

# AN EXAMPLE OF BRITISH EUROSCEPTICISM AND ITS EXPRESSIVE MODALITIES

## An Analysis of Nigel Farage's Speeches and Articles

FRANCESCO PIERINI  
UNIVERSITÀ DI GENOVA

**Abstract** – This paper is about an example of how some British Euroscepticism is conveyed. In particular my research is about Nigel Farage's Eurosceptical discourse, as he represents one of the most significant politicians of the this trend in the last years. I have tried to analyse some typical aspects of eurosceptical language as emerge in some Farage's texts (oral and written) both at a lexical level but also from the point of view of rhetoric. In fact political discourse is mainly based on the wise use of words and expressions in order to reach its goal and Nigel Farage seems to be very familiar in expressing his ideas by resorting to the typical "weapons" of persuasion.

**Keywords:** Euroscepticism; EU; Farage; rhetoric; UKIP.

### 1. Euroscepticism: A Short Political Overview

Euroscepticism is often regarded as a typical British phenomenon, born in England and gradually pervading other areas of the EU. As Harmsen and Spiering state, Euroscepticism in England is based on a sense of "awkwardness" or 'otherness' in relation to a Continental European project of political and economic integration" (2005, p. 13). Although some different forms of Euroscepticism have evolved since then all over Europe, "a more critical perception of European integration is, nevertheless, inescapable" (Ibid.). A lot of literature has been written on the subject as it has become a highly debated political issue, especially since the crisis hit the European economy and a more general anti-European idea spread among EU citizens.

As Gifford (2008, p. 6) observes, the fact that Euroscepticism is so widespread in a powerful member state of the EU, as Britain is, has aroused much interest from the academic world. Most of the literature available is concerned with the issue from a political point of view, which is instead only a point of departure in this research paper, based on the analysis of the phenomenon from a linguistic perspective, in a specific country, at a specific time and through the words of a leading eurosceptical politician, Nigel Farage. He is one of the founders and present leader of the UKIP (UK Independence Party) and has been a member of the European Parliament since 1999. He was a Conservative until 1992 when the party signed the Treaty of Maastricht. He has obtained remarkable electoral results since 2009, making Euroscepticism the flagship policy that brought him to European prominence.

The most recent literature has dealt with British populism and, more generally with right-wing populism in Europe, with special reference to critical discourse analysis. In Wodak *et al.* (2013) an interdisciplinary perspective of the phenomenon is provided by offering a comparative analysis of the policies and rhetorical devices of new and old parties such as the BNP in Britain and other European movements. Discursive

construction of social and political identities has been dealt with by Krzyzanowski and Wodak (2009) who show how political communication strategies work, with a special regard to discrimination in political discourse and the language used by national right-wing populist movements. The two scholars observe that most of the political ideas supported by those parties fall under the category of nationalist and populist stances though containing refined forms of racism and xenophobia, thus being able to increase their support simply as populist parties.

As regards Britain, it should be remembered that though immigration and other sensitive issues exist in the UKIP, there are some differences between the BNP and Farage's party. Ford and Goodwin state that the voters of both parties share the same fears, are indifferent or averse to politics and worried about immigration, but there ends any other similarity because the two parties certainly have different principles, histories and attitudes. One of them is that the Ukip "appears at ease with the global free market, while the BNP demands economic protectionism and the renationalization of some industries" (2014, p. 7). In the Ukip they regard themselves as libertarians who are in opposition to disproportionate state intervention, whereas the BNP is authoritarian and offers ethnic nationalism. UKIP voters say they are non-racist and non-sectarian and maintain that they are "open and inclusive to anyone who wishes to identify with Britain, regardless of ethnic or religious background" (*Ibid.*). The BNP seems to be more tied to a sort of nationalism based on race and origin, recalling other European extreme right-wing ideologies, whereas the emphasis of the UKIP is against the EU and its institutions.

