

AFRICAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE AND HUMANITIES

vol.4/Issue 1

March 2023



www.afjoli.com

ISSN 2706-7408

URL: afjoli.com/index.php/2019/09/06/september-2019-issue-1-vol-1/.
Fatcat: fatcat.wiki/con ...Google: www.google.com/...Bing: www.bing.com/se... Yahoo: search.yahoo.co..

Shaping Euroscepticism through Media in Andrew Marr's *Head of State*

SILUE Ténéna Mamadou

Maitre-Assistant, English department at Alassane Ouattara University,

Email: silue_tenena@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper examines Andrew Marr's *Head of State*, as it explores the process by which Britain's exit from Europe is re-imagined, fictionalized, and politicised through the media. In so doing, the study unpacks the ways in which the mediatized political discourse about the Brexit referendum has stirred up and shaped British Euroscepticism. The scrutiny of the paper draws on the theory of intermediality, specifically on Jorgen Bruhn's term of "medialities matters or media" as an analytical tool, on the discursive correlation between the media (inside and outside communicative action) in literary texts. In analyzing Andrew Marr's *Head of State*, we finally suggest that the surface features of the work are apparently hiding a very strong reliance on media in its way of constructing Eurosceptic attitudes, which turn out to be media prejudices in pre-referendum society.

Key-word: Brexit, Euroscepticism, Europhiles, *Head of State*, Media, Narratives, prejudice, Referendum.

Introduction

One of the most striking features of contemporary British fiction is the emergence of the phenomenon of Euroscepticism through media. Euroscepticism or British people's cynicism toward the European Union integration project is connected with the media. The British press has constantly influenced British people's attitude toward the European Union. In fact, the argument against Europe was common before, during and after the referendum in written press and audio-visual media.

This topicality of media in framing citizens' opinion about Europe has been investigated in several scholars' works. In an article entitled "Brexit and the media", Simon Hinde, a British lecturer, points out that "It is impossible to calculate the effect that the long running British press campaign had in preparing the ground for the moment when the referendum was finally called and the campaign began" (2016: 4). From Simon's observation, we may note that the press has long been shaping the relationships between Britain and the European Union.

In the same vein, Francis Rawlinson finds Euroscepticism in British journalists' analysis of the Brexit referendum vote. In his book, Francis Rawlinson argues that "The groundwork for the Leave campaign in the UK's 2016 EU referendum had already been laid over the course of several decades by a highly Eurosceptic press". (2020: 2). In what follows the critic presents the media as the driving force of British Euroscepticism during the Brexit referendum.

In his rendition of the media's framing of public skepticism towards the European Union integration project, Andrew Marr's fiction takes into account the same preoccupations raised by Simon Hinde and Francis Rawlinson, that is, the consequential media impact on British people's cynicism towards Europe. *Head of State* by Andrew Marr, depicts the role of the news media in affecting public Euroscepticism. Through eventful narrative structures focused on the media's involvement in British political history, the fiction unpacks a feud between Eurosceptic and Europhile characters for the control of media. In the end Eurosceptic character seizes press to secure a vote against the European Union integration project.

In this article, we specifically consider the correlation between news media framing of Brexit discourse and public pessimism towards the European Union integration project in Andrew Marr's *Head of State*. In doing so, we rely on the theory of intermediality, specifically on Jorgen Bruhn's concept of "medialities matters or media" as a critical perspective. For Jorgen Bruhn "medialities matters or media is a central term of intermediality of narrative literature. And it includes significant amounts of what appears to be extra literary material—formally and in content—and that we too often ignore this dimension of literature. It is as simple, but also as complicated, as that" (2016: 1). Drawing on Jorgen's concept of "medialities matters or media", central to the theory of intermediality we are therefore interested in teasing out the inevitable presence of medialities or media inside the apparently "pure" literary work, even when the extra-literary medialities have not been indicated in Marr's text. In this sense our contribution will first show how British People's Euroscepticism is analysed through media different discursive nexuses and trajectories in Andrew Marr's oeuvre. The second interest will explore the media prejudices in pre-referendum narratives.

