John Profumo?"[127]). In relation to "the Russians are coming" one article reads "Not any more; that is the language of the Cold War. The Russians are here already,"[128] hinting at a new

[120] Baker M.: op. cit.
[121] Ibid
[122] Ibid
[123] Moreton, C.: op. cit.
[124] Anon: "From Russia with Cash" op. cit.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Rawlinson, P.: op. cit. p. 346
[127] Ibid.
[128] Moreton, C.: op. cit.

"invasion" of Russians. Lastly we find superfluous reference to "penal colony YaG 14/10 in a region of Siberia polluted with uranium"[129], which invokes Soviet harshness. While not explicitly critical of Russians, the image that is projected in the Independent is filtered through a Cold War discourse and draws heavily on negative stereotypes and clichés based upon Britain's historical relationship with the Soviet Union.

The Times offers two articles primarily focusing on "new Russians", and two focusing on Russian espionage in relation to the murder of Alexander Litvinenko. In the latter we have "Buried in Lead in Londongrad" in which the Cold War rhetoric remains, and criticism of Russia overt: it contains interviews with dissidents and a secret service official and reference to Russia's "licence to kill", "state-controlled television" and "Cold War tactics".[130] The other article offers a less sensational and critical assessment of Putin's Russia, but still filters it through Cold War imagery: "Putin is no Ernst Blofeld".[131] With regard to the articles on the New Russians, the Cold War rhetoric is somewhat lighter, although there is nonetheless a sense of Russian deception and infiltration into British society. Russians are "making themselves at home" in the UK and trying to improve their image "through charitable acts and clever PR",[132] implying an element of deceit and that this re-branding is covering their true nature. In the other article Russians replace "strawberries and cream" with "blinis."[133] The language is not of integration but of replacement, and portrays the wealthy Russians as graceless and clumsy in their attempts to enter British (elite) society.

The Telegraph can once again be divided into those about the New Russians, which contain a prominent discourse of wealth and glamour (three) and those with a discourse of espionage and Russian danger (three), concerning Litvinenko or politics. In terms of form, the Telegraph's offerings are the most eclectic. We have for instance a novelty article in the form of a poem, and in this case the author perhaps feels more free to intensify the Cold war rhetoric: "Russia deals death" is repeated four times and references to nuclear material ("isotope" "polonium" "alpha rays"[134]) abound. London is also described as "a stretch too far" for "the Russians", invoking a sense of hostility towards Russian attempts to ingratiate themselves into British society. In "Red Alert", an article on Litvinenko the incident is described as being like a "classic spy novel" and reads in part like a book review: "twist after

[129] Ibid.
[130] Woods, R.; Leppard, D. & Walsh, G.: op. cit.
[131] Hames, T.: op. cit.
[132] Grimston, J.: op. cit.
[133] Toomey, C.: op. cit.
[134] Pindar, P.: op. cit.

bizarre twist…the tragic story…compelled and confused…"an intriguing tale".[135] This has a distancing effect that distances Russians and makes them seem like fictional caricatures.

Two of the articles dealing with Russian wealth invoke the language of the gossip column or celebrity tabloid press, with a personalised and gossipy style: "beautiful blonde" "I can reveal…" [136] and "spotted…at an Austrian health spa" [137]. This fictionalisation or dramatization of Russian only serves to portray Russia and Russians as alien to Britain: either as paparazzi-snapped celebrities or semi-fictional characters who are far from ordinary.

There is substantial negativization of descriptions of the Russians described in the articles, with a number of articles taking on an air of snobbery about the perceived lack of taste or vulgar displays of wealth on show, an approach particularly prominent in the Independent. In one article the Orthodox Church in London is a "mixture of sung liturgy and theatrical ceremony" and "The Easter service at the cathedral - surrounded by the Bentleys, Mercedes and Ferraris of moneyed parishioners" [138], which juxtaposes religion and ostentatious displays of wealth in a way which paints an absurd picture and overtly passes judgement on those involved. In another, an anonymous art dealer is quoted as saying that wealthy Russians "like to…show off to each other. They are still very nouveau"[139], implying here they are dated and anachronistic as well as ostentatious.

One journalist sneeringly refers to the attire of a wealthy Russian walking the fashionable streets of London as having "the sort of cap you might wear to track boar' at a dacha".[140] An article in the Times quotes a commentator saying: "Since the appearance of so many arrivistes, the season is said to have lost its appeal for some of its traditional patrons"[141] The implication in all of these statements is the Russians described are completely out of place, incongruous to an absurd and laughable degree, and again suggestive of a lack of taste. They also imply that those described are not really wanted or welcome in British society – a sense of vulgarity that sits uneasily with *normal* English middle-class values and subdued displays of affluence.

While poking fun at the New Russians may initially appear innocuous and largely inconsequential, it is remarkably prevalent and the use of comedic rhetoric widespread. It has

[135] Wansell, G.: op. cit.
[136] Walden, C.: op. cit.
[137] Woods, J.: op. cit.
[138] Milmo, C.: op. cit.
[139] Adams, G. & Harris, S.: op. cit.
[140] Moreton, C.: op. cit.
[141] Toomey, C.: op. cit.

the effect of reducing the Russians it discusses to a series of stereotypes that are likely familiar to an audience, and therefore easy to process and comprehend. As such we are told there are "tax loopholes that allow rich Russians to live here cheaply, and Bob, or Vlad, is your uncle, or rather, your new neighbour."[142] and in the Times: "wealthy Russians turn 'the season' into the seasonski." [143]

By way of describing the influx of Russians and Russian wealth into London we find the misleading use of statistics, which are rhetorically designed to inflate their power and influence in a way that is come across as alarming. This is visible in articles in all three newspapers. One article in the Telegraph discusses the "wealth" and "glamour" of the Russian émigré community, which has "swollen" [to]…"at least 100,000"[144]. Use of the word "swollen" carries the negative connotation of being oversized and having grown rapidly, while this vague figure of "at least 100,000" is equated with "wealth" and "glamour". At the same time no evidence is provided that "wealth" and "glamour" can be used to represent the whole figure. An article in the Times declares: "the acceptance of Berezovsky exemplifies the extent of Russian assimilation. The Russian community in Britain is now estimated to number 400,000."[145] The juxtaposition of these two sentences creates a link between the world of wealthy dissident Berezovsky and his legal and political troubles and the world of an "estimated" 400,000 Russians who may live in Britain. As such, it might be argued that the Russian community is being misrepresented and unfairly associated with murky dealings, not to mention the figure itself, which is contentious. It would also seem, on inspection, that the link between the first and second sentences is incredibly tenuous: that the apparent "acceptance of Berezovsky" is linked to a growing Russian community.

