

**Critical Discourse Analysis: A letter to
expatriates from the Rt. Hon. Sir Norman
Fowler MP.**

Submitted by: Andrew Atkins

January 2002

1.0 Introduction

Overt/extreme political bias is relatively easy to identify, perhaps because of its *sound and fury*, but there is however a much more sinister and intangible form of politically tainted language which is potentially more dangerous to the fabric of society. It is sinister because it is generally undetected and comes from those in power. It has the effect of conditioning recipients' attitudes and expectations, furthering social inequality and keeping *us* in our proper stations. Stubbs (1990: 8) comments on this phenomenon: 'if people and things are repeatedly talked about in certain ways, then there is a good chance that this will affect how they are thought of'.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was developed to identify this hidden socio-political control which proponents of CDA believe actively constructs society on some levels. This may be one reason the highly politicised media has so much influence on the views of society.

In this paper, I will examine a seemingly innocuous letter (Appendix 1), sent by the Rt. Hon. Sir Norman Fowler MP in June 1994, then chairman of the ruling Conservative Party, to expatriate Britons. I will analyse the letter, using as a base, the framework for CDA described by Fairclough (1989: 110-2), which I feel provides a suitable set of analytical questions for the amount of data I have chosen. It has been used successfully to analyse relatively small quantities of data by others, including Krishnamurthy (1996) and Caldas-Coulthard (1996). I will discuss this framework in further detail below.

2.0 Critical Discourse Analysis

There has been much written in recent years about CDA in its broadest sense. It appears to be quite difficult to define in simple terms and this is probably due to the nature of CDA. It encompasses a number of general tenets and uses a large range of techniques. It aims primarily to identify socio-political inequalities that exist in society. Fairclough (1995b) provides us with a useful definition that encapsulates most other definitions of CDA:

[CDA is the study of] often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations

and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power.

(Fairclough 1995b: 132-3)

CDA differs from other forms of discourse analysis in so much as it is 'critical'. "Critical" implies showing connections and causes which are hidden; it also implies intervention, for example providing resources for those who may be disadvantaged through change.' Fairclough (1995a: 9). The exposure of things hidden is important, as they are not obvious for the people involved and therefore cannot be fought against.

Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995a, 1995b) has contributed 'many articles and books that establish CDA as a direction of research, and that focus on various dimensions of power.' Van Dijk (1998: 12). That CDA is seen as a direction of research rather than a school of thought or a model of analysis is particularly important.

Batstone (1995) elaborates with a definition of what proponents of CDA actually try to achieve:

Critical Discourse Analysts seek to reveal how texts are constructed so that particular (and potentially indoctrinating) perspectives can be expressed delicately and covertly; because they are covert, they are elusive of direct challenge, facilitating what Kress calls the 'retreat into mystification and impersonality' (1989: 57)

Batstone 1995: 198-199.

The above definitions are useful but require further elaboration of how CDA is performed. In *Language and Power*, (1989) Norman Fairclough sets out to 'examine how the ways in which we communicate are constrained by the structures and forces of those social institutions within which we live and function.' (Fairclough 1989: vi). The book suggests a framework for analysing texts. Fairclough (1989: 24-6) describes his views on what discourse and text analysis are. He identifies three levels of discourse, these being firstly, *social conditions of production and interpretation*, i.e. the factors in society that have led to the production of a text and how these factors effect interpretation. Secondly, the *process of production and interpretation*, i.e. how the text has been produced and this effects interpretation. Thirdly, the product of the first two stages, the *text*. Corresponding to the three levels or dimensions of discourse, he proscribes three stages of CDA:

- Description is the stage which is concerned with the formal properties of the text.
- Interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction – with seeing the text as a product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation . . .
- Explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context – with the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation, and their social effects.

Fairclough (1989: 26)

Fairclough (1989: 110-2) provides us with a list of ten main questions and a number of sub-questions, which could be addressed when analysing a text. This is not intended as an exhaustive or all-encompassing list, but is a suggested list of possible directions or areas that could be investigated. The ten questions are divided into three main groups:

A Vocabulary

- 3.2 What *experiential* values do words have?
 - What classification schemes are drawn upon?
 - Are there words which are ideologically contested?
 - Is there *rewording* or *overwording*?
 - What ideologically significant meaning relations are there between words?
- 4.2 What *relational* values do words have?
 - Are there euphemistic expressions?
 - Are there markedly formal or informal words?
3. What *expressive* values do words have?
4. What metaphors are used?