1-Debunking Euroscepticism through Media

In studying the literary narratives what interest theoreticians in using intermediality is the manifestation of structural media discourse connections within literary texts. According to Jorgen Bruhn "medialities matter refers to tools of communicative action inside or outside the arts "(2016: 1). This implies that intermediality is understood as the interaction of various types of art-languages in a system of a single literary text. In a narrow sense, intermediality is a particular type of intertextual relationships in a work of art, where different types of art interact. A better way of delineating the contours of media discourse in narratives can be done through the reading of Media and Euroscepticism in *Head of State*. In this part we attempt to show how Marr's Andrew's fiction interacts with various semantic codes of media inside and outside to construct a Eurosceptic worldview. Particular attention is paid to the relationship between the fictional media coverage of Brexit referendum and individual British attitude to Europe.

Britain has a powerful Eurosceptic press which remains hostile to the European Union. The best media organizations which covered the British referendum were in Britain. In *Head of State*, *the National Courier* is an obvious and important feature of

the inside communicative tool and of what Lars Elleström labels as ‘technical media’ (2018: 6). The opening lines of the fiction refer to this pictorial press as representative of all major British daily media and the epicenter of socio-political and cultural debates about the European Union: “He was on his way to the offices of one of Britain’s once-great newspaper, *the National Courier*. “(Marr, 2014: 6).

Here, the *National Courier* is labelled as the unique emblematical national media amidst all the other daily British media. The extraordinariness of this press is established in the narrator’s statement through the phrase “one of Britain’s once- great newspaper” (Marr, 2014:6). What is contrived in this qualification of the journal is first its intrinsic communicative power within narratives and then its crucial role in the framing of British referendum discourse. This importance of the newspapers in the referendum matter is exposed as the narrator continues:

Everybody at the *National Courier* knew that the front page would be referendum, referendum, referendum. The cartoon would be referendum. The comment pages would contain referendum yes and referendum no. the editorial would be referendum maybe. (Marr, 2014:12)

Through this passage, the narrator’s vocabulary about *the National Courier* and Brexit referendum is rich and varied, with the odd rhetorical figure such as anaphoric or epiphoric repetition and alliteration. The passage is characterized by a number of media references or medialities matters. In fact, through *the National Courier*’s treatment of Brexit, we can draw allusion to British daily newspapers’ comment on the referendum. The actual textual narrative is preceded by an ironic reworking of a section of the Daily Mail’s comments on the referendum.

Marr’s novel is distinguished by the way in which it does not transgress the generic conventions of the novel. It mediates between various types of communicative actions and forms. Therefore, the text mobilizes different forms and discursive styles; this in a sense puts the questions of media and referendum at the foreground, but at the same time makes the task of establishing a relatively simple mediality structure quite demanding. *Head of State* necessitates an understanding of not only the represented medialities but also the more radical medial aspects of the text. Hence, the analysis of the *National Courier* opens a further understanding on Euroscepticism.

Regarding the linguistic material that the *National Courier* consists of, the comments given to the referendum within the narrative are of particular interest. In this sense, the plot of Marr’s fiction is in the borderline between information and imagination, and between fact and fiction. In fact, the reader can notice the presence of different types of participants in the above passage: reporters, audiences and fiction readers. This nexus of discourses is read as intermediality. As a result, intermediality is the presence in a work of such inside communicative structures that include media information about literary work.