The most overt misleading use of a statistic can be found in the Independent, in which one journalist writes: "There are an estimated 300,000 Russians in London, and one of them is standing on the pavement in New Bond Street".[146] This article (titled "Russian Power – Invasion!") takes a very atypical Russian – wealthy, walking along New Bond Street in upscale Mayfair, reducing him to being merely "one of" 300,000 Russians and suggesting that he as typical of the community at large. It would seem that a decision has been made decision has been made to scale up their presence either with high-end estimates in the case of

[142] Anon: "From Russia with Cash" op. cit.
[143] Toomey, C.: op. cit.
[144] Petre, Jonathan: "An unorthodox power struggle as Russian Patriach clashes with liberal Londongrad" (Telegraph, 30/5/2006)
[145] Grimston, J,: op. cit.
[146] Moreton, C.: op. cit.

the Times and Independent, or emphasize that their figure is a minimum figure in the case of the Telegraph. All have the effect of overstating the presence of wealthy Russians in the UK.

A phrase attributed in some cases to Richard Gray, a spokesperson for the upscale London department store Harvey Nichols, or in other cases paraphrased, is significant in that it features in five of the 17 articles analysed: twice in the Telegraph, once in the Times and twice in the Independent. As printed in the Independent, it reads "'The Russians are to this decade what the Japanese were to the Nineties and the Arabs were to the Eighties."[147] We might link this to Hall's aforementioned work on *stereotyping*: here three distinct socio-cultural groups are being classified and their definitions simplified and fixed so that they appear innate. What is implied, but not stated, in this phrase is that *exceptionally wealthy* Russians made their mark on the UK in a similar fashion to the way *exceptionally wealthy* Japanese and Arabs did in previous decades. But those who do not fit the mould are necessarily excluded and so the phrase is reductive and limited in its perspective of foreign groups, marginalizing those Russians, Japanese and Arabs who do not shop at Harvey Nichols. Given that the phrase seems to originate with an employee of an exclusive department store, it is perhaps inevitable that it lends a somewhat biased perspective, selected to make a point about a certain wealthy Russian presence that is nonetheless exclusive and imbalanced.

In mentioning the frequently repeated selection of a quote from Richard Gray it is worth noting that across the all three newspapers, and more frequently the Times and the Telegraph, there are articles concerning the New Russians which list or refer to elite figures and high-end brands or events. The listing of such brands and institutions is superfluous to the understanding of the text. The Times and the Independent publish quotes from Jonathan Hewlett, an estate agent in (wealthy) Knightsbridge, while in addition, a Telegraph article is written by an estate agent supposedly familiar with Russian clients. There are references to elite London neighbourhoods (Kensington, Mayfair, Belgravia), luxury brands (Ferrari, Cartier,), elite events (Henley Regatta, Chelsea Flower Show), expensive food and drink (Kristal Champagne, Nobu restaurant), and in the Telegraph there is mention of "celebrity" figures (Elton John, Mohammed Al-Fayed). The Tsars Come Out to Play in the Times is notable for the detail in which it describes the lifestyles of its subjects. It might at first glance derive from a desire to pain a picture of extreme wealth. Accompanying them, however, are two contributions, one from Clive Aslet of Country Life magazine, and the other Clare

[147] Ibid.

Milford Haven of Tatler, two socially prestigious publications, who are quoted as responding condescendingly to the tastes of the Russian rich.

Russians are subtly sneered at not only for their apparently gauche tastes, but also for the casual way in which elite establishments supposedly feature in their daily routines. Thus we are informed of "Nobu on Park Lane, from where Roman Abramovich likes to order the occasional takeaway"[148], and Russian women like to buy "bits and bobs from Harvey Nichols"[149]. Such sentences are ironic and included for humorous effect, but imply distance between *them* and *us* – they too have a routine that involves quick shopping and fast food but it is implied that they are unaware of the difference between their routine and ours.

5.4 Period 2 (2011-14) includes 27 articles across all four newspapers.

Three out of the four newspapers recorded increases in the frequency of reference to *Londongrad*. The Guardian, a newspaper which turned up no results for *Londongrad* in Period 1, records a relatively modest five results in Period 2. In the right-wing press, The Telegraph and the Times both record increases amounting to 21 articles combined, compared with only 7 combined between the Independent and the Guardian.

The Independent is the only newspaper where the frequency of articles referring to *Londongrad* has dropped. The time between Period 1 and 2 saw the purchasing of this newspaper by oligarch Alexander Lebedev and his son Evgeny, whose considerable wealth places them among the UK-based Russian elite. Given the largely negative and suspicious coverage of this group associated with the use of *Londongrad* found in Period 1, it is perhaps unsurprising that a reduction in its frequency at the Independent is to be found in Period 2, from five articles to just two over this four-year period. It is even more pronounced given the significantly increased frequency in all three other publications. Further examination will determine the exact nature of the usage of *Londongrad* between 2011 and 2014, but it is nonetheless telling that it appears less frequently in the Independent.

[148] Wansell, G.: op. cit.
[149] Anon: "From Russia with Cash" op. cit.

