

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI
FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

Lenka Slípková

Britishness versus Englishness and the Impacts of
Immigration in Terms of Racial Riots in London

Bakalářská práce

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Pavlína Flajšarová, Ph.D.

Olomouc 2013

Britishness versus Englishness and the Impacts of Immigration in Terms of Racial Riots in London

(Bakalářská práce)

Autor: **Lenka Slípková**

Studijní obor: Anglická filologie

Vedoucí práce: **Mgr. Pavlína Flajšarová, Ph.D.**

Počet stran: 40

Počet znaků: 74 606

Olomouc 2013

Prohlašuji, že jsem tuto bakalářskou práci vypracovala samostatně a uvedla úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne 23.4. 2013

Děkuji své úžasné mamce Lence Slípkové, bez jejíž neustálé podpory během studií bych dnes tuto bakalářskou práci nepsala.

V Olomouci dne 23. 4. 2013

OBSAH

Contents

1	Introduction	5
2	Britishness Versus Englishness and the Impacts of Immigration in Terms of Racial Riots in London	7
2.1	Beginnings of Britishness and Englishness	7
2.1.1	Britannia, Anglo-Saxons and Process of Building the English Identity	7
2.1.2	Treaties and Coinage of Britishness	9
2.1.3	The British Empire and New-found Identity behind Imperialism	11
2.2	Post-war Britain and Immigration	13
2.2.1	Decolonisation: Commonwealth Immigration	14
2.2.2	Swinging London and Cool Britannia	16
2.2.3	Thatcherism and Tackling Britishness	18
2.2.4	Tony Blair and Coping with Cultural Alienation	19
2.3	Negative Outcomes of Non-European Immigration in the UK after WWII	21
2.3.1	Racial Riots in Brixton in 1981 and 1985	21
2.3.2	Stephen Lawrence	23
2.3.3	Riots in 2001	24
2.3.4	London Bombings 2005	25
2.3.5	Jean Charles de Menezes' Death	26
2.4	Broken Britain and London Riots in 2011	27
2.4.1	Pretext for Riots and Death of Mark Duggan	27
2.4.2	During the Riots	28
2.4.3	Aftermath of the Riots	30
3	Conclusion	31
4	Resumé	33
5	Bibliography	35
6	Anotace	39
7	Abstract	40

1 INTRODUCTION

In my thesis I concentrate on the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland specifically on the issue of Britishness as a term applying to citizens of the country. In the United Kingdom, Britishness is connected to multiculturalism because the country has many foreigners and besides them there are four nations living in the same country. These nations are the English, the Scottish, the Welsh and the Irish.

I divide my bachelor thesis into four parts because in order to understand what Britishness and Englishness means we need to scrutinise them diachronically. Therefore the thesis is a summary of facts and is concluded with an example.

The first part specifies the terms Britishness and Englishness and talks about coinage of these words. Moreover, it proves that the term British is a great deal older than English and even though the term has existed for centuries it has been evolving ever since. It supplies the thesis with a summarised history of the British Isles from 1st century BC to early 20th century Britain. When it deals with the United Kingdom in the 20th century it points out the key issues of colonisation, decolonisation and subsequent immigration because these factors are the ones that created modern Britain as it is nowadays.

The second part focuses on the post-war Britain and the immigration to the country. It explains several different tactics taken by for example by Tony Blair or Margaret Thatcher. This part enlightens about the issue of re-born Celticism and steps taken by Tony Blair during his period as a Prime Minister. In 2nd half of the part I talk about Margaret Thatcher, the economical crises and issues of violence exercised on Thatcher by IRA. This part prepares the ground for the next chapter that focuses on negative outcomes of multiculturalism.

The third part states the most important events since WWII. Above all, the whole chapter deals with riots, terrorist attacks and race-based murders. It explains racial riots in Brixton in 1981 and 1985 and seeks for connection. This part also discusses the case of the murder of Stephen Lawrence. The final subchapter of the third part gives a full account of bomb attacks in London in 2001 and the murder of Jean Charles de Menezes that followed.

The end of the thesis concentrates on the riots in England in 2011. It deals solely with London riots because the incident that triggered the riots took place in London. This incident is a murder of a black teenager Mark Duggan and one subchapter explains what exactly happened and the aftermath of the act.

The thesis makes conclusion that British means a person who lives in the United Kingdom and has a British passport but does not belong to any nations living in the country such as the English, the Scottish, etc. British is an immigrant who was not born in the United Kingdom or second generation of immigrants.

2 BRITISHNESS VERSUS ENGLISHNESS AND THE IMPACTS OF IMMIGRATION IN TERMS OF RACIAL RIOTS IN LONDON

2.1 Beginnings of Britishness and Englishness

It is necessary to open the issue with looking at both terms English and British diachronically. British is historically older than English. The term Briton, that used to mean ancient peoples from the islands of Great Britain, evolved eventually into anyone who is a citizen of the United Kingdom (Gamble and Wright 1). There were three major milestones in change of term British: Anglo-Saxons, who coined term English, treaties between nations when British was created as a unification of nations and the British Empire which gave its birth to Britishness as we know it now.

2.1.1 Britannia, Anglo-Saxons and Process of Building the English Identity

The Isles were unsuccessfully raided by Romans from first century BC until the successful conquest in 43 AD. In 55 BC Julius Caesar launched several attempts to occupy the isles as he thought it would be very easy. He expected the tribes to withdraw immediately as they were very barbarian and he did not see them as a real threat or enemy. Romans traded with the tribes and they knew the isles were abundant in gold and other precious metals. However he underestimated the biggest enemy and that were the Isles themselves. Weather did not allow Caesar to conquer isles. Caesar's numerous attempts to conquer Britain failed. Even though the conquest did not happen the attempts were to be never forgotten. In the end only Claudius succeeded in what Caesar did not (Allport 30).

Under rule of Caesar, Britannia was the first formal mention of the term that gave its start to modern term British. It was taken from Latin by Romans. The term referred to the Isle they occupied. The isle was already taken up by, by estimation, around 27 major tribes ("Native Tribes of Britain") in the first century AD, when Romans came. The rule of Roman Empire lasted until 410. Romans called these tribes Britons. They were Celtic tribes living on British Isles since the Iron Age. Britons later evolved into British. Britons did not speak English because at that time English was still a mere dialect in north Germany.

In post-Roman period many tribes were raiding the isles. Amongst them the strongest were Scandinavians, Jutes, Angles and Saxons. They were creating the identity of British Isles from 550 till 1066 when Norman period started.

Dark Ages came as Angles and Saxons invaded the country by violence. There was a long gradual process of Saxonification of the nation into creation of Anglo-Saxon kingdoms. They lived amongst the Romano-British population. There was a clash of mingling of two opposite cultures. Europe saw the country as Britannia and the name perseveres till nowadays in spite of all the subsequent raids of various nations.

In 6th century Britannia was strictly divided into several areas. Remains of Britannia were taken by Germanic Anglo-Saxons in the West, Britons occupied the East and pagan Picts and Scotti lived in the North. The country was divided by different language, culture, habits and history. Later several heptarchies were set up from whose Mercia, Northumbria and Wessex were the biggest. It was the first appearance of England as being taken by Anglo-Saxons. All of these kingdoms used a similar language. It was the first reference to modern term English and English language which is now called old English (Allport 32).