So, as the researcher N. V. Tishunina highlights, in the system of intermedial relations at first, one artistic code is translated into another as a rule, and then their interaction takes place, but on a semantic level not on a semiotic one (2001: 149-154). Consequently, the inclusion of *National Courier's* comments on the referendum in Marr's fiction is meant to shape a Eurosceptic perspective in a semantic sense. What is significant about the *National Courier's* treatment of the referendum is that there are interpretative and explanatory comments against the European Union as we read: "The Courier at least still covered politics with some vigour, although the news pages seemed to be in favour of Britain leaving the EU, while the comment pages were aggressively the other way." (Marr, 2015: 14)

From a semiotic point of view, the *National Courier* is the inside sign code of Euroscepticism as its editorial line supports Britain's departure from Europe. This semiotic perspective is perceivable at the semantic level as the media is fractured between Eurosceptic and Europhile camps. In the context of Marr's fiction, this press animosity towards Europe is viewed through the division of the *National Courier's* journalists over Europe. These lines illustrate that as the narrator says: "

Once Cooper would simply have sacked the columnist and intimidated the others. he had always made a point of *the Courier's* tradition of dissent, holding out against the Cameron government's new press censorship law for two long years (...) Ken Cooper's old certainties had long gone. He also believed in creative tension between his journalists, and had just about held the editorial line. Lucy Scalding had become an important ally. (...) That was why she'd taken a seat on his office sofa so comfortably. But the frog-eyed columnist was now standing at the door, and he pitched in. (Marr, 2014:69, 70)

This extract depicts the internal conflict between Ken Cooper, the director of *the National Courier*, and his journalists over the European integration issue. The tension in the media office is read as the opposition between Eurosceptic and Europhile. It also indicates to the reader that the *National Courier* is the outside communicative tool that is shaping the Brexit debate between the different camps in literature.

Actually, the central prevalence of *The National Courier* office in narratives demonstrates the influence of extra literary element (media) on literary texts. This newspaper acts as a referent, and the development of the plot in *Head of State*. It is necessary to indicate that *The National Courier* is the inside and outside pictorial code by means of which we can decipher the smallest shades of artistic content. Given that the intermedial analysis of the text is based on the thesis that media structurally interacts in literary text to convey special artistic information, the *Courier* enables us to reveal an inextricable connection between press and characters' Euroscepticism.

Furthermore, media Euroscepticism framing was also due to a constant British discontent with the European and international leaders. In fact, British politicians often believed that Europe was threatening the British democratic parliamentary system. In

the estimation of political leaders, the European Union integration project is working for the alienating power of Britain and its elites. During a press conference, the former British Prime Minister, Theresa May draws public attention on the risk of substituting the country's institution to international norms:

But today, too many people in positions of power behave as though they have more in common with international elites than with the people down the road, the people they employ, the people they pass in the street. But if you believe you're a citizen of the world, you're a citizen of nowhere. You don't understand what the very word 'citizenship means (May, 2016, n. p.)

In these lines, May calls on British people not to opt for the Europeanization of British institutions and elites. She wants the people to imagine their future within their own institutions in order to preserve their independence from Europe. May's speech in this sense reinforces people's cynicism about Europe in the referendum vote. By calling elites to dissociate themselves from international elites, May implicitly works for the strengthening of public Euroscepticism. May's above political recommendation is intermedially reworked in *Head of State*, as the journalist alerts characters about pan-European media danger on Britain's political institution in the following lines:

The internet, Brussels propaganda, pan-European TV channels and the sophisticated commentaries in the expensive newspapers; in forty years of trying they had hardly changed things at all. So to pretend that British democracy could survive and thrive inside this superstate was a lie. (...) Europe was nothing but a huddle of timid and half-naked polities crouching together for warmth (Marr, 2014:103-104)

This quote contains an inclusion of internet discourse in literary text. The occurrence of the internet sources in narrative is done through what Jorgen labelled as "medialities matter or media". Here this outside media information in literary text relates the discourse of Britain's political decline within a European Union. In effect, for the Eurosceptic press, Europe is "a superstate" (2014:103) that works for an ebbing power of Britain's political institution. The word "superstate" reflects this verbal collapse of the United Kingdom's power vis à vis Europe. *Head of State* reinforces people's cynicism about Europe, for its journalists see Europe as a destabilizing power of Britain's political institutions.