This table indicates a breakdown of article themes, and their frequency in Period 2

Topic	Guardian	Independent	Telegraph	Times
Espionage	0	1	2	2
Politics	1	0	0	3
Politics/Business	1	0	0	1
Politics/Economics	0	0	1	0
Politics/Espionage	1	1	0	0
Politics/Elites	0	0	2	0
Wealthy Elites	2	0	2	5
Other	0	0	2	0

What is evident here is that the thematic content of the articles is a lot more diverse than in Period 1, with articles of a political nature becoming much more numerous. Articles in Period 2 are nonetheless more difficult to classify, such that articles about wealthy Russian emigres may also have a political dimension, as demonstrated in two Telegraph articles. Nonetheless, articles focusing solely on wealthy remain relatively common.

5.5 Use of *Londongrad*

Neither article in the Independent explicitly defines what *Londongrad* is, so it is to be assumed that readership is expected to understand what it refers to. In both, however, it is strongly alluded to in different ways. In Taylor's article, it is used in a quote from a Labour MP, who states that: "our main city is not 'Londongrad', and Russian killers should stay away"[150] – the word is being used in reference to Russian espionage activity in the UK, albeit taken in quote rather than directly from the author. Sengupta writes about formerly strong British-Russian economic cooperation during which time "oligarchs were bringing fortunes into Londongrad"[151] – for him then, *Londongrad* is being used in an atypically positive way and represents the strength of the economic relationship. The word is used quite differently in both articles, both positively and in economic sense, and negatively in a socio-political one. There is, however, a sense that that *Londongrad* is something that may have existed in the past but is no longer valid, an editorial approach that might be expected give the new Russian ownership.

None of the five articles found in the Guardian feel the need to define *Londongrad.* Nevertheless there is a sense in two articles that the label is used inappropriately, firstly that the "Londongrad narrative is attractive" but "doesn't quite hold" [152], and in another article

[150] Taylor, Jerome: "Call to name London's Russian hit squads" (Independent, 4/4/2012)
[151] Sengupta, Kim: "Ruling means Ivanov's star will keep shining" (Independent, 29/11/2013)
[152] Borger, Julian: "EU's economic war on Putin raises spectre of new iron curtain era: New blacklist may mean lengthy European rift Experts downplay impact of sanctions on London" (Guardian, 26/7/2014)

(written by a wealthy Russian exile) "incidentally, instead of Londongrad I would say Moscow-on-Thames. Londongrad may come later"[153]. The sense that it is an unhelpful word derives in the first article from the extent of Russian economic power in the UK, and in the second from the fact that *Londongrad* should refer to political corruption and espionage rather than simply Russian wealth in general. What is interesting in these two articles, not seen at all in Period 1, is some reflection upon what the word can and should mean, as well as its limitations. Two further articles use *Londongrad* in reference to economic sanctions on wealthy Russians in London ("the siege of Londongrad" & "Super-rich no longer so secure in Londongrad") while the final article refers in much more general terms to "the large number of Russians in 'Londongrad'".[154]

Four articles in the Times draw specific link between the use of *Londongrad* and the Russian émigré community. Thus London is so-called because of "an influx of wealthy exiles"[155] "an influx of Russians"[156] "well-off Russians, and "oligarchs" who have "made an impact"[157]. Five further articles make reference to Russian wealth and the *Londongrad* label without explicit definition, thus we see the following examples: "the Londongrad set," [158] "Londongrad playboy"[159] and "plush back offices of Londongrad"[160]. The authors of these five articles see no need to remind the reader what *Londongrad* is supposed to mean, or assume that it will be understood within the context. Lastly, we find an article where it is defined as deriving from London's role as a haven for unsavoury elements: "foreign influxes of an often unsavoury kind" and is equated with the use of "Londonistan"[161] for London-based Islamists. This is the notable political exception in a paper where *Londongrad* is used first and foremost in discussions of Russian wealth, and in particular a rather decadent and ostentatious wealth. Nonetheless, its single use in a political is evident of the loose associations and connotations that the word can hold.

---

[153] Chichvarkin, Yevgeny: "Russians are heading west to protect their children" (Guardian, 3/3/2012)
[154] Tisdall, Simon: "Europa: How do you solve a problem like Russia?: A resurgent Kremlin is setting the agenda on world issues, especially Syria, and has once again started to boss its backyard. How are Europe's leaders reacting to Putin's newfound foreign policy confidence, and are they responding with one voice?" (Guardian, 18/10/2013)
[155] O'Neill, Sean: "Cabbie sought as vital clue to shooting of Russian banker" (Times, 26/3/2012)
[156] Leppard, David; Franchetti, Mark & Dowling Kevin: "Shot banker was to testify on gang war; A Russian gunned down in London was due to tell prosecutors about a Moscow murder plot" (Times, 25/3/2012)
[157] Vowden, Charlotte: "Meet the 'Bollygarchs' outbidding the Russians in London" (Times, 15/6/2014)
[158] Dey, Iain: "Putin's sabre rattles the Londongrad set" (Times, 30/3/2014)
[159] Wells, Emma: "Welcome to my den" (Times, 26/9/2014)
[160] Whittell, Giles: "Richopolis: is London the greatest city on Earth?" (Times, 8/5/2012)
[161] Kampfner, John: "Posturing is no substitute for foreign policy" (Times, 26/8/2014)

Of the nine articles examined in the Telegraph, three choose to define *Londongrad*. It is "fondly"[162] known as *Londongrad* as a result of political refugees, it is "a warehouse for dodgy wealth"[163] and so-called simply because in London "Russians are everywhere, disguised as boutique salespeople, doctors, waitresses, estate agents, schoolteachers and university professors"[164]. In two other articles, *Londongrad* is implicitly associated with corruption and financial irregularity: "bolt holes…to salt away the spoils of office"[165] and a "comfortable refuge for those who have made billions out of…autocratic rule". It is also used to represent a loss of identity: "if this is Londonistan, or Londongrad…London is ceasing to be umbilically British"[166]. Next, it vaguely refers to an affluent Russian community in London, so-called by the "Russian contingent at parents' meetings" or "the Londongrad section of the audience,"[167] and there is in one final article a reference to a Russian spy in "the heart of Londongrad".[168] As in the Telegraph, the overall impression provided is a judgemental assessment of Russians and their activities, although it appears in a broader thematic spread of articles. Even in less openly critical articles, *Londongrad* carries implicit meaning: Russian parents at school are a "contingent" implying a militaristic tendency, while all members of the "Londongrad section of the audience"[169] are described as reacting in the same way and in contrast with non-Russians.