In 8th century this merge of Anglo-Saxon nations was even more imminent due to Venerable Bede who wrote the first history of Anglo-Saxons called *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* in English *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (Beda Venerabilis). Although it was first published in Latin, it served its purpose to cross the gap between differences among Anglo-Saxons. The work was later translated to English, Old English in these days, under the rule of Alfred the Great. It is possibly seen as the first propeller. Albeit it concentrated on history of Church and therefore tried to promote Christian Church, it helped to develop the English national identity as being of the same origin and now, on Bede's merit, sharing history. These are the key factors in forging identity. Of course, as the main purpose was to defend Christianity, it also helped to unify the nations under a single church. It was published a century after Synod of Whitby in 664 AD (“Synod of Whitby”) where Roman Anglo-Saxon church was preferred over Irish. It strengthened the unification. Christianity as a common religion was a milestone that contributed to the establishment of an English nation. Even though it was a formal statement, majority of countrymen still performed rituals given by Irish Celtic Church. After the book being published it helped Roman church to spread all around the country.

Despite common church, history and language, Mercia, Northumbria and Wessex kingdoms were still separated but then Vikings swept the country with raids in 9th century. That was the last important assembling of English nation. It was performed out of precaution and was not voluntarily decided. King Alfred the Great of Wessex saved the country from greedy and rapacious Scandinavians, mainly Danes, and found a solution where both sides would gain. According to a new treaty, a part of England seceded from English and Danelaw was created. Danelaw meant area under the rule of Vikings. The sovereigns were obliged to pay, in order to maintain peace, additional Danegeld meaning Danish money in Danish language (Peprník 25). The area of Danish rule was bordering with Northumbria, Mercia and Wessex and occupied the main part of England. This tax was imposed in order to stop Scandinavians ravaging the country and it was successful because it saved the kingdom.

Therefore it is obvious that there is an incompatibility between English and British from the very start. The term British is a great deal older than English. In that time British or Britons originally, were the only tribes that occupied Roman Britannia and that were pushed by Anglo-Saxons to the West. In these days these parts of country including south-western Cornwall is still occupied by people of Celtic origin. Along with Cornish people there are as well Welsh and Bretons who nowadays live in France. There are the remaining Celtic tribes that were called the Britons.

Even in those days being British meant being one of the tribes. It did not specify any nation in particular as it does not today.

2.1.2 Treaties and Coinage of Britishness

According to Paul Ward, Britishness is described as a flexible identity and that is also the reason why the notion is still persistent (5). The substance of the term flexible identity is an incorporation of several nations under one identity. This modern term emerged in one hand with the Laws in Wales Acts 1535 and 1542, union of England and Scotland in 1707 and it was sustained later by the Act of Union in 1800 with Ireland. These treaties stated all the nations of British Isles as a part of the United Kingdom. Unification of nations that were of different origin took over a single sovereign and followed the English rule (Allport 37).

The first steps towards unification of England and Wales were performed in 1283 when Prince Edward seized Wales with his great army. Later domination was

officially stated by Statute of Rhuddlan in 1284. Since that time Wales has shared more than crown with England but legal system and administration as well. This legal system is called English law and is still in practise.

Another official contract that connected England and Wales even tighter was the Laws in Wales Act in 1535 and 1542. It was not performed by violence as in 1283 but on pretext of entitlement. The Laws in Wales Acts were logic conclusions because King Henry VIII of England belonged to Welsh dynasty of Tudors sustaining his position with connection to Owen Tudor. From that time on, England was referred to as Kingdom of England and Wales. Despite the fact that Henry VIII was a successor of Welsh dynasty he was seen as English. It was annexation of administrations and legal systems which, in practise, meant that Wales took over English law and administration. The plan was to unify the countries so that one powerful nation would arise but it never succeeded. The outcome was seen as incorporation rather than unification of the nations, although under the same crown with the right mixture of English and Welsh by origin, they have never been one nation and never would be. There were many reasons why. Despite strong English dominance the most articulate ones were that the Welsh people were of different origin, had different culture and preserved their own language that is not Germanic as English but Celtic and therefore very different. Despite the legal ban of usage of Welsh as an official language they were capable enough to preserve it over centuries of discouragement from the English side. Wales became part of the Kingdom of Great Britain in 1707 and then of the United Kingdom in 1801 (Peprník 51).

Over the centuries the English tried to incorporate Scotland in England but unsuccessfully. The violence did not prove to be the right tactics. There were, of course, many attempts to cease the rivalry between Scotland and England some of them more efficient than others. The more efficient than any treaty was the marriage of James IV with Margaret Tudor. That was the first alliance by blood as James was the king of Scotland. This alliance, though efficient, did not last for long and new arguments arose between Scotland and England.

During the first decade of 17th century King James VI of Scotland wanted Scotland to be annexed. Even though there were oppositions on both sides the king forced Scotland to succumb to the proposition. His main argument was to create alliance that was the same as the one between England and Wales. In his doing the king

was too eager to unify and the nations were not prepared for it. He gave himself into creating new symbols of unification such as a flag and emblems.

Even that the two countries were under the same crown, the official act of annexation did not take place before 1706 and 1707 when The Acts of Union were accepted. This act created the first version of Great Britain seen as one kingdom with three nations under common name of British.

Great Britain was not alliance of nations but rather a hierarchy of nations signifying that Scotland became a part of the United Kingdom and a part of England as the flag illustrated with its St John's cross in front.

Last country that was annexed to the United Kingdom was Ireland in 1801. This Acts of Union merged the isles into United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and later in 1803 “the red diagonal cross of Ireland (...) was added to the flag” (Peprník 81) as a symbol of unification.

Britishness was based on purposefulness. The United Kingdom was a beneficial outcome where each nation was to be rewarded. Despite the attempts to build one strong nation, it did not prove to be successful and the alliance continued to be purely political.

2.1.3 The British Empire and New-found Identity behind Imperialism

Between the late 16th and early 18th century, the United Kingdom become the greatest empire in history with its colonies, dominions and protectorates. British identity was built on imperialism. People were proud to be connected to the British Empire. The central head to this global power was Queen Victoria, the Empress of India. The Queen was seen as the unifying symbol of Britishness that the nations needed. She was seen as a symbol of trade and imperialism. It was imperialism that ignited the notion of identity common to all the nations living on the British Isles. Imperialism created the British identity.

From at least the late nineteenth to at least the late twentieth century monarchy was seen as central to British national identity. Between 1876, when Disraeli gave Queen Victoria the title of Empress of India, and 1953, the monarchy was fundamentally entwined with the idea and reality of the British Empire (Ward 14).

From a small insular country Great Britain became the British Empire almost overnight. This achievement was managed in terms of trade not conquest. The country spread to America, Caribbean and Indian subcontinent and many other areas all over the world. It became the most powerful empire in history.

Although there was a different status on East and West, the Empire had its goods from all of the continents. East areas of Indian subcontinent traded with Great Britain and therefore the relationship was established by East India Company not government that would meddle into the affairs. There were no colonies, no slaves and the relationship worked purely on business terms.

On the other hand, America and West Indies, Caribbean, had the key position in the Empire and they were colonies. They took a key place with its production of sugar canes, tea and other, at that time, very expensive commodities. With its mass production that was increased by its unquenchable demand it gave its birth to a different kind of trade, slave trade with Africans but Indians as well.

These outrageous acts of inhumanity did not take place only in North America but also South America, Africa and many more places. Roger David Casement, a British consul of Irish origin, was not the first or the last to report on abuses and disregard of human rights. He was a British consul from 1903 to 1911. During that time he reported on atrocities happening in Congo and Peru. After his civil service he decided to retreat from the eyesight of the Empire. He felt being British as seeing colonisation through eyes of a Westerner and its blinding stunning grandeur. When he finally got to the wilderness he started to doubt his Britishness and realised that the Empire is built on back of suffering human beings and even grandeur wants its pound of flesh. The wealth of the Empire was achieved by slavery that goes with the territory. As many others he turned away from Britishness in order to understand his own national identity (Llosa).