## 2. Euroscepticism and Linguistic Implications

The term 'euroscepticism' is difficult to define and it has been used and abused in the press, especially as a derogatory word and sometimes as an offensive remark, but the term has hardly ever been defined – meticulously – by the academic community (Forster 2003, p. 1). Though it is not a recent one, the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) defines Euroscepticism as follows:

A tendency to have doubts or reservations regarding the supposed benefits of increasing cooperation between the member states of the European Union (and formerly the European Economic Community); opposition to greater political or economic integration in Europe.<sup>1</sup>

Indeed, the Eurosceptic is:

A person, esp. a politician, having doubts or reservations regarding the supposed benefits of increasing cooperation between the member states of the European Union (and formerly the European Economic Community); an opponent of greater political or economic integration in Europe.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Euroscepticism." Def. *Oxford English Dictionary*. 3rd ed. 2008. *OED Online*. Oxford.

<sup>2</sup> "Eurosceptic." Def. A. *Oxford English Dictionary*. First published in OED: Additions series 3 (1997) as a subentry of "Euro-, comb. form". OED Third Edition (March 2008) - fully updated and upgraded to full entry OED Online version March 2014.

The two words were respectively recorded for the first time in the OED in 1985 and 1990, but according to some websites, older recordings of the expression may be found in 1971.<sup>3</sup> Criticisms to Euroscepticism are often based on its alleged demagoguery, populism and nationalism, which, recently, have been gaining an ever-increasing acclaim in the European political sphere. According to the OED the first recording of the word ‘demagogue’ in English refers to its ancient origin, that is

[...] a leader of the people; a popular leader or orator who espoused the cause of the people against any other party in the state.<sup>4</sup>

But there is also a second meaning with a more negative connotation:

A leader of a popular faction, or of the mob; a political agitator who appeals to the passions and prejudices of the mob in order to obtain power or further his own interests; an unprincipled or factious popular orator.<sup>5</sup>

As Kruschwitz states, this label of irrationality, rather than rationality in the way political demagogues operate is somewhat patronising since “all political parties, in democratic systems everywhere, appeal to rational as well as irrational concerns [...] shared by a large(r) group: they may be indicative of an actual problem”.<sup>6</sup>

Another feature of eurosceptical parties and politics is populism. It consists in

[t]he policies or principles of any of various political parties which seek to represent the interests of ordinary people, *spec.* of the Populists of the U.S. or Russia. Also: support for or representation of ordinary people or their views; speech, action, writing, etc., intended to have general appeal.<sup>7</sup>

Dye maintains that populist stances are expressed in anti-EU claims based on a broad divergence between “the corrupt elites and the masses [and] is a uniquely sharp example of unaccountable institutions taking decisions contrary to the interests of the people” (Dye 2015: 6).

As I said before, another prominent aspect of eurosceptical politicians and politics is nationalism. At the beginning of European integration, the word ‘nationalist’ was the typical label for opponents to the integration (Leconte 2010, p. 3), but it still appears as a word especially used to refer to anti-European right parties and leaders, as evident in the newspaper headline below:

<sup>3</sup> An issue of the Spectator reported the following: “the Euro-sceptic Chiefs of Staff, and Lords Carrington and Balniel, equally sceptical” at [www.grammarphobia.com/blog](http://www.grammarphobia.com/blog) (3.3.2015).

<sup>4</sup> “Demagogue.” Def. 1, 2. OED First Edition (1895). OED Second Edition (1989). OED Online version 2000. OED Online version June 2013.

<sup>5</sup> See 3.

<sup>6</sup> From the blog of the University of Reading, “Demagoguery and populism”, posted by Professor Peter Kruschwitz on 24 May 2014 (3.3.2015).

<sup>7</sup> “Populism.” Def. 1. OED First Edition (1907). OED Second Edition (1989). OED Online version 2000. OED Third Edition (December 2006) - fully updated. OED Online version June 2012.