5.6 Intertextual Analysis: Prominent Discourse Topics and Features

Although the number of articles is small, it is nonetheless true that The Independent in Period 2 is markedly different in its use of *Londongrad* compared with Period 1. Both articles deal with diplomatic relations rather than *exposé* style pieces on the lifestyle of the London's wealthy Russians. One is a commentary piece on the on-going political effects of the

[162] Coughlin Con: "Vladimir Putin: a man the West can do business with? David Cameron's meeting with Russian president Vladimir Putin in Sochi may be fraught with mind games, but it could help bring an end to the civil war in Syria" (Telegraph, 10/5/2013)
[163] Newmark, Brooks: "Ukraine: How to punish Putin, the oligarchs – and their shopaholic wives" (Telegraph, 11/3/2014)
[164] Dmitrieva, Olga & Yuferova, Yadviga: "Destination: 'Londongrad'; Migrants Russians in Britain New wave of Russian expats washed up in 'Londongrad'. A growing number of our people are choosing to relocate to Britain. But who are they? And why do they remain such an enigma to the Brits?" (Telegraph, 19/4/2011)
[165] Parfitt, Tom & Freeman, Colin: "Was it murder or odd mishap?; Tax scandal that links dead businessman to another Russian who died in a Moscow prison" (Telegraph, 2/12/2012)
[166] Moore, Charles: "A grimy, chaotic Babel – but would we have London any other way? The world seeks refuge, fame and fortune in our capital, and it's a compliment that it does" (Telegraph, 28/7/2012)
[167] Thompson, Laura: "A little less soul–baring and a lot more ballet, please" (Telegraph, 4/4/2012)
[168] Rayner, Gordon & Gardham, Duncan: "MP's four–year affair with Russian 'honeytrap spy'; Lib Dem's young researcher was Kremlin's eyes and ears in Commons, tribunal is told" (Telegraph, 19/10/2011)
[169] Dennys, Harriet: "Russian to Cancel a Ball" (Telegraph, 26/3/2014)

Litvinenko case, and the other is a reported political warning by an MP to "Russian killers"[170] in the period leading up to the London Olympics. In both it is used fleetingly (in the case of the latter it is reported speech directly from the MP) and does not refer to wealthy individuals. There can be no way of directly linking the arrival of Lebedev as owner with a drop in frequency, although as a member of Russia's UK-based elite it is highly likely that it has had a bearing on their coverage.

The preoccupation of the Times with the intricacies of wealthy lifestyles remains prominent in Period 2. As we have seen before, this is done in the manner of a celebrity expose that aggrandizes its subjects by playing up their lavish lifestyles, but simultaneously undercuts it with a tone that mocks them and includes highly judgemental language designed to ridicule. Thus, a feature on (new Independent owner) Evgeny Lebedev insinuates that he is arrogant and has poor taste: "known for his penchant for white silk suits, his wolfdog and for being his own favourite foreign correspondent"[171]. Purchases made by wealthy Russians are grossly excessive: "In the topsy-turvy, Alice-in-Wonderland oligarchical world, it seems reasonable to buy a fur when the temperature outside is a sweltering 34 degrees centigrade"[172] and out-of-touch: "'We have been scalped,' says one Russian businessman, eating ice cream with his wife [in a resort in Cyprus]"[173].

In one article, the tone is set at outright mockery where at one point the author ridicules the poor English language skills of one subject "consumed by the quest for more 'clotheses' and 'shoeses'"[174] This article is titled: "Keeping up with the Zahoors… Lydia Slater meets the latest oligarch couple to hit the capital" employs the language of celebrity gossip journalism and firmly places Zahoor and his wife on the same level as much-ridiculed stars of reality TV. It pretends simultaneously promotes their bid for celebrity stardom: "Kamaliya's new single, Love Me Like, which was released with her latest album, Club Opera, on November 11" and sneers at it: "her trademark mix of opera (Bizet's The Pearl Fishers) combined with dance…is bound to make the playlist at many a Christmas disco."

[170] Taylor, J.: op. cit.
[171] Wells, Emma: "Welcome to my den" (Times, 26/9/2014)
[172] Boyes, Roger: "High-heel races, fur in summer: how to spot a Russian in Cyprus; Russia's oligarchs are conspicuous by their bronzed wives, big yachts and pasty legs. But if their cash isn't safe in Cyprus, will they stay, asks Roger Boyes" (Times, 10/4/2013)
[173] Ibid
[174] Anon: "Keeping up with the Zahoors; INSIDE THE SUPER-RICH WORLD OF LONDONGRAD: Champagne baths, diamond-encrusted rifles and a reality TV show - Lydia Slater meets the latest oligarch couple to hit the capital" (Times, 23/11/2013)

The preoccupation also leads in one article to dubious statements: a luxury estate agent is quoted as remarking that in the "Russian community…everyone knows each other"[175]. The same article quotes "tens of thousands" of Russians who live in the UK and are "led…by Roman Abramovich"[176]. Such factual blurring of the line between the Russian community and Russian super wealthy is nonetheless less prominent than in Period 1.

Two articles report the murder of a Russian banker in London, its use justified by the negative presentation of Russian criminality. It is employed in two further articles to justify a hard-line political stance against Putin, again holding entirely negative connotations. The Cold War discourse that was particularly notable in the Times in Period 1 is less prominent (save for a brief reference to Chernobyl and the UK's "infiltrated" [177] economy. As the furore surrounding the Litvinenko gradually dissipated and the notion of wealthy Russians in London became less novel, it is perhaps unsurprising that this is the case and that a gossip-page discourse has replaced it.