From outside or more likely from west European point of view, it was a grand Empire built on foundation of freedom and prosperity, abundance, independence and grandeur. Oppositely through the eyes of colonies and subdued nations it meant slavery and oppression hidden behind these big words. Grandeur of the Empire was built on the backs of suffering slaves.

Before the Empire was set up the English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish were clearly divided but with creation of Empire Great Britain they became one nation. Diversity of nationalities did not matter as long as the whole world saw a one big powerful nation

that prospered and flourished. That was the first positive outcome of the Empire but everything takes its toll and with power drawbacks come as well. The first thing to overcome was the multiculturalism. Even though it was supported in radios, newspapers and advertisements, it stretched the elastic band of Britishness. In addition, all over the world there were countries where English spread as an official language and started to develop its regional versions. The question arises. Who am I? On one hand, they were proud of their heritage and their country spreading all over the world. On the other hand, many British never actually visited any of these countries.

In its greatest period, the British Empire span over all six continents. British were not sure anymore whether, with that many vast areas, they knew their own country and as their mother tongue was used by millions of people who had originally a different native language. Identity of Britishness meant sharing cultures but it did not exist in terms of common race anymore. It became not only extra-cultural, extra-lingual but also extra-racial. Britishness was seen, for the very first time, meant ethnicity itself. The kingdom was flooded with products from different countries.

At the peak of its power, it was often said that the sun never sets on the British Empire because its span across the globe ensured that the sun was shining on at least one of its numerous colonies (Wilson 527). Nobody believed that it would last forever. The early signs of decolonisation appeared during WWI.

2.2 Post-war Britain and Immigration

During and after the process of decolonisation it was more than obvious that pre-war attempts to unify Britain into one nation of British people was not likely to happen. When a symbiosis stopped working and union did not offer benefits, nations started to swerve from it. Not only after WWII but even before, revolts against England mushroomed all over Scotland, Wales and Ireland. These measures were supported by national parties such as Plaid Cymru in Wales or Sinn Féin in Ireland. Sinn Féin was, for a long time, associated with the Provisional Irish Republican Army, a paramilitary organisation in Northern Ireland. In case of Sinn Féin it was street fighting and violence that led the policy more than negotiations after some members of the party joined the Irish Volunteers (Medlicott 37). In these days Sinn Féin has moved to the left in political spectrum and concentrate on social improvement.

The term British or Britons served well as a public phenomenon till 1930s and then the crisis came. During Second World War the identity was under pressure because the “notions of Britishness have been challenged by the end of Empire, Commonwealth immigration, 'Americanisation', European integration and the re-emerge Celtic nationalism.” (Ward 2). All these swift changes gave a very difficult situation for English people to cope with. The term had to be re-defined. It was very difficult to define who the British are. British Nation saw themselves as citizens of the greatest country but the Empire did not exist anymore and British tried to find their fabricated identity in the ashes of Empire. Some of them found the solution in their own separation from Britain.

What people brought together made them separate again. After WWII it was clearly obvious that the country's grandness was hidden behind slave trade, oppressions and suppression of individual nationalities within the kingdom but the Empire did no longer exist and made its way to national identity resurrection. People realised that “being British is a political project, not the actualisation of some primordial and unchanging essence” (Parekh 32). In a way, Britishness is a coinage.

The British state and national identity was always a sham, a political creation which suited the interests of those groups in all nations which favoured the Union and wished to create a new supranational focus for loyalty and allegiance. (Gamble and Wright 1)

The sun, eventually, set on the ashes of the British Empire and new era of Britishness started - post-war decolonisation.

2.2.1 Decolonisation: Commonwealth Immigration

In period of WWII till 1990s the Empire led its way to decline. It lost majority of its colonies and even though some of the countries never left the Commonwealth of Nations they were not part of the great global power anymore. British identity being described as a “flexible identity” (Ward 5) reached its furthest point. It was like an elastic string that had been pushed and pushed to include all the nations but after “dismantling of the British Empire” (Ward 8) it wore out as it outlived its purpose. It was no longer to be seen the great multicultural nation where the sun never sets on.

The dismantling of the British Empire between the 1940s and the 1990s removed a major prop to Britishness. The monarchy, weakened by the end of its imperial role, did however provide a sedative to relieve some of the pain of the loss of Empire. (Ward 8)

Commonwealth of Nations is to be seen as the last hope to save the former Empire. Commonwealth was supposed to protect the Empire from drowning as many nations were gradually getting its independence. Commonwealth was created for honourable sakes of “development, education, and matters of joint interest between them.” (Allport 42). In these days Commonwealth's population is 1.8 billion which makes 30 percent of the world's population (Allport 42).

With the end of the British Empire, there was a big wave of immigration after the disintegration. These immigrants were coming from ex-colonies especially Caribbean, India and newly freed state of Pakistan.

This immigration was, only from the start, two-sided back scratching as the UK needed to saturate the labour market with people who would perform unskilled jobs which British people did not want to perform. Based on this need the British Nationality act 1948 was passed. This act allowed many people from former British Empire to live and work in the UK without a visa (“British Nationality Act 1948”).

But as it happens after several years number of people migrating to the country from former colonies increased every year from 1948 at an alarming rate and the need for labourers was decreasing every year as the market saturated very quickly. Several immigration acts were introduced in order to hinder the migration.

The most important act that came in force was The Commonwealth Immigrants Act in 1962 (“The Immigration Acts”). It meant a rapid change in behaviour towards non-Europeans living or applying for residence in the country. The citizens of the Commonwealth no longer had rights to migrate to the UK freely. After the first act was introduced, another two subsequently followed. These came in force in 1968 and 1971. The government introduced selection policy. Only immigrants from the Commonwealth who had found a job in the UK and were granted official statements would be permitted to the country. It was a very controversial policy that some people found discriminating.

The question arose again. It was now even more difficult to answer who British were and what it meant to be British. The problem of multiculturalism itself was not

only the racial problem but also cultural dilemma of new-comers to the country. It was fundamental to find out how to live in a new surrounding but not to lose your roots. With thousands and thousands of people coming to the UK it was natural that the country was changing as well.

Emerging from the discursive appropriations of the far right in Europe since the 1970s, it is the cultural norms, values, traditions and lifestyles of outsiders which are now held to be problematic, rather than physiognomy (Lentil and Titley 50).

The other problem was that seeing Britishness as racial homogeneity did not exist in after-Empire Britain. People had to get used to the new notion of British citizen. Even though, acts to impede the immigration were forced it did not change the present situation in the UK.

The legacy of Empire, mass non-white immigration, challenged the racialised version of Britishness that rested on a myth of ethnic homogeneity (Ward 8).

The acts were believed to restore the status quo of white Britishness, homogeneous nation, because that was the only feature of Britishness that was left. The nation was challenged even more and gave its birth to the present multiracial Britishness.

2.2.2 Swinging London and Cool Britannia

After WWII a new era came. There was a complete change of atmosphere. It was the air of freedom and embracing diversity of the country and its myriad of cultures. Period was connected with Harold Wilson. He was the first down-to-earth prime minister who understood the common people. He encouraged the mainstream culture. It was thought as second Golden Age.

During the sixties television culture experienced a successful wave of bringing new types of entertainment in form of soap operas such as Coronation Street or Doctor Who which have been running since. Even the music industry discovered the forever-famous bands such as the Beatles, the Who or the Rolling Stones. Birmingham became the second capital of the country with its Bull Ring shopping centre, Spaghetti junction.