Third, thanks to a reworking of nostalgic discourse press agents succeeded in shaping a Eurosceptic thought. There is a regular parallel between the 1975 British referendum and the current Brexit referendum. The novel echoes this longing for the past as the narrator says: "There was certainly a fight ahead in Brussels, but nobody since Margaret Thatcher had managed to change Britain's relationship with Europe so dramatically" (Marr, 2014: 161). This extract focuses on Thatcher's achievement and its relevance to Britain's Europe relations today. The structural intermedial connection of the current Brexit situation with the past suggests that press opposition to European integration is a longstanding phenomenon. The mentioning of Thatcher may also mean that the present

future of Britain can only be devised if attention is paid to history. In terms of story, the nostalgic bias of the novel further manifests itself predominantly in the appointment of Thatcher's biographer as the official historian of the Brexit:

For Brisket was the finest political historian of the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. His early biographies— Blair, Thatcher, Johnson— were still in print (...) thus, it had generally been admired as a rather brave decision when the prime minister announced that he had appointed Brisket as the official historian of the great European referendum. The PM, himself an amateur political historian, had argued that such was the momentous nature of the choice now before the British people that they were owed— (2014:15-16)

Lord Brisket stands out as the outside communicative means or character who is able to revive past political discourse in time of British referendum. As a Margaret Thatcher's biographer, Brisket's appointment is read as an expression of nostalgia for Thatcher's policy toward Europe. Margaret Thatcher often said that the continent of Europe has been the source of most of Britain's ills. The choice of Thatcher's historian is meant to support press discourse of Euroscepticism. As proof, the friendship between Lord Briskett and the *National Courier's* director, Ken Cooper is indicative of the manifestation of Euroscepticism through nostalgia:

As it was a Monday, thought Briskett, (...) he might find his old friend Ken Cooper of the Courier in the bar. (...) he went back to brooding about the missing Lucien McBryde and, like everybody else, idly rehearsing in his mind the likelihood of the country voting to leave EU in a few days' time. Cooper brightened as Briskett waved to him across the crowded bar, and came over to join him (Marr,2014:91-92)

What comes out here is the special relationship between the *Courier* director and his friend Briskett. Britain's Europeanization is compromised by their friendship in the sense that both of them are reimagining Britain's identity out of European integration. In this wise, Britain as a nation is imagined as a single entity, hence Euroscepticism. A distinction like "the country" versus "EU" is important. This distinction draws upon inside and outside media agents' interpretation of history and historic events as the narrator explains: "in the offices of the *National Courier* Ken Cooper ground his fingertips into his skull (...) British political story of modern times—bigger than the fall of Thatcher" (2014:338). Here, Ken Cooper is the inside media agent who is drawing the comparison between the British referendum and Thatcher's fall. The Prime Minister's fall is the outside communicative element that alludes to the discourse of historical events in the shaping of modern Britain's identity. Thus we have a separated British national identity from a collective European identity in narratives of the media director and the historian:

When, later, that night, Ken scanned the early editions of the Courier's rivals, he was relieved to see that none of them was entirely clear about

which story to run with. Both the Sun and the Mirror refused to be deflected from the vote that still lay just ahead- ‘vote “No” for Britain “yes” for Britain’, they chirruped. The Times had a picture of Olivia Kite (...) only the Daily Mail had a front passage that made Ken feel a little jealous (2014:341- 342)

Through this extract the Sun, the Mirror, the Daily Mail and the Times are outside communicative tools and *the Courier's* rival media. By quoting these above newspapers, Marr's text strategically unveils the interaction between the *National Courier* and daily British newspapers. This structural intermediality of Marr's fiction enables the reader to classify British media in their treatment of the referendum campaign. Marr's classification of Eurosceptic press concurs with what Sarah Helm notes in her review published by The Guardian: “Among the British newspapers that advocated that the UK remain a part of the European Union, the most relevant were The Guardian, The Independent, and Financial Times, whilst on the Leave side one should list Sun, Daily Mail, Daily Express, Daily Telegraph, and Sunday Times” (The Guardian, Jan. 10, 2019). It is obvious that the British media played an important role in shaping the citizens' options, imposing themselves as actors in the construction of a Eurosceptic vision. The media in favour of Britain's departure from Europe often put forward the discourse of the country's independence.