B Grammar

5. What *experiential* values do grammatical features have?
 - What types of process and participants predominate?
 - Is agency unclear?
 - Are processes what they seem?
 - Are normalizations used?
 - Are sentences active or passive?
 - Are sentences positive or negative?
6. What *relational* values do grammatical features have?
 - What modes are used?
 - Are there important features of relational modality?
 - Are the pronouns we and you used and if so, how?
7. What *expressive* values do grammatical features have?
 - Are there important features of expressive modality?
8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?
 - What logical connectors are used?
 - Are complex sentences characterized by coordination or/ subordination?
 - What means are used for referring inside and outside the text?

C Textual structures

9. What interactional conventions are used?
Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?
10. What larger scale structures does the text have?

Fairclough (1989: 110-2)

The definitions of three terms; *experiential*, *relational* and *expressive*, are of great importance to the understanding of the framework. By looking at *experiential* values CDA attempts to show how ‘the text producer’s experience of the natural or social world’ (ibid: 112) effects and is shown in a text. A person’s views of the world can be identified by assessing formal features with *experiential* value. *Relational* values may identify the perceived social relationship between the producer of the text and its recipient. The third dimension, *expressive* value, provides an insight into ‘the producer’s evaluation (in the widest sense) of the bit of the reality it relates to.’ (ibid: 112) This should identify the relevant parties to the text’s social identities. I feel that these values are in the main largely (or completely) subjective. Fairclough (1989: 112) goes on to identify another value that any formal feature may possess, *connective* value, as its function may be to connect together parts of a text. He also stresses that ‘any given formal feature may simultaneously have two or three of these values’ (ibid: 112).

Fairclough’s list of questions seems capable of generating an astonishing amount of analysis and may be less suitable for larger quantities of text. Most writers that have based analysis on his model have addressed a reduced number of questions, and yet still produced a much greater quantity of writing than I am able to do in a paper of this size. It seems prudent, as others have done, to limit detailed analysis to areas that are the most interesting and poignant for this piece.

The model appears sound in its intentions, although it has been criticised (see Pennycook 1994 and Widdowson 1995) because of a perceived lack of focus on agency and its importance and ‘the relation between description and explanation’ (Langer 1998: 23). I do not feel that agency is necessarily an issue as questions five and six in Fairclough’s model do address agency and can be looked at in detail if they prove to be of relevance to the text. I personally find the potential lack of objectivity to be the most uncomfortable part of using the model.

CDA has been used to analyse a number of areas including; racial inequality (see Krishnamurthy 1996 and Wodak 1996) abuse of political and institutional power (see

Coulthard 1996 and Fairclough1989), and sexual inequality (see Hoey 1996 and Morrison 1996).

3.0 Critical Discourse Analysis of the letter

This section of the paper shows my analysis of the letter. I have as stated, used the Fairclough model in my attempt to discover why Kress (1993: 174) suggests ‘The everyday, innocent and innocuous, the mundane text is as ideologically saturated as a text which wears its ideological constitution overtly.’

3.1 Context of culture:

The letter is dated 1st June, 1994, at that time the Conservative party had recently won the General Election of 1992. The party was however losing support and facing apathy from voters. John Major, who some people thought was a poor substitute for Margaret Thatcher, and others felt was little different, was in his second term in office. The Conservatives had been in power for fifteen consecutive years and had brought about wide reaching changes in Britain. The changes were of course subject to critical scrutiny and judgement of success depended upon political viewpoint. Privatisation (see The Economist 1997) and trade union power (see Laybourn 1991 and Brown et al. 1997) were important issues at the time, which divided the nation. The letter has been written in an attempt to decrease the apathy of potential expatriate voters.

3.2 Context of situation:

Field A political campaign letter addressing expatriates, asking for political support and trying to dissuade the reader from voting for the other side.