Despite the new Renaissance, Cool Britannia struggled to restrict its immigration. In 1962 new act was passed to restrict the immigration from the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth Immigrants Act made it difficult for citizens of Commonwealth to stay and work in the kingdom and they were to be subjected to immigration control (“The Immigration Acts”).

Straight from a time of flourish Britain declined into crisis. The country was in debt after WWII. The country came into strike. There was an immediate backlash at Wilson. However the nation had a common enemy. This enemy was Wilson and USA that started a war in Vietnam. The whole Britain rose against the violence of the war. It was supported by the hippy movement. The problem laid in differences between generations. There was an old war Britain, generation of British by origin, and new fresh experimenting generation of British who were already multicultural society.

In 1967 the 14 Hour Technicolor Dream, a hippy festival, took place in London with its leading stars such as Lennon or Yoko Ono performing her famous naked statue (“The 14 Hour Technicolor Dream”). This brought the old Britain into struggle with new Britain. The clash did not occur only on levels of race but sexuality, obscenity, individualism against conservatism and restraint.

The new Britain had a new identity. This identity was built on diversity of cultures and races. The new British were publicly against common enemy of USA, wars and new imperialism of economic over-power. They were attacking the American embassy in London and protesting over the whole city. They were very radical.

Yet public concern was growing over the increase of immigration to the country. It was now in the public eye as number one. There were many people such as Enoch Powell warning about the negative outcomes of multiculturalism. Although Powell was involuntarily dismissed of majority of his political activities, Britain agreed with him. In case of Wilson, he was sitting on a fence with his politics against racial discrimination and simultaneous introduction of new restriction on immigration to the United Kingdom during second half of 1960s.

We must be mad, literally mad, as a nation to be permitting the annual inflow of some 50, 000 dependants, who are for the most part the material of the future growth of the immigrant-descended population. It is like watching a nation busily engaged in heaping up its own funeral pyre (“Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech“).

Britain did not have only multicultural affairs to solve but also aftermath of re-emerging of Celtic nationalism. Protests were springing all over the country. After Bloody Sunday in Derry, Northern Ireland, in 1972 the violence increased into bomb attacks in many cities all over England. View of Britishness was falling to pieces. There were problems of non-European immigrants and now also Celtic nationalism.

Multiculturalism became a different thing in terms of Britain because Britain as a national identity did not exist in a real life. Of course it existed, for centuries, as a political community. It has never been one nation though. Multiculturalism now had to include all these nations from British Isles, Europe and outside of Europe. In the end, nobody was British. Scottish were Scottish and Irish felt being Irish and after a very long struggle they did not want to be British.

The people of the U.K. have British nationality, and they are called the British (in the media often Britons). "The British" thus includes the English, the Welsh, the Scots, and the Irish. They, however, often have more loyalty to their land than to the U.K. as a whole. "The British" is preferable when one refers to immigrants from Asia, Africa and the West Indies. (Peprník 79 and 80)

In 21st century there is no need for political identity. Nations felt more estranged than ever. After co-living together for so long the country has changed into something nobody wanted - country of thousands of cultures. How long could Britain hold negative impacts for?

2.2.3 Thatcherism and Tackling Britishness

Margaret Thatcher was the longest-serving Prime Minister. Her premiership lasted from 1979 until 1987. She was very radical and introduced many controversial changes to the British economy such as "privatization of industry and curbing the power of trade unions" (Peprník 78).

During her premiership the country was in deep economic decline. She tackled to reduce the government's overlooking of the economy. During that time the country struggled to fight against inflation and a high rate of unemployment. Thatcher introduced a strategy of increasing value added tax but as a direct result there was a

subsequent increase of inflation and the crisis worsened even deeper. Thatcher thought that treating the decline by shock was the right decision to re-establish economy. Straight after her strategy was applied the situation worsened. Many businesses were closed down and went bankrupt. The unemployment rate passed three million (“1982: UK unemployment tops three million”). There was increasing poverty on the streets and many areas started to get out of control and deteriorate. These areas were mostly outskirts of bigger cities such as London, Birmingham or Manchester. These areas were inhabited mainly by immigrants. There was also an increasing crime rate.

During her premiership she not only had to tackle the economic crisis but also the cultural estrangement. On one hand there was the problem of Celtic nationalism, on the other hand the increase of crime rate of non-European immigrants in poverty-stricken areas of larger cities.

In 1983 there was a bomb attack on “Prime Minister Thatcher and her whole Cabinet at a Tory conference in a Brighton hotel” (Peprník 77). Fortunately the assassins were not successful and a different floor was bombed. The assassins were members of the IRA. Their reason for attack was above all Thatcher's extreme support of Unionists. She was stirring up antagonistic emotions not only in regard of her economy strategies but also in the issue of Britishness because she saw England as the main power of the union.

During the first government in 1981 there were riots in Brixton that were followed, during the second government in 1985, by more riots in the same area.

What she had done could not be undone and therefore Tony Blair could only hope that his sensitive treatment of the issue would lead to peace within the country.

2.2.4 Tony Blair and Coping with Cultural Alienation

There was not a single problem of cultural estrangement but racial as well. Culture needs to be connected to race and other way round. The first, cultural estrangement, led to logic decision to loosen up the tights that were roped between all the nations. Tony Blair was the first to realise that what Britain needed was not the unification of identities under the terms of already complex Britishness but to give space for your own identity.

Period of Tony Blair as Prime Minister was described as new Cool Britannia. He served as the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in period from 1997 to 2007. Tony

Blair was found very approachable by public. He was as a public persona making contact with common people. During his period he achieved what others did not even hope for.

10 April 1998 Good Friday Agreement or Belfast Agreement was performed in Northern Ireland. Tony Blair and many others worked really hard to reach this agreement. It was a great step towards peace process after almost half a century of conflict. The status of Northern Ireland was adjusted according to the agreement. This status is still in use. It set the structure of government of Northern Ireland within the United Kingdom but more importantly status between Northern Ireland and Republic of Ireland which were violently separated after 1922, major even in war of independence. It officially resulted in Anglo-Irish Treaty that divided Ireland for good. Good Friday Agreement set also status of relationship between the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom itself (Peprník 66).

One of the problems that the United Kingdom had to cope with was Provisional Irish Republican Army. It was one of many branches of Irish Republican Army that was created 1969 after split with the original branch. Main reason that separated them was not ideology based on separation of Northern Ireland from the UK but what measures to take in order to free the country. Provisional IRA took violence as an answer and so the bombing started. They chose street fighting. In the 1990s there were interferences from the British government requesting the provisional IRA to ceasefire IRA did what nobody expected because they did so. Even though, IRA later called off the ceasefire the organisation went into a ceasefire again which gave its birth to Good Friday Agreement. Despite the agreement, IRA continued to perform its bombing attacks all over England.

Many new paramilitary organisations claiming to be new branches of IRA have evolved since 1990s amongst them Real Irish Republican Army (RIRA) or Irish People's Liberation Organisation, some of them more violent than the others.

Tony Blair's first step towards peace with Northern Ireland made its results but even though there was an effort to make the Irish feel freer it would never lead to satisfaction on Irish side as long as Northern Ireland feels being part of the Republic of Ireland. The problem is that the Irish seeing themselves as Irish by origin, culture and language and never will be British. Feeling of British as something closely connected to English sovereignty is not desirable in Northern Ireland.

Another diminishing step for Britishness as a united identity was performed in 1997 when Scottish parliament was established.

On one hand, Tony Blair's achievements were logical steps in order to spare Britain of violence and possible future conflicts. On the other hand, it was a great disillusionment of already shattering idea of British being as one nationality. The view of the country altered into an area with countries within a country.