Actually, the narratives of *Head of State* are ostensibly permeated with the abundant occurrence of extra-literary elements (media narratives) so as to assert that the novel complies to the “medialities matters or media” (Jorgen Bruhn, 2016: 1) in its shaping of Euroscepticism. Moreover, a closer scrutiny of the work reveals the media prejudice in a pre-referendum narrative.

2- Media Prejudices in Pre- Referendum Narratives

As previously mentioned, Jorgen's (2016:2) concept of “medialities matter or media” posits that literary arts function in a network of clusters forms of communicative actions. In this wise, we can denote media reporting or commentaries inside or outside literary texts. The occurrence of media narratives in fiction makes writers' texts mediate between different genres. These genres do not simply report on media framing of plot events in a neutral way, but they also provide evaluations of press prejudices in narratives. This means that the media always play an instrumental role in the shaping of all narratives. To corroborate this idea, Marshall McLuhan pinpoints that “The medium is the message” (1967: 1). What McLuhan suggests here is the possible prejudices that can be symbolized in any message transmitted by the media.

In this part, we seek to demonstrate how Europhiles' support for Britain's integration in the European Union and prejudice are constructed, negotiated and contested in *Head of State*. In our discussion, we draw attention to Jorgen's concept of “media or medialities” to argue that media prejudice in *Head of State* is constructed and negotiated in par with internal and external political speeches or discourses.

The British referendum of Brexit was excessively mediatized. In corroboration of this, John Street's claims that "The referendum campaign was not just conveyed by our media; it was constituted by them" (2016:59). This assertion substantiates Muclum's postulation of the media pre-eminence in any discourse construction. However, media construction of referendum narratives often forges realities in British society.

First, the manipulation of public opinion is one of the media prejudices in the referendum narratives. Many pan European press manipulate opinion with excessive bias reports to influence the vote in favour of Europhiles. In *Head of State*, the concealment of the Prime Minister's death is imaginatively forged to introduce the subject of British media prejudices in referendum narratives. The third person narrator opines on this manipulative role of British media as follows:

All around the country junior ministers were gaping at their radios in disbelief. But then Bremer wrapped up the phone in with a long prime ministerial lecture on the importance of staying inside the Europe a Union that was so larded with literary quotations and obscure historical allusions that any suspicions faded away. Even so, it had been the most expensive phone-in in British political history, and Bremer had enjoyed himself hugely (2014:178)

In this account, Bremer, the dead Prime Minister's impersonator, is engaged in a radio conversation with characters. This speech is rooted in euro-optimistic discourse. Bremer's insistence on the importance of the European Union for British people indicates his euro-optimistic stand. Bremer constructs a vision of Europe in the Europhiles' interest areas. He solely exposes euro-optimism to characters in the radio conversation. His speech indirectly shuts Eurosceptics off from different opinions and ideas, and allows Europhiles to stereotype information that might conflict with euro-pessimists' point of view. By impersonating a dead Prime Minister, the radio broadcast creates prejudice of information as the narrator puts it "Nelson Fraser understood the British media backwards, upside down and in its every changeable mood. The job of hiding the prime minister's death convincingly enough, for long enough, was so dangerous, so fraught with risk" (Marr, 2014: 113-114).

This quotation encapsulates media manipulation of information in pre-referendum narratives. The narrator's statement intermedially echoes what Dr Sophie Quirk, Lecturer in Drama and theatre, University of Kent observes "Politicians and media alike failed to prepare the population for the referendum. This is because they failed to provide good-quality information" (2016:72). What Sophie Quirk points out about the failure of media and politics is observable in Bremer's impersonation of the Prime Minister. In fact, the impersonation of the Prime Minister's voice reveals the failure of politicians and journalists to render a credible narrative of the referendum.