Despite having no articles to compare with in Period 1, the Guardian in Period 2 presents a mixed use of *Londongrad* thematically. Two articles employ militaristic language - one of these leads with the headline "The Siege of Londongrad" while another refers to parts of London as "Russian turf" and "a battleground…for Russian billionaires." [178] An article written by Russian businessman Yevgeniy Chichvarkin offers an alternative perspective on Russian immigration to the UK, and passingly refutes the *Londongrad* label as misleading. This is a rare Russian perspective on *Londongrad* although again it comes from a wealthier-than-average individual. The final two offer more straightforward political and economic perspective pieces, and provide a pragmatic rather than sensationalised assessment of Anglo-Russian relations.

The tabloid-style reporting of the Times is not present in the Guardian, but there is superfluous reference to specific wealthy neighbourhoods and individuals in two articles. Overall, despite lingering associations with Russian wealth and criminal activity *Londongrad's* use in this newspaper is much less reliant on dubious facts and tabloid-style hysteria than the Times and Telegraph, nor does it offer such a judgemental assessment of Russians.

[175] Leppard, D.; Franchetti, M. & Dowling K.: op. cit.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Kampfner, J.: op. cit.
[178] Booth, Robert: "The oligarchs: Super-rich no longer so secure in Londongrad" (Guardian, 25/3/2013)

The Telegraph's offerings in Period 2 are heavy on tongue-in-cheek rhetoric but follow the path of patronising and belittling Russians. Of the nine articles, three that offer a point of view on how to deal with Vladimir Putin, three that offer a link between expat Russians in London and illicit activity, one is a commentary piece on London,[179] one a ballet review, and another takes the form of a gossip column. Of the politically focused articles, two refer to Putin as a "bully" and the other strongly implies it with an anecdotal aside about his attempts to intimidate Angela Merkel. The Russian ballet review comes with a three-star rating out of five, but the reviewer calls for "more restraint", saying that it is "less about dance, more about a theatrical experience"[180]. However, it is qualified with the notion that the "Londongrad section…rose to [their] feet" as if to suggest that excess is inherent among Russians. Russians in two of these articles are petulant and childlike: they shouldn't be allowed to "have their way",[181] while Putin's associates are described as his "mates"[182].

The language of espionage and the Cold War is also present. Russia is portrayed as a natural enemy" "Russophilia"[183] is used as a criticism of energy cooperation, "tiny Baltic states" are being threatened by "numerous acts of belligerence"[184], Russians have established a "fiefdom"[185] in London. Even when there is an attempt to remain impartial the language is heavily weighted against Russian individuals: so we are informed that lawyers "portrayed Miss Zatuliveter as a femme fatale with a talent for seducing men in powerful positions", as though unfairly, but then superfluously describes her attire "a black knee–length dress and purple jacket"[186] which would seem to support that idea. A conversational style simplifies world politics: "Picking up a pattern here? So are our friends in Eastern Europe. First Georgia. Now Ukraine. Who next? Estonia? Latvia? Lithuania?"[187]

5.7 Close reading: Repeated Encoding of Prejudice in Rhetoric

Results suggest that thematically there has been some progression in the way *Londongrad* is employed between Period 1 and Period 2. However, when looking beyond the use of the word *Londongrad* itself, it is clear that these articles feature repeating rhetorical forms that continue

[179] Moore, C.: op. cit.
[180] Thompson, L.: op. cit.
[181] Coughlin, Con: "By defying the West, bully-boy Vladimir Putin could lead Russia to ruin" (Telegraph 22/7/2014)
[182] Newmark, Brooks: "Ukraine: How to punish Putin, the oligarchs – and their shopaholic wives" (Telegraph, 11/3/2014)
[183] Coughlin, C.: op. cit.
[184] Ibid
[185] Ibid
[186] Rayner, G.: & Gardham, D.: op. cit.
[187] Newmark, B.: op. cit.

to manifest themselves in discussions of Russians and are presented in a way that creates distance between them and society at large. We might consider these a part of "discursive practice", in that they offer evidence of the way in which a particular way of discussing an issue can become normalised, copied and repeated, even between newspapers of varying political stances. In examining the following sentences, I intend to show that such rhetoric is derivative and reliant on established clichés that offer a distorted perspective on Russians in the UK.

We might compare, these two examples, the first from Period 1 in the Independent, and the second from Period 2 in the Telegraph:

1) "The Russians are not coming. Not any more; that is the language of the Cold War. The Russians are here already, living in Georgian town houses, shopping for jewellery in Bond Street, watching football."[188]

2) "Forget the famous Cold War warning, 'the Russians are coming': they're already here – and making a big impact on British society."[189]

The language used here, as both authors admit, invokes the language of the Cold War. And yet what is being said is not that things have changed, but rather that the Cold War warning of "the Russians are coming" has happened: they have slipped unnoticed into British society and had an "impact" on it. The use of the word "impact" perhaps suggests that the effect of Russians on the UK has not been one of seamless integration but a forceful and incongruous move. There are of course also sweeping generalizations: "they" or "the Russians" do not all live "in Georgian town houses". Of those who do, their leisure activities are speculatively based on what any wealthy individual *might* want to do.

I also wish to examine this example of rhetoric present in both periods of research, the first example taken from the Independent in Period 1, and the second from the Telegraph in Period 2.

1) [Russian spies and dissidents of the past were] "…rare finds in these islands and to meet one was as exciting as spotting a golden oriole would be to an ornithologist. Now Russians are as common as starlings and no one follows them around as their

[188] Moreton, C.: op. cit.
[189] Dmitrieva, O.: & Yuferova, Y.: op. cit.

only agenda is buying things - property, if they're men and bits and bobs from Harvey Nichols if they're women."[190]

2) "From several hundred Russians – exotic birds inhabiting these lands in the Seventies – to several hundred thousand at the start of the new century, this is the speed at which the UK is being 'Russified'."[191]

The dehumanizing of the Russians here, in which in both examples they are likened to birds, gives us some indication of the way in which the articles wishes us to view the influx of Russians. They are birds, or specimens, and the British are "ornithologists" or birdwatchers, emphasizing the distance between "them" and "us". In the past when they were smaller in number, they were exotic novelties and we apparently looked on from a distance in fascination. Today, they are so numerous that their role is no longer to present themselves for our amusement, they are instead here for their own, that is to say go shopping and take control of our property and institutions. This shift in power and the idea that Russians are growing numerically and financially are accordingly presented as a threat. They are not coming to join the UK but to take it over, or *Russify* it, and in line with the previous example, to impact rather than integrate.