2.3 Negative Outcomes of Non-European Immigration in the UK after WWII

2.3.1 Racial Riots in Brixton in 1981 and 1985

As stated above, during the end of the 1970s and 1980s the economic crisis led to higher rate of unemployment and people of non-European origin who performed low-paid jobs were made redundant. Not only that Margaret Thatcher's attempt to tackle the unemployment, inflation and re-establish economy by shock did not happen but it also put the country into a worse state than it was before. In consequence there were areas of larger cities that suffered from poor living conditions and insufficient housing conditions. These areas were mainly inhabited by non-European immigrants. The suburbs became a dangerous place to live in and people dwelling in these areas were frightened to freely go out. Crime rates were increasing and the situation came to a head. It ended up by race riots between particular communities in Brixton, South London; Handsworth, Birmingham; Toxteth, Liverpool and Chapeltown, Leeds.

The tension between ethnic minorities was precedent. On 18th January 1981, thirteen people died during the fire in New Cross.

On 18th January, there was a birthday party in a house in New Cross Road, south London. The fire started on the ground floor as evidence suggests. The victims were trapped upstairs. Some of them managed to escape but the majority died in the building.

All of the victims were black but the police denied any racial pretext and they claimed that the fire could have been a pure accident but it is possible that someone else might have started the fire.

(“1981: Nine die in New Cross house fire“)

After this incident there was a public rage against disinterest on the side of the police and a demonstration took place in London. It was the first impetus to the riots. People's general distrust of state authority, not only police but also government, deepened and led to the first public outburst of violence in Brixton where it all started. The tension was present for a long time before the incident so it was only a natural flow of things.

A serious increase in street robbery in Lambeth caused the District Commander to institute a plainclothes operation known as Operation Swamp 81, which resulted in a significant number of black youths being stopped and searched. This intensified the resentment of a group who already frequently protested against and obstructed police actions on the street. (“History of the Metropolitan Police: Brixton Riots, 1981“)

On the 10 April 1981 in late evening hours a black youth was attacked by a group of black youths. His name was Michael Bailey. He was alleged to be running past a policeman but he did not stop him even though Bailey was visibly wounded. The policeman reported that Bailey was running away from other three blacks. He stopped on Atlantic Road. A crowd started to gather and the police who came to help were allegedly negligent. Instead of immediately calling for an ambulance they tried to put him in the back of a police car. People started to protest. More police forces had to be called to the area. The crowd became violent and started to attack police officers. Rumours spread through the city that it had been witnessed the policemen questioning the stabbed boy and failing to supply him with first aid. The Metropolitan police, although, reported that they gave him first aid immediately and called for an ambulance via radio in the car. A group of enraged youths, by violence, got hold of Bailey and took him to St Thomas's Hospital in their car. The main outburst of the riot happened the following day. There was much violence on the streets but nobody died.

299 police were injured, and at least 65 civilians. 61 private vehicles and 56 police vehicles were damaged or destroyed. 28 premises were burned and another 117 damaged and looted. 82 arrests were made. (“History of the Metropolitan Police: Brixton Riots, 1981“)

It is still regarded as the most violent riot in 20th century in Britain. It spread from London to other cities. The riots took place from April to July 1981. People experienced first consequences of multiracial Britain. It showed people that these things can happen in the UK too. This was only the start and other riots followed.

On 28 September in 1985 there was another riot in South London. The ignition factor was shooting of Jamaican-origin immigrant Cherry Groce by Metropolitan Police who broke into her flat in order to find her son Michael Groce - a suspect of firearms offence. The police thought that Michael Groce was hiding from authorities in the flat. The policemen failed to give any warning and shot. The bullet made Cherry Groce paralysed below the waist.

News spread across that Mrs. Groce was killed and a crowd of protesters gathered at a police station near the place where the incident took place. It resulted in street violence. The police lost control and during following 2 days there were looter attacks, acts of vandalism, property damage including cars and one building. There was also a victim who died several days later as a result of a head injury that he suffered from looters when he was trying to take a photo of them. His name was David Hodge. He was a photo-journalist. Besides tragic death of David Hodge 50 people were injured and over 200 people were arrested during the riots (“1985: Riots in Brixton after police shooting”).

The situation in Brixton had been tense for years and the police did not handle the situation well. Although the riot ended after 48 hours it left people stunned.

2.3.2 Stephen Lawrence

On 22 April in 1993 Stephen Lawrence, 18-year-old black teenager, was stabbed to death by a gang of white youths on a bus stop in Eltham, London. He did not provoke the gang. There was a witness standing with Lawrence on the bus stop that day. It was his friend Duwayne Brooks (“Stephen Lawrence case: Key events following the murder of Stephen Lawrence”).

There were two suspects Gary Dobson, 36, and David Norris, 35, who were later found guilty of the murder of Stephen Lawrence. However, Dobson later dropped his appeal against the verdict (“Stephen Lawrence killer drops appeal against conviction”).

This act was an act of racism exercised on an innocent boy who was just in a wrong place that day.

The case was left unsolved for several years. During those years Lawrence family launched a private prosecution against the suspects. However, the final verdict on 13th February in 1997 was that Stephen Lawrence “was 'unlawfully killed by five white youths'.” but the three suspects were acquitted because of the lack of evidence (“Stephen Lawrence case: Key events following the murder of Stephen Lawrence“).

The crime committed on an innocent person who was coloured raised a question whether and how long Britain can survive under severe acts of racism. The case of Lawrence was the first one that was publicly stated as having racial context. It also led to the fact that tension building between the police and public was even bigger after the incident.

2.3.3 Riots in 2001

The riot in May 2001 did not take place, as the other ones, in London. It occurred in Oldham in Greater Manchester. There was the same problem as in 1985 riots. There was tension building between particular communities living in the same area. During 2000 there were over 600 racist incidents and 60% of the victims were white. Majority of these incidents were done by Asian youths (Oldham's racial tension 'nothing new“).

The riots took, in total, three days from 26 to 28 May. It is very hard to trace a single cause because there were numerous occurrences of violence in Oldham the year before. Some believe that an atmosphere in the town had been very tense after 76-year-old white World War II veteran Walter Chamberlain was mugged and attacked by three Asian youths. The pensioner was walking home alone from an amateur rugby match. He was seriously beaten up by youths and mugged of his belongings. This incident possibly led to the riots. Mr Chamberlain had suffered fractured bones and other injuries and he had to be transported to hospital. It was a grave incident of racism against whites. This incident happened on 21 April 2001 (“Hague calls for race apology“). There was other side of racism where whites were actually outnumbered by Bangladeshi and Pakistani communities in Oldham. It was not a safe place to live. It was a white racism which threatened the United Kingdom.

On 26 May 2001 the real outbursts of violence started. There were bricks thrown at police, bottles but also petrol bombs. Fortunately nobody was killed.

2.3.4 London Bombings 2005

After 11th November 2001 Britain officially supported USA even though it was very involuntarily accepted by the people. Britain supported invasions to the Middle East. The aftermath did not take a long time to appear.

It was 8:50 am 7th July 2005. There were several loud blasts as three bombs exploded on London underground. Three trains and one city bus suffered an explosion. The first train was travelling between Liverpool Street and Aldgate leaving King's Cross. The second train exploded between Edgware Road and Paddington. The last train was on between King's Cross to Russell Square. At first, it was not known how many explosions actually were set off. Due to a great destruction, the first estimation was about six blasts not only four. The cause was not known at first and they suspected just some power surge.