Tenor the letter is allegedly sent from the Rt. Hon. Sir Norman Fowler MP, chairman of the governing Conservative Party. The use of the full political title carries with it some “authority” as one of the most politically powerful men in Britain at the time. It is aimed at the large number of British expatriates unregistered to vote. The ‘ideal reader’ would probably have been known to the writer from research.

Mode The letter is naturally in written form, and is organised seemingly to provide information for the reader and to help with voting. The letter is not a public

discourse act but is intended only to be read by a small selected part of society. It is a persuasive text that uses a number of ‘facts’ to reinforce and further its aims.

It appears useful at this point to question how much input if any the alleged author had in the writing of the text. I can only speculate on the processes involved in production of the text, but it would perhaps be naïve to assume that it was written solely by Sir Norman. I suspect that in fact it was written by a team of speech/literature writers and signed by the Right Honourable gentleman for the purpose of lending it authority, but as I said this is pure speculation.

This piece of discourse fits into a long series of discourse between the parties concerned. The series will consist of a number of discourse types, such as, media reporting both written and spoken, press releases by the government, electioneering as well as other forms of political discourse that a British citizen will have received in their lifetime.

3.3 Post contextual analysis

3.3.1 What *experiential* values do grammatical features have?

- *What types of process and participants predominate?*

Fairclough offers an effective introduction to this question: ‘When one wishes to represent textually some real or imaginary action, event, state of affairs or relationship, there is often a choice between different grammatical process and participant types, and the selection made can be ideologically significant’ Fairclough (1989: 120). The following questions look at the different *grammatical processes* and *participants*.

- *Is agency unclear?*

Fairclough (1989: 123) provides examples of how agency can be hidden or distanced by the choice of grammatical structure used. In this text however some of the choices seem to go against the obvious. I will give an example:

Britain under the Conservatives has been transformed.

The choice of the nominalisation ‘*Britain under the Conservatives*’ obscures the active participation of the Conservatives in the process by putting Britain in the first

position and emphasising it. This sentence could easily have started '*The Conservatives have transformed Britain.*' This when fully considered however, would have been too strong a claim to make in British politics. The Conservatives may have felt it to be true, but it removes all onus of success from Britain and the British people and may have been offensive to the people. The use of '*Britain under the Conservatives*' links the Conservatives with the process but does not take all the credit. 'Nominalization is said to be particularly well suited to the expression of power through the mystification of time and participants' Batstone 1995: 206.

On further examination, there are no occasions when the Conservative Party takes the fullest credit for its actions in the past. I feel that this is not due to direct modesty but is an attempt to avoid arrogance and project a sense of the responsible 'custodianship' of Britain, rather than the dictatorial control an alternative could imply. There are two sentences in which *the Conservative Party* is in the head position but, they are used with future and present meaning respectively and show how the Party will help the reader and how it relies on the reader:

The Conservative Party will then suggest to you a reliable Conservative who will agree to be your proxy.

The Conservative Party relies entirely on voluntary donations and, unlike the Labour Party, is not able to call upon captive funds from the Trades Unions.

Another example of unclear agency:

Privatisation has almost completely reversed all the nationalisations of past Socialist Governments.

'Privatisation' is 'an untypically inanimate agent of an action process' (Fairclough 1989: 123). Fairclough (1989: 123) also suggests that this 'obfuscation of agency' is ideologically motivated. It appears however, to share similarities with the use of '*Britain under the Conservatives*'. The obvious agent of the process of privatisation is the Conservative Party, but this is avoided perhaps for reasons of appearing arrogant or to slightly distance itself from the highly controversial subject.

Another slightly unusual feature of the above sentence is the contrast between '*Privatisation*' and '*all the nationalisations of past Socialist Governments*'. The first term sounds like one planned process whereas the latter term sounds less planned,

more haphazard and random, and this is emphasised with the use of ‘*all the . . .*’. It is also quite untypical to use the plural form ‘*nationalisations*’.