Another prejudice caused by press agents in pre-referendum narratives was the toxicity of the political discourses. During the Brexit referendum, the media offered spaces for politicians to engage in political debates. This led to the escalation of political tension in the society. There was anger-filled rhetoric instigated by political actors, media and especially Europhiles' tabloid newspapers. As a result, the British political climate became toxic. In *Head of State*, Marr holds Europhiles politicians and their press accountable for the toxicity of British political scene through the viewpoint of the opposition leader, Olivia Kite:

Hard-core Europhiles thought Kite had seemed bonkers, and would turn people off. But the most common reaction was of disgust and disbelief at the concealment of the prime minister's death. There was a strong sense that this was the way the political establishment always behaved, given half a chance, and that they must therefore be punished. A vote against Europe was a vote against the career politicians, against the kind of people who had been conspiring in Downing Street. (Marr, 2014: 348)

This passage describes tropes of toxic politics. Olivia accuses Europhiles and people in power of thwarting the political scene. By claiming elites' punishment, she implicitly depicts a devastating political landscape. The viciousness of Olivia's discourse might mean that the British referendum was divisive, ugly and corrosive. It is important to note that the toxic image of British politics drawn by Olivia is even more expanded by intermedial allusions to statements by the Scottish politician, Nigel Farage, such as "When you challenge the establishment in this country, they come after you, they call you all sorts of things" (The Irish Times 2016). What Nigel Farage observes is the elites' reluctance to accept punishment as a result of people's exasperation with the toxicity of the political climate. On this account, Olivia's persistence on elites' punishment is an intermedia reference to Nigel Farage's political discourse.

Having identified the toxicity of the political scene, Olivia constructs a Eurosceptic political mandate which she believes best suited to build a Britain people want. This becomes particularly palpable towards the end of her speech, when she frames the act of voting for Britain's exit in Europe as an act of defying and punishing the establishment: "A vote against Europe was a vote against the career politicians, against the kind of people who had been conspiring in Downing Street. (Marr, 2014: 348)". An intermedia connotation can be drawn between Olivia's speech and the Prime Minister Theresa May's political discourse when she says: "it took that typically British quiet resolve for people to go out and vote as they did: to defy the establishment, to ignore the threats, to make their voice heard." (May 2016, n. p., my emphasis, J. H.)

Both Olivia's and May's speeches thus point to the punishment of political elites as a way to escape the toxicity of the British political climate. In the same intermedia connection with Olivia and May, the political commentator, Kirsty Hughes' notes that: "within the first few days of the Leave vote, UK political dynamics twisted into a set of

inter-related crises.” (2016:59). Actually, as a media commentator of politics Hughes scrutinizes an atmosphere of toxic politics in this statement above. This is implicitly an alert of the press about this conflicting political situation of Brexit referendum.

Furthermore, *Head of State* appears as an apocalyptic novel in the way the Europhile media constructs Britain’s future in narratives. In fact, the anti-Brexit press employ discourses of severe economic crisis to predict the total collapse of Britain in case of a Brexit vote. This foretelling of a future calamity is what we call the myth of apocalypse. *Head of State* structure raises this myth of apocalypse through the narratives of Francis Fieldfare, the Prime Minister’s press secretary. The text foregrounds this apocalyptic narrative of anti-Brexit press as Fieldfare describes Britain’s future in these terms:

Fieldfare sat immobile, rigid with disgust, as Ashe awkwardly mumbled his way through his explanation. ‘The thing is Francis, this is about a lot more than the referendum, you know. The PM’s whole legacy hangs on it. And the country’s prosperity. Its prosperity, Francis. The FTSE will crash if we leave the EU. Crash. A lot of British companies will go under. You can kiss goodbye to your pension pot, too. It’s a ghastly situation. Ghastly. And extreme danger requires extreme measures (Marr, 2014: 221)

Alongside this passage, the press secretary, Fieldfare draws a pessimistic and disastrous picture of Britain’s future in case there is a Brexit vote. Fieldfare elaborates on the myth of apocalyptic narratives since there is, for instance, a correlation between voting leave and the economic catastrophe that will hit Britain. Also noted is the pessimistic contention that Fieldfare holds as a press agent, best epitomizes the manifestation of media prejudice in referendum narratives. Here, this prejudice is deployed to scare people about the outcome of the referendum.