March of Europe's Far Right: Failing economies, mass immigration and contempt for politicians has fuelled support for nationalist parties which make Ukip look moderate.<sup>8</sup>

The OED defines nationalism as

[the] advocacy of or support for the interests of one's own nation, esp. to the exclusion or detriment of the interests of other nations. Also: advocacy of or support for national independence or self-determination.<sup>9</sup>

According to Gellner, nationalism is “a political principle, which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent” (1983, p. 1). The main nationalist claim in Euroscepticism is that “deep European integration is by definition illegitimate, because it attaches political power to something other than the national unit” (Dye 2015, p. 8). Therefore, Euroscepticism may be based on demagoguery, populism and nationalism in some cases and it may differ in type. Politically speaking, four categories of euroscepticism have been distinguished: utilitarian, political, value-based and cultural; such varieties respectively focus on the alleged benefits derived from being part of the EU, the effects on national sovereignties, the impact on normative subjects and “a broader hostility towards Europe as a continent” (Leconte 2010, p. 43). These forms have been used alternately from the 1950s up to now. Taggart and Szczerbiak (2001) outline a distinction between hard and soft Euroscepticism. The former shows strong opposition to the existence of the EU as a principle while the latter is moved by disagreement to some EU policies. Hard eurosceptic parties and followers are also called ‘withdrawalists’ due to their conviction that the country they represent should withdraw from the EU. This is the case of the UKIP and its leader Nigel Farage.

### 3. Aims and Scope of the Research

This paper aims to analyse the linguistic techniques that make Farage a persuasive speaker. Because, though deeply criticised by political opponents and part of society, his utterances and written word – his communication style – have increasingly affected the audience in Britain in the last years; this is due to his ability to persuade through the linguistic choices and rhetorical devices he uses to get his ideas across. His political style is well-known for his fervent, debatable but witty speeches at the EU Parliament as well as his interviews and newspaper articles where he criticises the euro-project. In this paper I analyse eight texts in the lapse of time from November 2011 to September 2013, the period when he gathered consensus and which led him and his party to the successful results obtained in both local and European elections between 2012 and 2014.

The texts selected here are aimed at examining his ideas from a linguistic point of view. The material chosen consists in three newspaper articles, two interviews and three speeches held at the European Parliament, delivered/written by Farage and published on the UKIP official website. The scope of this work is deliberately limited to his views on

<sup>8</sup> Headline of an article published on The Daily Mail, by A. Brummer on 22 May 2014 and available online at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2636850/Across-Europe-support-nationalist-parties-makes-Ukip-look-moderate.html> (10.3.2015).

<sup>9</sup> “Nationalism.” Def. 1. OED First Edition (1906). OED Second Edition (1989). OED Online version 2000. OED Third Edition (June 2003) - fully updated. OED Online version June 2012.

the EU,<sup>10</sup> the most fertile ground on which to carry out some research based on Farage's expressive modalities toward Europe. Though the analysis is based on a small corpus of texts it can reveal how Farage uses rhetorical and lexical tools in order to successfully convey his anti-European belief. The data was gathered exclusively through manual search, for both vocabulary and rhetorical devices, and is meant to be an indication of a phenomenon through significant examples. Needless to say, the subjective element guides the choice of the topic, the methodology used as well as the interpretation of data. In particular I focused my attention on the following four aspects in Farage's discourse because they seemed to me prevalent in his anti-EU thought:

- a) Powerful words and repetitions (to express empathy or distrust)
- b) Offensive language and criticism (to diminish opponents)
- c) Use of pronouns (to include or exclude others)
- d) Rhetorical figures and idioms (to suggest immediacy and informality)

#### 4. Nigel Farage's Use of the Language through Text Analysis

The choice of texts in this paper was made by carefully examining the articles, speeches and interviews published on the UKIP website, in which Farage's favourite issues are presented. Of course here emphasis on Europe is strong because the eight texts chosen are all about the EU and I was keen to see what kind of stylistic and lexical forms the leader of the UKIP prefers, in order to understand how eurosceptical themes would be linguistically conveyed. In the sample corpus of texts examined, political stances and personal dislikes are all against the euro as well as EU President Herman Van Rompuy and EU Commission President Manuel Barroso. Here is a list of the texts analysed in this paper:

- 4.1. The genius of mutual indebtedness<sup>11</sup>
- 4.2. Voters not fooled by plastic Euroscepticism<sup>12</sup>
- 4.3. Euro – A financial disaster<sup>13</sup>
- 4.4. This is how dictatorship begins<sup>14</sup>
- 4.5. This is my greatest worry as we head into 2013<sup>15</sup>
- 4.6. Nigel Farage offers Barroso some cooling news<sup>16</sup>
- 4.7. Greece has been sacrificed on the altar of the failed euro experiment<sup>17</sup>
- 4.8. We want our country back<sup>18</sup>

<sup>10</sup> <http://www.ukipmeps.org/>

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.ukipmeps.org/news\\_541\\_The-Genius-of-Mutual-Indebtedness.html](http://www.ukipmeps.org/news_541_The-Genius-of-Mutual-Indebtedness.html)

<sup>12</sup> [http://www.ukipmeps.org/news\\_787\\_Farage-Voters-not-fooled-by-plastic-euroscepticism-Mr-Cameron.html](http://www.ukipmeps.org/news_787_Farage-Voters-not-fooled-by-plastic-euroscepticism-Mr-Cameron.html)

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.ukipmeps.org/news\\_397\\_Nigel%20s-speech-goes-viral---again.html](http://www.ukipmeps.org/news_397_Nigel%20s-speech-goes-viral---again.html)

<sup>14</sup> [http://www.ukipmeps.org/articles\\_272\\_Nigel-Farage-This-is-How-Dictatorship-Begins.html](http://www.ukipmeps.org/articles_272_Nigel-Farage-This-is-How-Dictatorship-Begins.html)

<sup>15</sup> [http://www.ukipmeps.org/news\\_679\\_Farage-My-greatest-worry-as-we-head-into-2013---.html](http://www.ukipmeps.org/news_679_Farage-My-greatest-worry-as-we-head-into-2013---.html)

<sup>16</sup> [http://www.ukipmeps.org/articles\\_714\\_Farage-offers-Barroso-some-cooling-news.html](http://www.ukipmeps.org/articles_714_Farage-offers-Barroso-some-cooling-news.html)

<sup>17</sup> [http://www.ukipmeps.org/news\\_750\\_Greece-has-been-sacrificed-on-the-altar-of-the-failed-euro-experiment.html](http://www.ukipmeps.org/news_750_Greece-has-been-sacrificed-on-the-altar-of-the-failed-euro-experiment.html)

<sup>18</sup> [http://www.ukipmeps.org/news\\_568\\_Farage-We-won%20t-get-fooled-again-PM.html](http://www.ukipmeps.org/news_568_Farage-We-won%20t-get-fooled-again-PM.html)

## 5. Linguistic Considerations

### 5.1. Powerful Words and Repetitions

Borrowing from Rudyard Kipling's famous quotation about language I am willing to remember at this stage that "words are, of course, the most powerful drug used by mankind".<sup>19</sup> The metaphor used by the author – words and drug – suggests how words can be powerful in persuading others. As we have previously remarked, Farage uses words very skillfully depending on what he is aiming to. He is capable of employing high-impact words – fatal, heavy and negative terms – to make the enemy look worse and create a sense of distrust toward opponents, as well as emotive and hopeful expressions, so suggestive as to move the reader/listener and develop empathy with his public. This also happens through repetition of the same words and expressions, as in politics this really matters. Repetitions help to fix the key concepts in the public's mind but they also emphasise the main themes dear to the speaker. The recurrence of words is a typical feature of Farage's speeches that sometimes leads to a sort of chant. For example in 4.3, *The answer is none of you because none of you have been elected; none of you have any democratic legitimacy for the roles you currently hold*, or in 4.2 through the anaphora in *The man who addresses a parliament miles away from the UK ... The man who thinks that wanting direct democracy and the UK to run its own affairs is somehow dangerous .... The man who when he looks in the mirror sees David Cameron winking back with a smile* to refer to President Barroso.