I feel at this point it may be useful to stand back from the text and look from a slightly different perspective. The first two real paragraphs start with the word ‘*Britain*’ and this may be meant to *catch the eye* and appeal to the homesick Briton. The next four paragraphs start with these typically inanimate agents: ‘*Privatisation . . .*’, ‘*Inflation . . .*’, ‘*Income tax rates . . .*’, ‘*Strikes . . .*’, which make skimming/scanning the text very easy. If readers are interested in a particular area they can read on, if not, they can move on. The letter is being sent to possibly apathetic expatriates who are not directly affected by these factors and the features may be to maintain enough interest for the reader to get to the end of the letter, rather than discard it. I realise the party would prefer the reader to scrutinise the finer points of the text but probably realise that in many cases this does not happen. This is my personal opinion as an apathetic expatriate.

3.3.2 What *experiential* values do words have?

- *Are there words, which are ideologically contested?*

A word in the text that is immediately noticeable as being ideologically contested is ‘*socialist*’. The synonymy of ‘*Labour*’ and ‘*Socialist*’ is also ideologically contestable, and would not have been used by the Labour Party in its own literature. It appears that although some members of the Labour Party may have had ‘*socialist*’ leanings at the time the letter was written, the party as a whole was trying to disassociate itself from the term. This terminologically inexact word has various meanings, which according to Fairclough (1989: 114) share the same core ‘the belief that social control should be exercised in the interests of the majority of working people’. This hardly seems negative, but a cursory look at the Cobuild Corpus seems to suggest rather negative usage patterns for ‘*socialist*’ in the newspaper corpora. Labourite could have been used as a possible alternative, although it appears to be particularly uncommon.

- *What ideologically significant meaning relations are there between words?*

Labour and Conservative are (obviously) ideologically different and therefore contested. 'Conservative' occurs eight times in the letter whereas 'Labour' is used seven times and the intended synonym 'Socialist' twice. It is not surprising that Labour is represented in a negative way and the Conservatives are talked about very positively. I find the collocations of the two parties to be of significance and have listed them below.

'Conservative' collocation:

the Conservatives (three occurrences)

the Conservative Party (two occurrences)

vote Conservative (one occurrence)

a reliable Conservative (one occurrence)

the Conservative cause (one occurrence)

'Labour' collocations:

the Labour Party (three occurrences)

Labour (two occurrences)

Labour Government(s) (two occurrences)

the Socialists (one occurrence)

Socialist Governments (one occurrence)

It is interesting that the three occurrences of 'Government(s)' collocate with either 'Labour' or 'Socialist', but not with 'Conservative'. This suggests that 'Government(s)' has negative connotations. 'Conservative' also collocates with 'reliable' and 'cause', which carry positive associations.

3.3.3 What *relational* values do grammatical features have?

- *What modes are used?*

The declarative mode is used for all but two sentences in the letter, in which the imperative mode is used:

Please complete them, converting initials into forenames and making any corrections and return them in the enclosed envelope to this office.

Please be as generous as you can.

These two sentences are polite, using 'please', but are direct imperatives, which often signify that the writer is in a position of perceived power over the addressee. This

power may be commensurate with what is expected of Government. If a less direct imperative had been used it may have been associated with weakness, which would be unwanted.

- *Are there important features of relational modality?*

Norman Fowler's use of unmodalised polar statements in the text adds to his or the Governments authority. He presents almost all the information as unquestionable facts that appear to the reader to be true. This coupled with his 'individual invisibility' (Kress 1985 in Caldas-Coulthard and Holland 2000: 121), i.e. only one occurrence of 'I', makes the modal force very strong. I feel some statements are purely the party's opinion and should contain some modalisation. E.g., '*Industrial relations have never been better.*' This is clearly the view of industrial relations from the side of management and not from the perspective of the trade unions.

There are a few modal auxiliaries in the text, mostly used in either predictive statements, will with future use or with relation to ability. The predictive statements seem to have most significance to CDA and these are:

*A Labour Government would halt the process and try to reverse its achievements.
Inflation is dramatically down, running below 2% for the whole of 1993 for the first time since 1960 and independent forecasts are that it will remain low for the foreseeable future.
At the next General Election, these achievements will be threatened by Labour.*

These statements are given strong modal force as they are intended to be perceived as having a very high probability of occurrence.

- *Are the pronouns we and you used, and if so, how?*

The pronoun *we* is only used once and is used to mean the Conservative Party, therefore there is no attempt to be inclusive. There is also a single occurrence of '*us*' which is used in the same sense. This scarcity is related to the use of nominalisations (see above).