I finally compare two passages taken from the Telegraph, firstly from Period 1 and secondly from Period 2.

1) "In Russia, they call it muzhik. Its original meaning is 'peasant man', but its modern usage would translate better as machismo."[192]

2) "…corruption probes and sackings in Moscow could have left the officials accused by Mr Magnitsky and Mr Perepelichny without a 'krysha' (roof, or protector)."[193]

The use of words transliterated from Russian, which have multiple meanings and no direct translation into English, emphasizes their separateness from UK society. Both words have a regular meaning (peasant, roof) and a more sinister colloquial or contemporary meaning (machismo, protection) that are symbolic of the idea that there is some form of Russian deception or disguise, hiding a violent or dangerous element. While it might initially seem

[190] Anon: "From Russia with Cash" op. cit.
[191] Dmitrieva, O. & Yuferova, Y.: op. cit.
[192] Woods, J.: op. cit.
[193] Parfitt, T. & Freeman, C.: op. cit.

that the English translations are designed to demystify, they in fact have the opposite effect - of further reinforcing a notion of Russian danger, or a Russian agenda against the UK, and therefore separateness. The use of Russian words that do not have an entirely equivalent English version suggests incompatibility with British values, or at the very least a Russian society with thought processes very different to the British.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion I refer back to my research question: **How do UK newspapers employ the term *Londongrad* and how has this changed over time and between different newspapers?** This thesis is the first to offer an analysis of *Londongrad* in the British or indeed any media. However, it is firstly important to note that the results of the CDA do not offer evidence that the UK press is inherently biased in its representation of Russia or Russians. My research is limited only to those articles that feature *Londongrad* and to examine the extent to which its usage is problematic. As such is intended to contribute to any future research on media representation of Russians or minority communities, which might encompass a broader examination of representations of Russians in the Media.

What is clear, as results obtained from the CDA suggest, is that *Londongrad* is prevalent in print journalism and that overall the frequency of its usage has increased over time. When comparing Period 2 with Period 1, it is also a label that in the later period is more readily applied to a broader spectrum of topics relating to the present-day activities of Russians in the UK. In comparing the two periods it is evident that the term has not only remained convenient shorthand for articles concerning wealthy individual Russians but has migrated to articles of a more political and economic nature.

It is also evident that its usage varies between different publications. In both Period 1 and 2, *Londongrad* is much more common in the right-wing press. Even when taking Lebedev's arrival at the Independent into account, this is not particularly surprising, as it might be expected that left-of-centre publications would take a more progressive stance on issues relating to representation of minorities and wealthy elites, and broadly speaking *Londongrad* is not used in a positive light with regard to these groups. The Guardian acknowledges the word's existence in the public lexicon, but does not commit the *Londongrad* label to any particular topic, or use it to inform a negative representation.

In Period 1 the majority of articles (12 out of 17) discuss those who might be considered the Russian elite, frequently in a way that sensationalises their lifestyle while sneering at their ostentatious displays of wealth. This can be read as reflecting the tabloidization and penchant for sensationalism of the quality press, as described by Esser. Yet in Period 2 it comes to be used in a much more diverse topical array of articles, referring to a perceived Russian community in the UK, Russian business interests in the UK or Russian espionage activity in

the UK. There are incidences elsewhere where it does not fall neatly into any of these categories.

It is necessary to consider why its use has diversified over time. It is this lack of explicit definition that allows it to adapt to a more political dimension that we see in Period 2. As a term, then, it is malleable, and does carry *implicit* meaning. Referring back to Rist's definition of a *buzzword* it is reasonable to conclude that *Londongrad* has "an absence of real definition, and a strong belief in what the notion is supposed to bring about". The concern here is that the *Londongrad* is so imprecise and so adaptable to a variety that its appearance in an article might simply have become recognised shorthand for negative representations of Russians.

In discussing representation, we must refer back to Hall's work on stereotyping. A feature of both periods has been a disproportionate focus wealthy elites, or those linked to underhand political activity. The marginalization of Russians who do not fit into these brackets risks reinforcing a portrait of Russia that is very narrow in its scope, and statistically unrepresentative of the wider Russian community in the UK. Hall suggests that according to established norms in British society this pitches Russians as in a sense abnormal.

Indeed, what links a majority of articles, and therefore what *Londongrad* represents, is a sense of Russian "otherness", and its separateness from an implied set of British values or norms. This would seem to reflect Khosravnik's critical work on in-groups and out-groups which he states has had a polarising effect on debate and tends to pigeon-hole and reduce minority groups to a set of stereotypes. To accentuate this point, the language of conflict or espionage, informed to some extent on historical socio-political relationship between the UK and Russia, is evident in a large number of articles, and I have mentioned that broadly speaking the tone of the articles is negative or suspicious. This has the effect of alienating or distancing whatever *Londongrad* is deemed to represent from the readership.

If we view this in the context of power relations, the use of *Londongrad* perpetuates stereotypes that present a derisory and narrow picture of Russian activity in the UK, and focuses disproportionately on wealthy or political elites. We see that the language used in these articles often gets repeated, and well-worn tropes included in multiple articles. The reason why this is important is that these publications are influential such representations promote inequality. It is a discourse that, to refer back to Foucault, perpetuates "systems of exclusion", and given the influence of the UK press on the formation of opinion in society, it is quite plausible that the repeated encoding of this relationship will influence public opinion. It is my intention in this thesis to draw attention to the way in which a single word can come

be indicative of a "naturalization of ideologies" [194] and lead to the reproduction of hegemony. The consequences of this, in the digital age, are further reaching than ever before.

