



**Revue Internationale de Langue,
Littérature, Culture et Civilisation**

Actes du colloque international

**Vol. 4, N°1, 25 août 2024
ISSN : 2709-5487**

Revue Internationale de Langue, Littérature, Culture et Civilisation

Actes du colloque international sur le thème :

**« La modélisation de la sécurité et des stratégies de paix pour
une paix durable dans l'Espace CEDEAO »**

"Modeling of security and strategies for sustainable peace in ECOWAS zone"

**Revue annuelle multilingue
Multilingual Annual Journal**

**www.nyougam.com
ISSN : 2709-5487
E-ISSN : 2709-5495
Lomé-TOGO**

Revue Internationale de Langue, Littérature, Culture et Civilisation

Directeur de publication : Professeur Ataféï PEWISSI, Littérature de l'Afrique anglophone

Directeur de rédaction : Monsieur Paméssou WALLA (MC), Littérature anglaise

Directeur adjoint de rédaction : Professeur Mafobatchie NANTOB, Sociologie

Comité scientifique

Professeur Komla Messan NUBUKPO, Université de Lomé, Littératures africaine et américaine

Professeur Léonard KOUSSOUHON, Université Abomey-Calavi, Linguistique appliquée

Professeur Yaovi AKAKPO, Université de Lomé, Philosophie

Professeur Koffi ANYIDOHO, University of Legon, Littérature orale

Professeur Augustin AINAMON, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Etudes américaines

Professeur Essoham ASSIMA-KPATCHA, Université de Lomé, Histoire

Professeur Abou NAPON, Université de Ouagadougou, Sociolinguistique

Professeur Martin Dossou GBENOUGA, Université de Lomé, Littérature africaine

Professeur Kossi AFELI, Université de Lomé, Sciences du langage

Professeur Kazaro TASSOU, Université de Lomé, Littérature africaine

Professeur Méterwa A. OURSO, Université de Lomé, Linguistique

Comité de lecture

Professeur Ataféï PEWISSI, Université de Lomé, Littérature de l'Afrique anglophone

Professeur Komlan Essowè ESSIZEWA, Université de Lomé, Sociolinguistique

Professeur Ameyo AWUKU, Université de Lomé, Linguistique

Professeur Laure-Clémence CAPO-CHICHI, Université Abomey-Calavi, Littérature de l'Afrique anglophone

Professeur Dotsè YIGBE, Université de Lomé, Littérature et civilisation allemandes

Professeur Koutchoukalo TCHASSIM, Université de Lomé, Littérature africaine

Professeur Minlipe Martin GANGUE, Université de Lomé, Linguistique

Professeur Essohanam BATCHANA, Université de Lomé, Histoire contemporaine

Professeur Didier AMELA, Université de Lomé, Littératures francophones

Professeur Vamara KONE, Université Alassane Ouattara de Bouaké, Etudes américaines et Littérature comparée
Professeur Akila AHOULI, Université de Lomé, Littérature allemande
Professeur Gbati NAPO, Université de Lomé, Sociologie
Professeur Innocent KOUTCHADE, Université d'Abomey-Calavi, Linguistique anglaise appliquée
Professeur Bilakani TONYEME, Université de Lomé, Philosophie et Sciences de l'Education
Professeur Tchaa PALI, Université de Kara, Linguistique descriptive
Professeur Ayaovi Xolali MOUMOUNI-AGBOKE, Université de Lomé, Littérature africaine
Monsieur Komi KPATCHA, Maître de Conférences, Université de Kara, Littérature
Monsieur Damlègue LARE, Maître de Conférences, Université de Lomé, Littérature de l'Afrique anglophone
Monsieur Paméssou WALLA, Maître de Conférences, Université de Lomé, Littérature anglaise
Monsieur Weinpanga A. ANDOU, Maître de Conférences, Université de Lomé, Etudes hispaniques
Monsieur Hodabalou ANATE, Maître de Conférences, Université de Lomé, Littérature de l'Afrique anglophone,
Monsieur Essobiyou SIRO, Maître de Conférences, Université de Lomé, Littérature de l'Afrique anglophone,
Monsieur Komi BAFANA, Maître de Conférences, Université de Lomé, Littérature anglaise.

Secrétariat

Dr Atsou MENSAH (MA), Dr Akponi TARNO (A), Dr Eyanawa TCHEKI.