After explosion of a city bus leading from Hackney Wick to Marble Arch not more than an hour later, it was obvious that there was no power surge but a planned bomb attack.

There were in total 52 victims and 4 suicide bombers who died that day. Majority of them were British citizens. There were four Muslim suicide bombers out of who three were of Pakistan origin. The other one was a Jamaican-born citizen. All of them were British citizens by passport and did not have any records of previous crimes. There were four common British citizens living orderly with their families and working in the United Kingdom. One of them Mohammad Sidique Khan, who was 30 years old, the oldest of them, was a learning mentor at a primary school. There was no explanation but one video tape that was to put light on the matter. It was Khan's confession why they did what they did. On the video there is also his daughter and three other attackers. Only later it was found out that the video was edited and it might be possible that al-Qaeda did nothing to do with it. The video was in English.

I and thousands like me are forsaking everything for what we believe. Our drive and motivation doesn't come from tangible commodities that this world has to offer. Our religion is Islam, obedience to the one true God and following the footsteps of the final prophet messenger. Your democratically-elected governments continuously perpetuate atrocities against my people all over the world. And your support of them makes you directly responsible, just as I am

directly responsible for protecting and avenging my Muslim brothers and sisters. Until we feel security you will be our targets and until you stop the bombing, gassing, imprisonment and torture of my people we will not stop this fight. We are at war and I am a soldier. Now you too will taste the reality of this situation. (“London bomber: Text in full“)

After revelation of the video, it was obvious that these four young men were acting on behalf of Islam but the question was whether on behalf of Osama Bin Laden and al-Qaeda as well. Speech was directly against British support of invasion to Afghanistan and Iraq and helping USA with British Armed Forces. However, this was not just outspoken criticising of Tony Blair’s policy on terrorist attacks after 2001 but it was a trigger, trigger for people living in the United Kingdom. It made them realise that their country has become dangerous with all people who, even though officially, stated as British have never been part of the British Isles. They might have been British but not English, or Scottish, or Welsh. They were non-Europeans and they believed in different religion. Citizens of the United Kingdom saw what people could do out of religious reasons to the country they lived in for years and where they built up their lives. Major xenophobia deepened not for the sake of diversity, as in the past, but for scare that the whole country plunged into. New era of racial estrangement began and after 2005 many new specialised units against terrorism were raising.

Not long after the attack, another incident happened. On 21 July 2005 there were five planned bomb attacks. Only four of them actually succeeded. The bombers tried to attack public transport structure again. As the last time subjects of bombing were underground station and a bus. Fortunately this time the explosions were a great deal smaller and nobody died. The stations that suffered bomb attacks were Shepherd’s Bush, Oval and Warren Street. The bus was leading from Waterloo to Hackney Wick and ended up exploding in Shoreditch (“Sky News - 21 July 2005 London bombings“). All four bombers were arrested and sentenced to life imprisonment (“Patient wait for life behind bars“).

2.3.5 Jean Charles de Menezes' Death

On 22 July 2005 Jean Charles de Menezes, Brazilian immigrant to the UK, was shot by Metropolitan Police of London. He was alleged to be one of the bombers from 21 July.

He was suspected only because he was wearing a jacket of the same colour as Osman that day. He was confused with Osman Hussain. Menezes did not resemble Hussain and the only thing they shared was a blue jacket and the fact that both were coloured.

The police failed to give Menezes any notice in advance and shot him seven times in the head in cold blood on Stockwell underground station. The only argument that police came up with was that Menezes started to run as soon as he caught sight of armed forces. It is not known why he was running but it is clear that Jean Menezes was a legal immigrant living in the UK and did not have a criminal record. It is assumed that he panicked when he saw the police following him and that might be the reason why he tried to flee. It could have happened to almost anybody but Menezes' bad luck was that he lived in the same block of flats as Hussain. Police were blamed by public and Sir Ian Banks, police commissioner, was forced to resign. Although nobody in particular was punished for Menezes's death in the end (“Q&A: The day De Menezes died”).

2.4 Broken Britain and London Riots in 2011

The popular term broken Britain applies to the present state of decay of the United Kingdom. It was coined by *The Sun* newspapers and it refers to the children negligence, increase in street crime, gangs, underage drinking and teenage pregnancy (“Cam: I'll mend broken Britain”).

The biggest riots in London, England since 1985 took place in the period of 6 to 10 August 2011. The riots swept across the whole country. The country plunged into acts of “arson, criminal damage, looting, violent behaviour and clashes with police” (Briggs 14) on the streets.

The 2013 riots were the first riots that were supported and spread in terms of social networks such as Facebook and Twitter. The aggressors were planning meetings, appraising their achievements and other activities online.

2.4.1 Pretext for Riots and Death of Mark Duggan

It is believed that the riots and unrest was caused by the shooting of Mark Duggan but there is a question whether it was only pretence for a longer-lasting violence in the streets. His death might have been only the last straw that broke the camel's back and what followed was just a natural flow of things.

It is now mostly agreed that the killing of Mark Duggan triggered the unrest which followed across the country (Briggs 14)

Mark Duggan lived in the area of Tottenham, north London, where the history of violence and tension between police and community of blacks has been recurrent. On 4th August 2011 he was shot by the police after he was stopped sitting in a taxi. It was said that Duggan was armed and that he shot at one of the police officers. It was witnessed that the police shouted at Duggan to stop but he did not obey. It was later claimed that Duggan was the one who fired his gun first (“Man dead and police officer hurt in Tottenham shooting“). Only later it was denied that Mark Duggan was armed that day and the injured officer was actually shot by another officer. A message about the police attack was not long after the incident put on social network Facebook, Twitter and BlackBerry messenger (BB) (Briggs 28) and that was why the news spread so quickly.

Nadine, a local resident, stated that “the police shot another officer and Mark Duggan already knew he was being followed ... and put out a BB message” (29 Briggs). After unsatisfactory explanation by police, Tottenham residents arranged a protest that ended up by riots. The reason why it got out of control was not only Duggan’s death but because there were still people who remembered the previous riots in 1985. Therefore death of an innocent boy was only an excuse for the community to aggravate relationships between the police and the community that have been tense for years.

A crowd gathered in front of Tottenham Police station urging explanation and clarification of the matter. Police failed to give transparency and to offer conciliation with the public.

The police handled the situation ill and they should have thought about how delicate the relationships between the community and the police are. If they had done so the riots would not have possibly taken place. Of course, there is no easy solution because the situation has been very complex and difficult. The community will take many years to recover from the riots.

2.4.2 During the Riots

As stated above, around 300 people gathered in front of the police station on the High Road and demanded explanations (“Riots in Tottenham after Mark Duggan shooting

protest“). It was 17:00. The event was firstly seen as a calm procession of people demanding justice but later, when two patrol cars parked nearby the crowd, it evolved into violence as the police mishandled the situation and did not pay their full attention to possible outcomes.

The group of protesters was fuming at the police’s decision to place the patrol cars near the police station. Instead of clarifying the matter of the death of Mark Duggan the police wanted to keep the crowd in control. It was wrong tactics.

It was stated by London Ambulance Service that the first night eight injured police officers ended up in hospital and “total of ten people had been treated and nine had been taken to hospital” (“Riots in Tottenham after Mark Duggan shooting protest“).

The overnight riots were the severest in its intensity. There were petrol bombs thrown at the police and cars and buildings set alight. At 20:20 two patrol cars were set alight (“Riots in Tottenham after Mark Duggan shooting protest“). Fortunately, they were empty and nobody was injured.

Afterwards, the real mayhem started because looters started to smash shop displays and, pushing shopping trolleys, stealing goods. The looting continued during the entire next day. There were many records of the looters breaking into shops and succumbing to violence against other people on the streets. They did not care anymore who they were attacking.