[194] van Dijk, T.: *Discourse and Power*, op. cit, p. 91

Bibliography

Newspaper Articles for CDA

THE TELEGRAPH 2005-2008

Egerton, Lulu: “Fear not, the rich are still happy to spend squillions on the very best” (1/12/2007)

Petre, Jonathan: “An unorthodox power struggle as Russian Patriach clashes with liberal Londongrad” (30/5/2006)

Pindar, Peter: “Rhyme and Reason: From Russia with Death” (3/12/2006)

Walden, Celia: “To Russia with Goss” (9/6/2007)

Wansell, Geoffrey: “RED ALERT: The sinister death of Alexander Litvinenko has unveiled the shadowy world of 'Londongrad' - a melting pot of dissidents, defectors and billionaire oligarchs” (25/11/2006)

Woods, Judith: “When silence is golden Irina Abramovich has hit the jackpot due to her very discreet divorce. But the dent in husband Roman's bank accounts is nothing compared to the blow to his ego, says Judith Woods” (15/3/2007)

THE TIMES 2005-2008

Grimston, Jack: “Making themselves at home: Russian elite bring their 'stealth wealth' to Londongrad” (10/6/2007)

Hames, Tim: “Never say never, but Putin is no Ernst Blofeld” (4/12/2006)

Toomey, Christine: “The Tsars Come Out to Play” (23/4/2006)

Woods, Richard; Leppard, David & Walsh, Gareth: “Buried in Lead in Londongrad” (10/12/2006)

THE INDEPENDENT 2005-2008

Anon: “From Russia with Cash” (17/10/2005)

Adams, Guy & Harris, Sarah: “The super rich” (17/12/2006)

Baker Martin: “The Russians are coming, so pour yourself a Kalashnikov” (3/6/2007)

Frith, Maxine: “Russian oligarchs flock to Britain with billions to spend and a taste for luxury” (17/10/2005)

Jones, Alice: “Arts previews: Intoxicating new spirit from Russia” (7/11/2005)

Milmo, Cahal: “Russian community faces schism as Patriarch Alexis sacks London bishop” (19/5/2006)

Moreton, Cole: “RUSSIAN POWER - (Invasion!)” (8/1/2006)

THE TELEGRAPH 2011-2014

Coughlin, Con: “By defying the West, bully-boy Vladimir Putin could lead Russia to ruin” (22/7/2014)

Coughlin Con: “Vladimir Putin: a man the West can do business with? David Cameron’s meeting with Russian president Vladimir Putin in Sochi may be fraught with mind games, but it could help bring an end to the civil war in Syria” (10/5/2013)

Dennys, Harriet: “Russian to Cancel a Ball” (26/3/2014)

Dmitrieva, Olga & Yuferova, Yadviga: “Destination: 'Londongrad'; Migrants Russians in Britain New wave of Russian expats washed up in 'Londongrad’. A growing number of our people are choosing to relocate to Britain. But who are they? And why do they remain such an enigma to the Brits?” (19/4/2011)

Moore, Charles: “A grimy, chaotic Babel – but would we have London any other way? The world seeks refuge, fame and fortune in our capital, and it’s a compliment that it does” (28/7/2012)

Newmark, Brooks: “Ukraine: How to punish Putin, the oligarchs – and their shopaholic wives” (11/3/2014)

Parfitt, Tom & Freeman, Colin: “Was it murder or odd mishap?; Tax scandal that links dead businessman to another Russian who died in a Moscow prison” (2/12/2012)

Rayner, Gordon & Gardham, Duncan: “MP's four–year affair with Russian 'honeytrap spy'; Lib Dem's young researcher was Kremlin's eyes and ears in Commons, tribunal is told” (19/10/2011)

Thompson, Laura: “A little less soul–baring and a lot more ballet, please” (4/4/2012)

THE TIMES 2011-2014

Anon: “Keeping up with the Zahoors; INSIDE THE SUPER-RICH WORLD OF LONDONGRAD: Champagne baths, diamond-encrusted rifles and a reality TV show - Lydia Slater meets the latest oligarch couple to hit the capital” (23/11/2013)

Boyes, Roger: “High-heel races, fur in summer: how to spot a Russian in Cyprus; Russia's oligarchs are conspicuous by their bronzed wives, big yachts and pasty legs. But if their cash isn't safe in Cyprus, will they stay, asks Roger Boyes” (10/4/2013)

Boyes, Roger: “Only shock-and-awe sanctions will hurt Putin” (30/4/2014)

Boyes, Roger: “The Russian Railway Man” (21/3/2014)

Dey, Iain: “Putin's sabre rattles the Londongrad set” (30/3/2014)

Kampfner, John: “Posturing is no substitute for foreign policy” (26/8/2014)

O’Neill, Sean: “Cabbie sought as vital clue to shooting of Russian banker” (26/3/2012)

Leppard, David; Franchetti, Mark & Dowling Kevin: “Shot banker was to testify on gang war; A Russian gunned down in London was due to tell prosecutors about a Moscow murder plot” (25/3/2012)

Vowden, Charlotte: “Meet the ‘Bollygarchs’ outbidding the Russians in London” (15/6/2014)

Wells, Emma: “Welcome to my den” (26/9/2014)

Whittell, Giles: “Richopolis: is London the greatest city on Earth?” (8/5/2012)

THE INDEPENDENT 2011-2014

Sengupta, Kim: “Ruling means Ivanov's star will keep shining” (29/11/2013)

Taylor, Jerome: “Call to name London's Russian hit squads” (4/4/2012)

THE GUARDIAN 2011-14

Booth, Robert: “The oligarchs: Super-rich no longer so secure in Londongrad” (25/3/2013)

Borger, Julian: “EU's economic war on Putin raises spectre of new iron curtain era: New blacklist may mean lengthy European rift Experts downplay impact of sanctions on London” (26/7/2014)

Borger Julian; Norton-Taylor, Richard & Macalister, Terry: “The siege of Londongrad” (29/3/2014)