In 4.1 the recurrent use of words such as *Spanish, euro, Italy, Greece, banking* makes it clear that the gist of this speech is the economic and banking crisis that affected Spain and the other southern European countries, but also the crisis of the euro. Farage often uses the word *democracy* in his speeches in order to show that he wants to focus on national states within the EU and allow them to have a voice in supranational decisions made in Brussels. He describes an endangered and pending democracy, especially in Greece and Italy, whose main cause is Van Rompuy. As far back as 1946 Orwell considered the word *democracy* as "a meaningless word". In fact (Orwell 1946, p. 2237),

not only is there no agreed definition, but the attempt to make one is resisted from all sides. It is almost universally felt that when we call a country democratic we are praising it: consequently the defenders of every kind of regime claim that it is a democracy, and fear that they might have to stop using that word if it were tied down to any one meaning. Words of this kind are often used in a consciously dishonest way.

In 4.2 he also employs high-impact words and phrases such as *dangerous, obsession, overriding, hoodwink*, notably when he talks about the *currency struggle to survive* or an *increasing green obsession*. In 4.3 he uses powerful words and strong expressions like *disaster, dullest, failure, vacuum, German-dominated Europe, breach of confidence, disgusting spectacle, bumped off, unelected*. By resorting to the fact that this political class has not been chosen by voters he arouses a feeling of distrust toward them. So, he highlights the lack of legitimacy and "social contract" between the EU and the people. In 4.4 the expression *bully-boys* is used by Farage in order to critically portray the European political elite, notably Barroso and Van Rompuy, by simply addressing them as *guys*. He compares them to ordinary boys, unreliable and unable to keep promises, and making

<sup>19</sup> The quotation is from a speech Kipling gave at the Royal College of Surgeons in London in 1923.

them responsible for the crisis which is hammering the EU: there is also a sort of cruel irony aimed at spreading a sense of doubt and irritation for the politicians. The nickname they earned – *bully boys* – was not given by chance; in fact Farage wants to compare their political actions to the bullies' behaviour who are always picking on the weakest people in society in order to lead.

Farage describes a quasi apocalyptic situation when he uses terms such as *dictatorship*, *monstrosity*, *failure*, *disaster*, *emergency*, just to underline the loss of democracy undergone by Italy and Greece. In the last part of the interview he goes back to the emotive and hopeful language as in *we believe in freedom and democracy, legitimacy*. Farage uses the evocative word *democracy* 3 times in order to explain the “end of democracy” in Italy. In addition, he blames Monti too for being guilty of the euro disaster saying he is one of the *architects* of failure and ruin. In 4.5 a sense of critical tone towards the ongoing economic catastrophe is conveyed by the words *rates* and *crises*, emphasising that the issue has not been tackled effectively. In 4.6 emphasis is initially expressed via fatal and heavy words (*disaster*, *die*, *death*) and then developed into emotive words calling to mind the sphere of politics like *democracy*, *identity*, *national*, *believe*.

Throughout 4.7 a huge presence of high impact words as well as populist terms occur: *depredation*, *generations*, *destruction*, *penury*, *crisis*, *colonial*, *lie*, *failed*, *youth*, *sacrificed*, *destroyed*, *decimated* and they focus on the EU's responsibility towards unlucky Greece. Here it may be observed that the eurosceptical British leader brings into play evocative and impacting terms such as *dreams*, *future*, *hopes* aiming to arouse emotions in the listeners. In 3.8 the leitmotif is *pride*, the noun occurring 3 times and the adjective *proud* 4. Many words strictly refer to the nation, such as *identity*, *Union Jack*, *patriotic*, *flag* and *past* and the majority of them focuses on positive meaning in order to invigorate the reader and make them share his ideas: *fantastic*, *joy*, *success*, *admiration*, *win*, *celebration*.