There are ten cases of ‘you’ in the letter, but all of these are exclusive of the writer. An attempt has been made to personalise the letter and make the readers feel as though it was written to them directly.

- *What relational values do words have?*

The letter and its vocabulary are targeted towards the expatriate with a typically Conservative viewpoint. It makes many assumptions about what will be perceived as good. There are a number of issues, which although good for ‘the pound in your pocket’ and the individual, have negative consequences for society as a whole.

‘*Socialist(s)*’ also has a relational aspect, it assumes that the expatriate reader is anti-socialist. Perhaps a fair assumption to make.

‘*Privatisation*’ is assumed to be a mutually agreeable term. No hint of ‘selling off the family silver’ here. It perhaps assumes that the addressee was party to the under-priced selling off and made a little money. British Telecom was profitable before privatisation and has been even more profitable since, making much more profit than it is paying in corporation tax.

‘*Inflation . . . running below 2%*’ is undoubtedly to be thought of as something good, whereas many economists would suggest that it is too low and read into it that the growth of the economy was very low too.

3.3.4 What *expressive* values do words have?

Words with expressive values can be classified in two main ways, those that are positive and associated with the Conservatives and those which are negative and used in conjunction with Labour.

Positive connotations:

‘*successfully* weathered’

‘*dramatically* down’

‘*fallen steadily*’

Negative connotations:

‘*bitterly* opposed’

‘*over*-regulation’

‘*threatened* by Labour’

This is not out of place but subtly furthers prejudice towards the Labour Party, as I am sure is the intention.

'The humiliating decline of Britain in the World under successive Labour Governments has been reversed.' Is also laden with negative evaluation and interestingly the writer uses the word *'successive'* and appears to have forgotten Conservative Governments which also had power during the period of decline.

- *What metaphors are used?*

'The sick man of Europe' an expression allegedly coined 150 years ago by Czar Nicholas I, when referring to the Ottoman Empire, has become part of our language, and I have found it used in association with a number of countries including; Scotland and modern-day Turkey. The expression was also used extensively in and about Britain in the 70's and 80's.

'weathered the . . .' is also a common metaphor, originating from *'weather the storm'* – a completely unavoidable event. Placing blame anywhere but at the feet of the Conservatives.

- *What expressive values do grammatical features have?*

- *Are there important features of expressive modality?*

Fairclough (1989) notes that expressive and relational modality features overlap and I feel it is almost impossible to separate them cleanly. I have already identified *'authenticity claims, or claims to knowledge'* (ibid. 129) under question six. The verbs in the majority of cases are in non-modal tenses giving the impression (justified or not) of authority and knowledge. These represented truths need to be questioned by the reader as they are often opinion disguised as fact and fact shown in an unquestionably positive way when it may not necessarily be so.

3.3.5 How are (simple) sentences linked together?

The following two sentences are not directly linked together, but there is a strong connection between them. The implication seems to be that all sensible governments/political parties realise that privatisation is the only common sense thing

to do. There is a strongly implied *however* between the sentences, which leads the reader to infer that the Labour Party is not only opposed to the Conservative Party's scheme of privatisation but also unable to understand reason.

*Now Governments of all political persuasions around the world are following suit.
A Labour Government would halt the process and try to reverse its achievements.*

Former Conservative prime minister Harold Macmillan however, likened the process to 'selling off the family silver', and it appears he had a point in the case of profitable nationalised industries such as British Telecom, which made and continues to make huge profits for its investors.

- *What larger scale structures does the text have?*

Without comparison to other similar letters, it is difficult to assess whether this letter fits the typical pattern. It does however follow some typical conventions of formal letters. The first real sentence in the letter makes an attempt to start with a reference to previous correspondence and reason for writing. The next paragraph says what a great job the government has done generally and is followed by more detailed paragraphs which list its greatest achievements/campaign policies and talks briefly in a very negative way about the Labour Party's policies. The next section describes how to register to vote and actually vote. The final section is simply asking for money. This format seems unsurprising for this kind of letter and there appears to be nothing unusual.