At the junction of High Road and Brook Street there was a double-decker bus set on fire. At the same time a shop nearby was set alight and fire fighters had to tackle the flames very quickly before the fire could spread to other shops.

The rioters did not mind being recorded during their acts of looting, vandalising and attacking police officers.

On 7th August 2011 the scared shop owners were forced to protect themselves. They mobilised in order “to protect their neighbourhoods against rioting and looting” (Busher 237). It was publicly discouraged by police to do so because it was very dangerous. On the other hand social networks such as Twitter or Facebook boasted with appraisal of the vigilantism.

Riots started as a racial outcry and later evolved into a blind rage. The violence was not exercised for the sake of revenge for Duggan's death anymore.

English Defence League (EDL) mobilised their members in Eltham on the next day too. EDL is known for controversial beliefs and is a very radical movement in its

hatred towards “militant Islam” (Busher 239). Although they do not regard themselves as a far right organisation, the participation in riots is very antagonistic.

Later the riots spread to other cities such as Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool but after several days police had the situation in control even though the aftermath was immense.

2.4.3 Aftermath of the Riots

The riots proved again that the relationship between wider public and state authorities is very tense and fragile. Even though, there were not many cases of hostility between the police and community, pressure has been present for decades.

Publicly, the riots were ascribed to gangs and the usual problematic groups such as youth and underclass (Briggs 27). Reason was underestimated and taken as a common lower-class social disorder. The matter was not social though. It was racial. The issue was not officially explained and the reasons why it occurred and spread so quickly not mentioned. It seems such as the whole country was trying to evade the consequences of the riots. Riots were case example of negative consequences of multicultural Britishness that is why it was easier to blame delinquent teenagers.

According to the fact stated above not only government but also the police failed to face the issue of racial Britain and how to handle the current situation.

The riots were not just a singular event of violence but a consequent and gradual racial estrangement.

Although there were many theories serving to explain the riots, they were rather antagonistic. These theories are divided by left and right explanations. Some believe that the riots were an outcome of deteriorating living conditions in poor areas of bigger cities. Whether it is the lower-class youths experiencing worsening living conditions, the racial division or both, there is no doubt that Britain has been affected by all these factors enough.

In modern Britain, Britishness means being a citizen but not being a member of a nation. Great Britain is a country full of English, Scottish, Irish, Welsh and the rest. The rest means citizens with a British passport such as Indians, Pakistani, Indonesians, etc.

3 CONCLUSION

The thesis is divided into two main parts that are closely related. The first two chapters: *Beginnings of Britishness and Englishness* and *Post-war Britain and Immigration* are explanations of the status quo of modern Britain. It serves as a summary of events that made the United Kingdom a place where acts of violence, religiously motivated hatred and racism are on daily basis and where an identity is something that is difficult to define. These two chapters are not only to be understood as an explanation but also as a fragile relationship between doings and consequences.

The first chapter deals with coinage of two distinctive terms: Britishness and Englishness. It proves that term Britishness has never referred to a member of a nation in particular but it was always a collective entity. On the other hand, Englishness is a name that specifies one nation with the same language and of the same origin. English means a homogenous community whereas British does not.

The first chapter is accompanied by the second chapter *Post-war Britain and Immigration* that shows all the changes that the term Britishness has undergone since the end of WWII. I stress the immigration after the collapse of the British Empire as major source of immigrants. This chapter contains, above all, selected episodes of history of the United Kingdom after WWII that discuss the major changes. These episodes focus on multiculturalism and immigration. The conclusion I came to was that nothing such as British national identity ever existed and ever will and therefore British refers to somebody who has a British passport but is not a member of the nation.

Second part, chapters *Negative Outcomes of Non-European Immigration in the UK after WWII* and *Broken Britain and London Riots in 2011*, concentrates on the United Kingdom as a multicultural community. It shows the side effects of the diverse multi-racial, multi-religious and multicultural society. There are three main outcomes that I focus on and these are: riots, terrorist attacks, and race-motivated murders. All of the incidents that are mentioned in this chapter show fear of non-Christian religions, xenophobia and discontentment within the kingdom.

The last chapter *Broken Britain and London Riots in 2011* is the latest and the severest example of British multiculturalism and I decided to concentrate on it because it shows that the United Kingdom will always struggle to find peace and never will be understood as a single nation. One day the country will evolve into a state within a state where the English, the Scottish, the Welsh and the Irish are outnumbered by British

people. These British will try as hard as they can to fit in but they never will and the United Kingdom might end up like the United States of America one day where American is a man of many identities.

4 RESUMÉ

Tato bakalářská práce je rozdělena do dvou částí, které jsou blízce spojeny. První dvě kapitoly: *Beginnings of Britishness and Englishness*; a *Post-war Britain and Immigration* jsou vysvětlením současné situace v dnešní Británii. Tato část shrnuje události, které zapříčinily, že Spojené království je místem, kde násilí, náboženská nesnášenlivost a rasismus jsou na denním pořádku, místem, kde národní identita je něco nedefinovatelného. První dvě kapitoly nejsou pouhým vysvětlením, ale poukazují také na křehký vztah mezi příčinou a následkem, a proto se druhé dvě kapitoly zabývají následky. Tyto dvě pomyslné sekce dohromady tvoří komplexní pohled na Spojené království a obyvatele této ostrovní země.

První kapitola se zabývá vznikem britské a anglické identity. Kapitola dokazuje, že první z termínů vždy znamenal kolektivní entitu. Britská identita nikdy nedefinovala příslušenství člověka k jednomu určitému národu. Co se týče anglické identity, toto slovo vždy definovalo jeden národ, který mluví společným jazykem a má stejné kořeny. Anglický, jako přídavné jméno, vyvozuje homogenní společenství.

Druhá kapitola doplňuje první kapitolu, jelikož se zaměřuje na všechny změny, které ovlivňovaly podstatu britské identity od druhé světové války. V této kapitole uvádím zejména rozpad Britského impéria jako hlavní faktor velkého přílivu přistěhovalců do země. Tato kapitola obsahuje vybrané úryvky z historie Spojeného království od druhé světové války po současnost se zaměřením na britský multikulturalismus a na imigraci s ním spojenou. Díky argumentům, které zmiňuji v této kapitole, jsem dospěla k závěru, že britská národní identita neexistuje a nikdy neexistovala. Brit je člověk, který vlastní britský pas, tudíž je státní příslušník, ale není součástí národa.

Druhá část, kapitoly *Negative Outcomes of Non-European Immigration in the UK after WWII* a *Broken Britain and London Riots in 2011*, se zaměřuje na Spojené království jako multikulturní společenství a poukazuje na vedlejší efekty různorodé multirasové, multináboženské a multikulturní společnosti. Rozdělila jsem je do tří základních skupin, což jsou výtržnosti, teroristické útoky a rasově motivované vraždy. Všechny události zmíněné v této části poukazují na náboženskou nesnášenlivost, rasovou nenávisť, frustraci a xenofobii, která v zemi vládne.

Poslední kapitola je zároveň nejnovějším a nejzávažnějším příkladem negativního dopadu multikulturní Británie. Rozhodla jsem se soustředit se na nepokoje v roce 2011, jelikož jsou zářným příkladem toho, že tato země bude vždy podnětem konfliktů, protože nikdy nebude jednotným národem. Jednoho dne se země vyvine ve stát ve státě, kde Angličané, Skoti, Velšané a Irové jsou menšina, a kde Britové jsou v přesile. Tito Briti se, jako nové společenství, budou snažit zapadnout, ale nikdy se tak nestane. Jednoho dne Spojené království možná bude stejné jako Spojené státy americké, kde Američan je občanem mnoha národností.