## 5.2. Offensive Language and Criticism

The use and functions of offensive language have largely been dealt with by scholars. According to Bolstrom *et al.* (in Fitzgerald 2007, p. 17) it can be used “to create attention, to discredit someone or something, to provoke confrontations, to provide a type of catharsis for the user, and to establish interpersonal identification”.

In 4.1 Farage attacks the European Union by starting to talk about Spain, which was the fourth nation since the adoption of the euro to be helped by the European Central Bank to avoid bankruptcy. The word ‘genius’ in the title ironically underlines the wrong choice that only an ‘incompetent’ could have made: *mutual indebtedness*. He talks about prime minister Rajoy as *the most incompetent leader in the whole of Europe* and through satire he adds this is quite hard since *there is pretty stiff competition*. In 4.2 accusations towards Cameron and Barroso are evident in the frequent occurrence of their names (respectively 4 and 8 times) and especially when addressing Barroso he conveys a sense of unrelatedness and unfamiliarity using the word *man* often preceded by *this*. For example in *this man who on Wednesday stood in front of MEPs in Strasbourg...*, *this man who no one in the UK has ever had a chance to vote for...*, or *and how did this man who leads a political union come to make speeches...* In 3.5 he openly attacks Barroso and indignantly says *he's an idiot*. In this interview Mr Farage claims that Barroso's greatest concern is just to reassure everyone about the end of the euro crisis when instead we should worry because nothing is changing: growing youth unemployment and weakening economies.

Through irony and satire Farage can express his criticism and disapproval of opponents rather than through foul language.

### 5.3. Use of Pronouns

Pronouns are used meaningfully. Based on Molek-Kozakowska's study about territorialization in political discourse, "identities are constructed through linguistic means of inclusion and exclusion" (Molek-Kozakowska 2011, p. 183-4) and pronouns are a crucial elements to include/exclude people. Basically, it can be either exclusive or inclusive depending on the speakers's rhetorical purposes. Farage can highlight opposing views by using them in an inclusive or exclusive manner or replicating the subject (notably used to oppose people, groups, parties) throughout the text and associating it with negative events or results. For example *they* may include all those who are responsible for the EU "disaster" (Van Rompuy, Barroso, Monti, IMF, ECB,) but in 4.8 *they* is used to address other British political leaders as in *they lied, they want, they promise us*. The personal pronoun *we* is often meant to represent those who play the role of "saviours" and the fair, who have a sense of responsibility and neatly oppose "evil", opposed to *they*. For example in 4.8 he repeats *we* 18 times, e.g. *we have had enough* and *we want our country back*, that are full of meaning from a nationalistic point of view. Here also the possessive adjective *our* that occurs 24 times is also an evidence of territoriality.

In 4.6 Farage's propaganda in favour of his party and eurosceptical stances is also manifest in *we've argued from the start* or *we've been proved to be right*. Direct opposition is mainly conveyed by the personal pronoun *you*, maybe even more derogatorily; he resorts to it when his style and tone become more aggressive, e.g. when he directly turns to Mr Van Rompuy and Mr Barroso, listing all their faults. In 4.1 the repeated use of *you* (6 times) is a sign of accusation against the leading "Eurocrats" in Brussels as well as in 3.3. Here the tone of criticism against the EU, the euro and its creators is undeniable in the occurrence of the personal pronoun *you* (18 times), mostly to refer to the Presidents of the European the Commission and the Eurogroup: *You should all be held accountable for what you've done. You should all be fired, you guys have played a role, none of you because none of you have been elected; none of you have any democratic legitimacy for the roles you currently hold within this crisis*.

In 4.6 Farage turns directly to Barroso and tells him that for about ten years he has simply taken care of Eurofederalism, giving advantages to the bureaucrats, the wealthy and the businessmen rather than the poor and the unemployed. The fact that Farage is turning directly to Barroso is evident from the massive use of the subject *you* (20).