4.0 Summary of analysis

- There are a number of instances where contentious and ideologically contestable issues are presented in the form of facts. This kind of factual inexactitude, while not exactly lies, may be considered by many to be unethical.
- The issues of nominalisation and agency were of particular interest, especially because I did not find what I had expected from my reading of the literature. I found that the writer never put himself or the Conservative Party in the first position of a sentence, the position of greatest emphasis, and instead (and I

speculate here) tried to avoid arrogance and create a sense of unity with the British people.

- Labour and the Labour Party are portrayed, unsurprisingly, in a negative light. Some of the ways in which this is done are more subtle than others. The use of negative collocates, contentious nomenclature and the expressive value of words used in conjunction with respective parties.
- Due to television documentary programmes we are all aware of the vast marketing machine behind every political party and its campaigning, this letter appears to be a product of that machine and little to do with Sir Norman. He may have commissioned the letter and had some input into the contents, however the obvious care and attention that has gone into producing it leads me to believe a great deal of linguistic expertise has been applied to its fabrication.

5.0 Conclusion

I have shown that there are many cases where using Fairclough's (1989) CDA framework it is possible to identify features that probably effect in some way the thinking and actions of voters without them being aware of this influence. Even a form of discourse that seems banal and ordinary, such as this letter, contains elements that may perpetuate and reinforce the power and control of those who have it. Control of discourse and therefore probably peoples minds seems an effective 'way to reproduce dominance and hegemony' (Van Dijk 1997: 4) and is definitely an area of concern for both the voting public and political parties not in power.

When first reading this letter I felt it would be very difficult to find enough subject matter to analyse, but was surprised by how much depth and detail the framework produced. It was possible to identify areas of concern and to uncover political bias, but there appears to be nothing in the form of checks and balances of the analyst's own political views. Although it is not exactly 'witch-hunting', it may be open to polemic distortion of the kind it attempts to expose.

A large amount of the work done in the field of CDA has quite correctly looked at issues of unfairness from the point of view of the disenfranchised. It may also be interesting for further study to look at how the language of unfairly treated, itself,

perpetuates oppression. This too, would provide results that could be acted upon by the oppressed and show the level of acceptance they have of their position.

Bibliography and References

Batstone, R. 1995. 'Grammar in discourse: attitude and deniability', in **G. Cook**, and **B. Seidlhofer**, (eds.) Principle & Practice in Applied Linguistics, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.197-213.

Bourdieu, P. 1999. 'Language and symbolic power', in **A. Jaworski**, and **N. Coupland**, (eds.) The Discourse Reader, London: Routledge, pp502-513.

Brown, W. S, Deakin and P, Ryan. 1997 'The effects of British industrial relations legislation 1979-97', National Institute Economic Review, 161, 69-83

Caldas-Coulthard, C.R. 1996. 'Women who pay for sex and enjoy it. Transgressions versus morality in women's magazines', in **C.R. Caldas-Coulthard**, and **M. Coulthard**, (eds.) Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis, London: Routledge, pp.250-270.

Caldas-Coulthard, C.R. and **M. Coulthard**, (eds.) 1996 Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis, London: Routledge.

Economist, The. 1997. 'Privatisation A hard sell' [Online], <http://www.ge97.co.uk/economist/pri.html> (accessed 17th November 2001).

Fairclough, N. 1989. Language and Power, London: Longman

Fairclough, N. 1992. Discourse and Social Change, London: Polity Press

Fowler, R. 1966. 'On Critical Linguistics', in **C.R. Caldas-Coulthard**, and **M. Coulthard**, (eds.) Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis, London: Routledge, pp.3-14.

Jaworski, A. and **N. Coupland**, (eds.) The Discourse Reader, London: Routledge.

Krishnamurthy, R. 1996. 'Ethnic, racial and tribal: the language of racism?' in **C.R. Caldas-Coulthard**, and **M. Coulthard**, (eds.) Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis, London: Routledge, pp.129-149.

Langer, R. 1998. 'The concept of discourse in the analysis of complex communication events' [Online], http://www.diskurs.dk/litteratur/pdf/artikler/Langer,%20Roy_The%20concept%20of%20discourse%20in%20the%20analysis_IKL-paper%201998.pdf (accessed 12th November 2001).