Fieldfare’s language of apocalypse was also noted in the headlines of some British media. Michael White, the *Guardian*’s assistant editor, for instance described the vote against Europe as the “greatest political crisis since the Second World War” (The *Guardian*). What the journalist predicts here is a severe downturn that could hit the British nation. This amounts to a narrative of apocalypse. Marr intermedially alludes to the same argument of great financial crisis and myth of desolation throughout the language of Europhiles’ newspapers, as the third person omniscient narrator utters: “(...) Newspaper warnings about the terrible impact on the City and on British exports if the country voted to leave EU were familiar” (Marr, 2014: 181)

Clearly, by viewing chaos in Britain’s exit from Europe, the Europhiles press implicitly elaborate on a regressive narrative. Here the media warnings amount to the development of this regressive narrative. It is therefore important to note that the Europhile press fabricate the myth of a regressive narrative to seek public support for

the maintenance of Britain in Europe. This is how the discourse of apocalypse narrative functions as a media prejudice in Marr's fiction.

Besides, the media prejudice is also foregrounded through the novel's pro immigrants' stance. Immigration reporting particularly in the tabloid press has tended to be clemency narratives. In Europhile's media, immigrants were depicted as valuable workers who could contribute to future job security and social peace in Britain. Many pro-European press believe the country will be bettered off with them. Marr intermedially echoes the dynamism of immigrants in the space of the United Kingdom as the narratives reveal:

Dawid and Borys had done their military services and found useful trades which they had brought to Britain. Well-read and hardworking, (...) they were typical examples of the tens of thousands of Eastern European who arrived in the United Kingdom in recent years—more ambitious and determined by far than most of the locals. (Marr, 2014: 123)

In this passage of the *National Courier*, the reporting of Polish men's immigration is extraordinary a clemency narrative, for these immigrant populations seem to be heartily welcome in Britain. This clemency account of immigration in the pan European press shows how the English and the immigrant become compatible in a multicultural United Kingdom. In this contemporary novel Marr holds immigrant and native British in a productive relation to facilitate a desire to turn to a future of more mobile narratives of interrelation and connectedness within Europe. By allowing the *Courier* to provide such a positive comment on Eastern Europeans, the novel becomes suggestively gesturing to an opening out of British people's opinion and imagination towards immigrants in the context of referendum.

Indeed, this clemency discourse of *Head of State*, overlooks the reality that the referendum provided a vehicle for subnational division among the English, British and immigrants population; for many, the vote presented an opportunity to curb immigration and find better job opportunities for native populations. On this account *the Courier's* clemency narrative on immigration reporting appears as the Pan-European media prejudice, because it overlooks the factual reality in British society, as the narrator blames journalism in this term: "A good journalist does not simply receive what is given; he always asks why he was given it, (Marr, 2014: 46). Here, the narrator's disillusionment with journalism is a way to criticise the Europhiles' media prejudice on immigration reporting.

Actually Andrew Marr's oeuvre represents a literary attempt to uncover media prejudices during Brexit referendum. Although *Head of State* is set in London, it also broaches the subject of geopolitical peripherality in relation to Brexit. Its clemency narrative about immigrants is positioned in the Europhiles' media as a signpost of

cultural and geographical integration in a prosperous post referendum British social space.

CONCLUSION

In this article, we specifically consider the relationship between news media framing of the Brexit referendum discourse and public pessimism towards the European Union integration project in Andrew Marr's *Head of State*. Marr's text enables us to tease out the explicit and implicit relation between literary texts and "medialities matter or media" (Jørgen, 2016:1) in order to understand and question the implications of media in the construction of British People's Eurosceptic attitudes. It is obvious that the British media have played an important role in sculpting the citizens' options, imposing themselves as actors in the construction of a Eurosceptic vision.