### 5.4. Rhetorical Figures and Idioms

From a rhetorical point of view Farage makes recurrent use to figures of speech. His language is very rich in metaphors, which can draw the public's attention and excite their imagination in order to better communicate the message. Of course political discourse is generally abundant in metaphors as they add to the vivacity of the language and "vivid language can arouse the audience's interest, hold their attention and enhance their comprehension" (Zhang 2005, p. 88). Farage reaches his effects by means of metaphors, similes and allegories, but also other figurative expressions such as idioms. Farage starts his speech by using a very famous title of a Queen's song, "Another one bites the dust", whose meaning is 'to fall', 'to succumb', to refer to the Spanish bailout from the EU.

A very interesting metaphor is found in 4.1 where he talks about the *Euro-Titanic*



to refer to Europe, regarded as a body that is about to hit an “economic iceberg” and stop existing: *This ship, the euro Titanic has now hit the iceberg and sadly there simply aren't enough life boats*. Metaphors are also used ironically and sarcastically, as again in 4.1 when he talks about Mr Van Rompuy, president of the European Council, and says *he's done a runner*, an idiomatic expression whose meaning is ‘to leave a place in order to avoid a difficult situation’. This is what Van Rompuy did when he realised the situation was still negative and understood that Europe had not *turned the corner*, to metaphorically express that the critical point in the crisis had not passed yet. Here we also find, talking about Greece, the metaphorical idiom *the real elephant in the room* in order to outline that an evident truth is being ignored: *once Greece leaves...the European Central Bank is bust...*

In 4.2 Farage ironically agrees with Barroso’s prediction, based on the belief that the UK Independence Party would win the upcoming elections. The UKIP leader declares that this *messed up the feathers* to David Cameron, who pretends to be Eurosceptic but who actually supports Barroso and the EU. Then, by saying that Mr Barroso *must be quaking in his boots* Farage wants to ironically outline that the President of the EU Commission is not shaking with fear because of Cameron’s possible admonishment, also because they are *hand in glove*, that is to say very close to one another. They are so close that *when [Barroso] looks in the mirror [he] sees David Cameron winking back with a smile*. Barroso is also referred to as a *previous Maoist*, someone who adhered to the Marxist movement developed in China by Mao Zedong. In 4.3 again on the Greek case he uses a simile and compares European technocrats to *a pack of hienas*, who surrounded premier Papandreou without accepting the Greek referendum. Finally he ironically wonders who will be the next premier to be *bumped off* and this is made by the use of an analogy as he says that *it's getting like an Agatha Christie novel*.

He also uses metaphorical expressions in 4.4 such as *beyond the pale* to refer to Berlusconi’s removal and affirms that *Mr Monti and his cronies* should be *booted out* as soon as possible. In 4.5 he compares the situation of Greece to that of World War II, through an analogy with that period made by an old Greek man who said *the suffering he sees now reminds him of the devastation caused by the German occupation in World War II*. He also makes use of a metaphor to say he will convince Barroso to change his mind about the crisis by saying *I'm going to ram it down his throat*. The crisis is not over, he adds, but only *resting*.

The theme of Greece is always in the spotlight. In 4.7 Farage uses the expression *Greece has been sacrificed on the altar of the failed euro experiment*. This figurative and powerful expression means the country has been neglected to the advantage of the euro, which he regards as a *failed experiment*. He also offers images of a derelict Greece by using one of the country’s symbols, the olive, stating that Greek *hopes [are] left rotting in untended olive groves*.

The allegory can “illustrate complex ideas and concepts in ways that are easily digestible and tangible to its viewers, readers, or listeners”.<sup>20</sup> In some cases Farage uses sayings and idiomatic expressions which are well-consolidated in the language and which are the result of metaphoric processes. For instance, ‘to turn the corner’ has the figurative meaning of ‘to pass a critical point or stage’ though its literal meaning is ‘to pass round a corner into another road, street, etc.’.

<sup>20</sup> Project Gutenberg Self-Publishing Press, <http://self.gutenberg.org/articles/allegory> (18.4.2015).