Laybourn, K. 1991. British Trade Unionism c.1770-1990. Stroud: Sutton Publishing.

Pennycook, A. 1994. 'Incommensurable Discourses?' in Applied Linguistics, Vol.15, No.2, pp.115-138. Oxford University Press.

Van Dijk, T. 1996. 'Discourse, Power and Access', in **C.R. Caldas-Coulthard**, and **M. Coulthard**, (eds.) Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis, London: Routledge, pp.84-106.

Van Dijk, T. 1997. 'Critical Discourse Analysis' [Online], <http://www.hum.uva.nl/~teun/cda.htm> (accessed 31st October 2001).

Wallace, C. 1992. 'Critical Literacy Awareness in the EFL classroom', in **N. Fairclough** (ed.) Critical Language Awareness, London and New York: Longman.

Wallace, C. 1995. "'Reading with a suspicious eye": Critical Reading in the foreign language classroom', in **G. Cook**, and **B. Seidlhofer**, (eds.) Principle & Practice in Applied Linguistics, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.335-347.

Widdowson, H.G. 1995. 'Discourse analysis: a critical view.' in Language and Literature 4, pp.157-172.

Appendix 1 – Text

1st June 1994

Dear Expatriate,

It is now fifteen years since the General Election victory in 1979.

Britain under the Conservatives has been transformed. The humiliating decline of Britain in the World under successive Labour Governments has been reversed. The sick man of Europe has been transformed into the first choice for international investors.

Britain under the Conservatives has successfully weathered the two world recessions of the 80s and 90s. Unemployment, which is still rising across Europe, has fallen steadily in Britain. At the time of writing it has fallen by over 289,000 since January 1993.

Privatisation has almost completely reversed all the nationalisations of past Socialist Governments. This policy, so bitterly opposed by the Labour Party at the time, has returned huge swathes of British industry to profitability and competitiveness. In 1979, under Labour, nationalised industries were costing the taxpayer £50 million per week. Now privatised, they are paying £60 million per week into the Exchequer in Corporation Tax! Prices to the consumer are also down. For example, British Telecom are charging 30% less in real terms whilst domestic gas is similarly down by 23%. Now Governments of all political persuasions around the world are following suit. A Labour Government would halt the process and try to reverse its achievements.

Inflation is dramatically down, running below 2% for the whole of 1993 for the first time since 1960 and independent forecasts are that it will remain low for the foreseeable future.

Income tax rates under the Conservatives are down to a basic rate of 25% and a top rate of 40%. So different from the 33% and 83% (98% on savings income) levied by the Socialists!

Strikes have fallen to their lowest level since records began more than a century ago. Industrial relations have never been better. The confidence of the rest of the World in British industry is reflected in the huge amount of foreign investment. In recent years Britain has received around 40% of all inward investment into Europe.

At the next General Election, these achievements will be threatened by Labour. The Labour Party remain committed to high taxes, over-regulation of industry and a reversal of many of our reforms. You have a vital role in helping to achieve a historic fifth successive election victory. Eligible expatriates, who register to vote before 10th October 1994, will be able to vote in all Westminster Elections (including by-elections) held between February 1995 and February 1996.

In the belief that you are still eligible, and on the basis that you left the UK after 10th October 1974, I am enclosing the form(s) to re-register as overseas elector(s). Please complete them, converting initials into forenames and making any corrections and return them in the enclosed envelope to this office. We will re-direct them to the appropriate Electoral Registration Officer.

If you want to vote Conservative and do not have a relative or friend on whom you can completely rely to follow your wishes, tear off Part 2 of the form and discard it and fill in the *Find me a Proxy* request form sending it to us with Part 1. The Conservative Party will then suggest to you a reliable Conservative who will agree to be your proxy.

Organising a modern election campaign is an expensive business. The Conservative Party relies entirely on voluntary donations and, unlike the Labour Party, is not able to call upon captive funds from the Trades Unions. We rely upon the support of thousands of individuals like you. Not only can you help the Conservative cause by re-registering to vote, you can also make a contribution to the costs of the campaign. Please be as generous as you can. It will be an investment with a real return.

Yours sincerely

THE RT. HON. SIR NORMAN FOWLER MP
Chairman of the Party