5 BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allport, Alan. *England*. 2nd ed. New York: Chelsea House, 2008. Print.

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC*. "Native Tribes of Britain." 2013. Web. 8 Feb. 2013. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/british_prehistory/iron_01.shtml>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC Home*. "1981: Nine die in New Cross house fire." 1981. Web. 1 Apr. 2013. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/january/18/newsid_2530000/2530333.stm>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC Home*. "1982: UK unemployment tops three million." 1982. Web. 24 Mar. 2013. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/january/26/newsid_2506000/2506335.stm>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC Home*. "1985: Riots in Brixton after police shooting." 1985. Web. 27 Feb. 2013. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/september/28/newsid_2540000/2540397.stm>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC News*. "Hague calls for race apology." 2001. Web. 5 Mar. 2013. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/news/vote2001/hi/english/newsid_1355000/1355606.stm>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC News*. "London bomber: Text in full." 2005. Web. 4 Mar. 2013. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/4206800.stm>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC News*. "Oldham's racial tension 'nothing new'." 2001. Web. 3 Mar. 2013. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/1296007.stm>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC News*. "Patient wait for life behind bars." 2007. Web. 4 Mar. 2013. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/6291954.stm>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC News London*. "Man dead and police officer hurt in Tottenham shooting." 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-14412752>>

British Broadcasting Corporation. *BBC News London*. "Riots in Tottenham after Mark Duggan shooting protest." 2011. Web. 2 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-14434318>>

British Government. *Home Office: UK Border Agency*. "The Immigration Acts." Web. 18 Feb. 2013. <<http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/policyandlaw/nationalityinstructions/nisec2gensec/immigrationacts?view=Binary>>

British Government. *Metropolitan Police*. "History of the Metropolitan Police: Brixton Riots, 1981." Web. 23 Feb. 2013. <http://www.met.police.uk/history/brixton_riots.htm>

British Government. *The National Archives*. "British Nationality Act 1948." Legislation. Web. 15 Feb. 2013. <<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/11-12/56/contents>>

Gamble, Andrew, and Tony Wright. "Introduction: The British Question." *Britishness: Perspectives on the British Question*. Ed. Andrew Gamble and Tony Wright. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. Print.

Guardian Media Group. *The Guardian*. "Stephen Lawrence case: Key events following the murder of Stephen Lawrence." Web. 1 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2007/nov/08/lawrence.ukcrime>>

Guardian Media Group. *The Guardian*. "Stephen Lawrence killer drops appeal against conviction." Web. 1 Apr. 2013.

<<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2013/mar/15/stephen-lawrence-killer-drops-appeal>>

Guardian Media Group. *The Guardian*. "Q&A: The day De Menezes died." Web. 26 Feb. 2013. <<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2008/dec/12/de-menezes-police-shooting>>

Laville, S. "Mark Duggan investigation plagued by 'inaccuracies'." *The Guardian*. 24 Nov. 2011.

Lentin, Alana, and Gavan Titley. *The Crises of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age*. London: Zed Books Ltd, 2011. Print.

Llosa, Mario. *El Sueño del Celta*. USA: Santillana USA Publishing Company, Inc., 2010. Print.

Medlicott, W. N. *Contemporary England 1914 - 1964*. London: Longmans, Green Co. Ltd, 1967. Print.

Parekh, Bhikhu. "Being British." *Britishness: Perspectives on the British Question*. Ed. Andrew Gamble and Tony Wright. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. Print.

Peprník, Jaroslav. *Británie a USA: Ilustrované reálie*. Olomouc: Olomouc s. r. o., 2004. Print.

The Archive: UK Rock Festivals 1960-1990 & UK Free Festivals 1965 - 1990. *The Archive*. "The 14 Hour Technicolor Dream." Web. 1 Mar. 2013. <<http://www.ukrockfestivals.com/14-hour-tech-dream-menu.html>>

The English Riots of 2011: A Summer of Discontent. Ed. Daniel Briggs. London: Waterside Press Ltd, 2012. Print.

The Sun. "Cam: I'll mend broken Britain." 2008. Web. 2 Apr. 2013. <<http://www.thesun.co.uk/sol/homepage/news/justice/article741731.ece>>

The Telegraph Media Group. *The Telegraph*. "Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech." 2007. Web. 19 Feb. 2013.

<<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/3643823/Enoch-Powells-Rivers-of-Blood-speech.html>>

Thurston, Herbet. "Synod of Whitby." *The Original Catholic Encyclopedia*. Web. 1 Mar. 2013 <http://oce.catholic.com/index.php?title=Synod_of_Whitby>

Venerabilis, Beda. *Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. Ed. Betty Radice. Trans. Leo Sherley-Prince. London: Penguin Books Ltd, 1990. Print.

Ward, Paul. *Britishness since 1870*. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Wilson, John. "Not a More Abstemious Man than Old Kit North in His Majesty's Dominions, on Which the Sun Never Sets." *Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine* Apr. 1829. Web. 7 Mar. 2013.

<<http://books.google.cz/books?id=vsTFI6Ab9VIC&pg=PA527&dq=%22his+Majesty%27s+dominions,+on+which+the+sun+never+sets%22&hl=cs#v=onepage&q=%22his%20Majesty%27s%20dominions%2C%20on%20which%20the%20sun%20never%20sets%22&f=false>>

YouTube, LLC. *YouTube*. "Sky News - 21 July 2005 London bombings." 2008. Web. 4 Mar. 2013. <<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=157lEhi4AoE>>

6 ANOTACE

- *Autor:* Lenka Slípková
- *Název fakulty a katedry:* Filozofická fakulta, Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky
- *Název práce:* Britská versus anglická identita a důsledky imigrace na pozadí rasových nepokojů v Londýně
- *Vedoucí práce:* Mgr. Pavlína Flajšarová, Ph.D.
- *Počet stran:* 40
- *Klíčová slova:* britská a anglická národní identita, nepokoje, bombové útoky, multikulturní problematika
- *Popis:* Bakalářská práce pojednává o problematice národní identity občanů žijících na území Spojeného království Velké Británie a Severního Irska. Zaměřuje se na významy slov Brit a Angličan a rozdíly mezi nimi. Dále rozebírá, co znamená být Brit a kdo je občanem Spojeného království. Na toto navazuje téma negativních dopadů multikulturní společnosti, jelikož Spojené království je zemí, která hostí mnoho přistěhovalců. Práce je zakončena praktickou ukázkou negativních dopadů, protože se soustřeďuje na nepokoje v roce 2011, které se odehrály v Londýně, hlavním městě.

7 ABSTRACT

- *Author:* Lenka Slípková
- *Faculty and Department:* Philosophical Faculty, Department of English and American Studies
- *Title:* Britishness versus Englishness and the Impacts of Immigration in Terms of Racial Riots in London
- *Supervisor:* Mgr. Pavlína Flajšarová, Ph.D.
- *Number of Pages:* 40
- *Key Words:* Britishness, Englishness, national identity, riots, bomb attacks, issues of multiculturalism
- *Description:* In my Bachelor thesis I focus on the issue of national identity of the citizens of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. I concentrate on terms Britishness and Englishness, what these terms mean and how they differ. Afterwards I talk about what it means to be British and to be a citizen of the United Kingdom. This chapter is concluded with negative outcomes of multiculturalism because the United Kingdom is a place where many foreigners live. The thesis is supplied with an example of negative outcomes because in the last chapter I discuss the riots in 2011 London.