The present study has offered a snapshot of media shaping of the British referendum. The British people were constantly exposed to Eurosceptic press and Europhiles' manipulation of journalism to allow the country's involvement with Europe. *Head of State* exposes a binaristic discourse on the referendum vote. At times it shapes a fierce Eurosceptic perspective and in other circumstances it elaborates a clemency narrative. All this encapsulates the ambivalent role of the press in the framing of narratives.

REFERENCES

Bruhn, Jørgen. *The Intermediality of Narrative Literature: Medialities Matter*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016

-Elleström, L. 'The modalities of media: A model for understanding intermedial relations'. In *Media borders, multimodality and intermediality*, ed. L. Elleström, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Forster, Anthony. *Euroscepticism in Contemporary British Politics: Opposition to Europe in the British Conservative and Labour Parties Since 1945*, London and New York: Routledge, 2002.

McLuhan Marshall. *The Medium is the Message*, Great Britain: Harper Collins Publishers: 1967

Helm, Sarah. 'Brexit: The Uncivil War proves Hamlet right: the play's the thing'. *The Guardian*, January 10th, 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/jan/10/james-graham-drama-brexit-the-uncivil-war>

Hinde, Simon. 'Brexit and the Media' in *EU Referendum Analysis 2016: Media, Voters and the Campaign, Early Reflections from Leading UK Academics*, Great Britain: Bournemouth University, June 2016, P 59

Hughes Kirsty (2016). 'Neither Tackling Lies nor Making the Case: The Remain Case' in *EU Referendum Analysis 2016: Media, Voters and the Campaign, Early Reflections from Leading UK Academics*, ed. Daniel. Jackson, et. al., Great Britain: Bournemouth University, p65- 67

Marr, Andrew. *Head of State*, Great Britain: Harper Collins Publishers, 2014

Quirk, Sophie. 'Comedy Clubs Offered a Better Quality of Debate than the Political Stage' in in *Eu Referendum Analysis 2016: Media, Voters and the Campaign, Early Reflections from Leading UK Academics*, ed. Daniel. Jackson, Einar. Thorsen and Dominic. Wring, Great Britain: Bournemouth University, June 2016, P 72

Rawlinson, Francis. *How Press Propaganda Paved the Way to Brexit, Great Britain*: Palgrave Macmillan, Mai 2020

Street, John. 'Less a Soap Opera, More a Fantasy Drama' in *Eu Referendum Analysis 2016: Media, Voters and the Campaign, Early Reflections from Leading UK Academics*, ed. Daniel. Jackson, Einar. Thorsen and Dominic. Wring. Great Britain: Bournemouth University, June 2016, P 60

Tishunina, N.V. *Metodologiyaintermedial'nogo analizavsvetemezhdistiplinarnykh issledoaniy*. (Intermediate analysis Methodology in the Light of Interdisciplinary Research, in Russian). St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Philosophical Society, 2001, Pp 12, 149-154

WEBOGRAPHY

- [Online 1] Available from <https://whatukthinks.org/eu/are-voters-changing-their-minds-about-brexit/> [Accessed on 3 March 2022]

- [Online 2] Available from <https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/our-research/uk-press-coverage-eu-referendum> [Accessed on 1 February 2022]

- [Online 3] Available from <https://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/policy-institute/CMCP/UK-media-coverage-of-the-2016-EU-Referendum-campaign.pdf> [Accessed on 1 June 2022]

-[Online 4] <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2012/nov/17/eu-referendum-poll> [Accessed on 1 January 2022]

-[Online 5] Max Bearak . 'Theresa May criticized the term 'citizen of the world.' But half the world identifies that way' <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/10/05/theresa-may-criticized-the-term-citizen-of-the-world-but-half-the-world-identifies-that-way/> October 5, 2016 at 11:10 a.m. EDT [Accessed on 13 May 2022]