Chichvarkin, Yevgeny: “Russians are heading west to protect their children” (3/3/2012)

Tisdall, Simon: “Europa: How do you solve a problem like Russia?: A resurgent Kremlin is setting the agenda on world issues, especially Syria, and has once again started to boss its backyard. How are Europe's leaders reacting to Putin's newfound foreign policy confidence, and are they responding with one voice?” (18/10/2013)

Other Media Articles

Stewart, Will “Could fallout from the Litvinenko poisoning mean a new Cold War?” (Daily Express, 23/5/2007)

Radwanick, Sarah: ‘Most Read Online Newspapers in the World: Mail Online, New York Times and The Guardian’ (Comscore, 12/12/2012)

Literature

Baker, Paul; Gabrielatos, Costas & McEnery, Tony: *Analysis and Media Attitudes: the Representation of Islam in the British Press* (Cambridge University Press, New York 2013)

Breeze, Ruth: "Critical Discourse Analysis and its Critics" in Pragmatics 21:4, (International Pragmatics Association, 2011)

Cole, Peter & Harcup, Tony: *Newspaper Journalism*, (SAGE, London 2010)

Cornwall, Andrea & Eade, Deborah (eds): *Deconstructing Development Discourse: Buzzwords and Fuzzwords*, eds, (Practical Action Publishing, Great Britain, 2010)

Esser, Frank: "'Tabloidization' of News: A Comparative Analysis of Anglo-American and German Press Journalism", in European Journal of Communication 43:3 (London 1999)

Fairclough, Norman: *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (Longman, London and New York, 1995)

Fairclough, Norman: *Media Discourse* (Edward Arnold, London, 1995)

Fowler, Roger: *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press* (Routledge, London 1991)

Foucault, Michel: *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, trans: Sheridan Smith, A.M.: (Pantheon, New York, 1972)

Foucault, Michel: *The History of Sexuality: an Introduction,* trans Robert Hurley (Penguin, London, 1990)

Gallie, W.B: 'Essentially Contested Concepts' in *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, New Series* Vol. 56 (1955 - 1956)

Graham, Linda J.: *Discourse Analysis and the Critical Use of Foucault* (Queensland University, 2005)

Hall, Stuart (ed): *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (SAGE Publications, London & New York 2003)

Hook, Derek: *Discourse, knowledge, materiality, history: Foucault and discourse analysis* (LSE Research Online, London 2007)

Jerman, Helena: "Russians as Presented in TV Documentaries" in (The Global Review of Ethnopolitics, 3:2, University of Helsinki 01/2004)

Jorgensen, Marianne & Phillips, Louise: *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (SAGE, London 2002)

Khosravinik, Majid, *British Newspapers and the Representation of Refugees, Asylum Seekers and Immigrants between 1996 and 2006,* (Lancaster University, Lancaster, 2008)

Machin, David and Van Leeuwen, Theo: *Global Media Discourse: A Critical Introduction* (Routledge, London 2007)

Marko, Davor, "Fear Control in Media Discourse" in *Southeastern Europe 37:2* (University of Belgrade and Centre for Social Research ANALITIKA Sarajevo, 2013)

Powers Penny: "The Philosophical Foundations of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis" in *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines,* 1:2*,* (Thompson Rivers University, 2007)

Ramos, Fernando Prieto: *Ethnic Alterity in the News: Discourse on Immigration in the Spanish and Irish Press, 1990-2000* (Dublin City University, 2002)

Rawlinson, Patricia: "Mafia, Media and Myth: Representations of Russian Organized Crime" (Howard Journal 37:4, 11/1998)

Richardson, John, E: *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis* (Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire 2007)

Rist, Gilbert: "Development as a Buzzword" in *Development in Practice 17:4*, (IUED Geneva 2010)

Wang, Jiayu: "Criticising Images: Critical Discourse Analysis of Visual Semiosis in Picture News" in *Critical Arts: South-North Cultural and Media Studies*, 28:2, April 2014)

Wodak, Ruth (ed): *Language, Power and Ideology: Studies in Political Discourse,* (John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1989)

Wodak, Ruth, and Meyer, M.: *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis* (Sage, London 2009)

van Dijk, Teun A.: "Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis" (Japanese Discourse vol. 1, 1995)

van Dijk, Teun A.: *Discourse and Power* (Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire, 1998)

Young, Robert: *Untying The Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, Boston, London & Henley, 1981)

PEW Global Research

Anon: "Global Opinion of Russia Mixed, Negative Views Widespread in Mideast and Europe Survey Report" (Pew Global, 3/9/13) retrieved from http://www.pewglobal.org/2013/09/03/global-opinion-of-russia-mixed/

Anon: "Russia's Global Image Negative amid Crisis in Ukraine, Americans' and Europeans' Views Sour Dramatically" (Pew Global, 9/7/14) retrieved from http://www.pewglobal.org/2014/07/09/russias-global-image-negative-amid-crisis-in-ukraine/

Political Articles

Monaghan, Andrew: *The UK and Russia: A Troubled Relationship part. 1* (Defence Academy of the United Kingdom, 05/2007)

Monaghan, Andrew: *The UK and Russia – Towards a Renewed Relationship?* (Russian Analytical Digest 130, 07/2013)

Stratfor briefing email to employees: "Russia, U.K.: Lavrov and Miliband Play the 'Great Game'" (2/11/2009) retrieved from https://wikileaks.org/gifiles/docs/13/1350487_russia-u-k-lavrov-and-miliband-play-the-great-game-.html

Statistics

Office of National Statistics: “Nationality and country of birth by age, sex and qualifications” (11-12/2013) retrieved from http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/taxonomy/index.html?nscl=Population+by+Nationality+and+Country+of+Birth

IOM: “Russia Mapping Exercise, London” (07/2007) p. 6 retrieved from http://unitedkingdom.iom.int/sites/default/files/doc/mapping/IOM_RUSSIA.pdf

Other Online Resources

IMDB http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1289813/?ref_=fn_al_tt_2

Oxford English Dictionary, http://www.oed.com