## 6. Conclusions

Farage's anti-EU political discourse outlines a wealth of lexical and rhetorical devices. The UKIP leader uses language powerfully through evocative, influential and accusatory terms in order to arouse intolerance for European rules, trying to fuel Euroscepticism and a consensus for the UKIP. Of course, being his policy focused on anti-euro issues and aimed to persuade people to adopt an anti-European point of view, his language is characterised by a critical tone, sometimes reaching an apocalyptic style. He makes attacks against the Euro and European institutions (notably against their representatives) and though he is often sarcastic he is rarely offensive. In most of his speeches/writings the subject is often fooled and treated with witticism and in few cases a 'cruel' irony is used to reach the aim, e.g. a sense of aversion and distrust for a politician or an institution.

On the whole, Farage often resorts to all the typical devices of political discourse, especially through lexis (words with strong connotation), rhetoric (repetitions and metaphors), as well as a clever use of extra-linguistic features (tone of voice and ironic style). Thus, he makes his speeches more persuasive and, as the case may be, he can either pull on people's heartstrings or arouse anger and lack of trust towards his opponents. In fact, the common anti-EU attitude or at least, the feeling of suspicion for the EU widely present in Britain is wisely exploited by Farage and is well matched to the language used in order to be convincing, motivating and appealing to a large number of people.

**Bionote:** Francesco Pierini is Researcher in English Language at the Department of Political Science of the University of Genoa (Italy). His main research interests are intercultural communication in English, and the analysis of specialized discourse (politics, diplomacy and business). He has taught English language at the University of Genoa for both BA and MA courses since 2005. He also taught English language at the School of Architecture of the same university, from 1996 to 2010. He graduated in modern languages and literatures with full marks and took a postgraduate specialization in English language teaching.

**E-mail address:** [francesco.pierini@unige.it](mailto:francesco.pierini@unige.it)

## References

- Dye D.T. 2015, *The Language of Euroskepticism: UKIP Discourse in Comparative Context*, American University, School of International Service. Paper prepared for the 2015 Political Studies Association Annual International Conference Sheffield, England – 30 March-1 April.
- Fitzgerald M. 2007, *Offensive Language Spoken on Popular Morning Radio Programs*, Florida State University, Tallahassee.
- Ford R. and Goodwin M. 2014, *Revolt on the Right: Explaining the Support for the Radical Right in Britain*, Routledge, Abingdon.
- Forster A. 2003, *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics*, Routledge, London.
- Gellner E. 1983, *Nations and Nationalism*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca.
- Gifford C. 2008, *The Making of Eurosceptic Britain: Identity and Economy in a Post-Imperial State*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Harmesen R. and Spiering M. 2005, *Euroscepticism: Party Politics, National Identity and European Integration*, Editions Rodopi, Amsterdam/New York.
- Krzyzanowski M. and Wodak R. 2009, *The Politics Of Exclusion. Debating Migration in Austria*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Leconte C. 2010, *Understanding Euroscepticism*, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Molek-Kozakowska K. 2011, *Territorialization in Political Discourse: A Pragma-linguistic Study of Jerzy Buzek Inaugural Speeches*, in Pawlak M. and Bielak J. (eds.), *New Perspectives in Language, Discourse and Translation Studies*, Springer, New York, pp. 180-188.
- Orwell G. 1946, *Politics and the English Language*, Horizon, London.
- Simpson A.J. (ed.) in progress, *The Oxford English Dictionary (1884-1928)*, 3rd ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, <http://www.oed.com> (8.10.2016).
- Taggart P. and Szczerbiak A. 2001, *Parties, positions and Europe: Euroscepticism in the EU candidate states of Central and Eastern Europe*, in “Opposing Europe, Sussex European Institute Working Paper” 46.
- Wodak R., Mral B. and Khosravinik M. (eds.) 2013, *Right Wing Populism in Europe: Politics and Discourse*, Bloomsbury Academic, London.
- Zhang X. 2005, *English rhetoric*, Tsinghua University Press and Beijing Jiaotong University, Beijing.