Infographie & Montage

Dr Aminou Idjadi KOUROUPARA

Contacts : (+228) 90284891/91643242/92411793

Email : larellicca2017@gmail.com

© LaReLLiCCA, 25 août 2024

ISSN : 2709-5487

Tous droits réservés

Editorial

La *Revue Internationale de Langue, Littérature, Culture et Civilisation* (RILLiCC) est une revue à comité de lecture en phase d'indexation recommandée par le Conseil Africain et Malgache pour l'Enseignement Supérieur (CAMES). Elle est la revue du Laboratoire de Recherche en Langues, Littérature, Culture et Civilisation Anglophones (LaReLLiCCA) dont elle publie les résultats des recherches en lien avec la recherche et la pédagogie sur des orientations innovantes et stimulantes à la vie et vision améliorées de l'académie et de la société. La revue accepte les textes qui cadrent avec des enjeux épistémologiques et des problématiques actuels pour être au rendez-vous de la contribution à la résolution des problèmes contemporains.

RILLiCC met en éveil son lectorat par rapport aux défis académiques et sociaux qui se posent en Afrique et dans le monde en matière de science littéraire et des crises éthiques. Il est établi que les difficultés du vivre-ensemble sont fondées sur le radicalisme et l'extrémisme violents. En effet, ces crises et manifestations ne sont que des effets des causes cachées dans l'imaginaire qu'il faut (re)modeler au grand bonheur collectif. Comme il convient de le noter ici, un grand défi se pose aux chercheurs qui se doivent aujourd'hui d'être conscients que la science littéraire n'est pas rétribuée à sa juste valeur quand elle se voit habillée sous leurs yeux du mythe d'Albatros ou d'un cymbale sonore. L'idée qui se cache malheureusement derrière cette mythologie est que la littérature ne semble pas contribuer efficacement à la résolution des problèmes de société comme les sciences exactes. Dire que la recherche a une valeur est une chose, le prouver en est une autre. La *Revue Internationale de Langue, Littérature, Culture et Civilisation* à travers les activités du LaReLLiCCA entend faire bénéficier à son lectorat et à sa société cible, les retombées d'une recherche appliquée.

Le comité spécialisé « Lettres et Sciences Humaines » du Conseil Africain et Malgache pour l'Enseignement Supérieur (CAMES) recommande l'utilisation harmonisée des styles de rédaction et la présente revue s'inscrit dans cette logique directrice en adoptant le style APA.

L'orientation éditoriale de cette revue inscrit les résultats pragmatiques et novateurs des recherches sur fond social de médiation, d'inclusion et de réciprocité qui permettent de maîtriser les racines du mal et réaliser les objectifs du développement durable déclencheurs de paix partagée.

Lomé, le 20 octobre 2020.

Le directeur de publication,

Professeur Ataféï PEWISSI,

Directeur du Laboratoire de Recherche en Langues, Littérature, Culture et Civilisation Anglophones (LaReLLiCCA), Faculté des Lettres, Langues et Arts, Université de Lomé.
Tél : (+228) 90284891, e-mail : sapewissi@yahoo.com

Ligne éditoriale

Volume : La taille du manuscrit est comprise entre 4500 et 6000 mots.
Format: papier A4, Police: Times New Roman, Taille: 11,5, Interligne 1,15.

Ordre logique du texte

Un article doit être un tout cohérent. Les différents éléments de la structure doivent faire un tout cohérent avec le titre. Ainsi, tout texte soumis pour publication doit comporter:

- ***un titre en caractère d'imprimerie*** ; il doit être expressif et d'actualité, et ne doit pas excéder 24 mots ;
- ***un résumé en anglais-français, anglais-allemand, ou anglais-espagnol*** selon la langue utilisée pour rédiger l'article. Se limiter exclusivement à objectif/problématique, cadre théorique et méthodologique, et résultats. Aucun de ces résumés ne devra dépasser 150 mots ;
- ***des mots clés en français, en anglais, en allemand et en espagnol*** : entre 5 et 7 mots clés ;
- ***une introduction*** (un aperçu historique sur le sujet ou revue de la littérature en bref, une problématique, un cadre théorique et méthodologique, et une structure du travail) en 600 mots au maximum ;
- ***un développement dont les différents axes sont titrés***. Il n'est autorisé que trois niveaux de titres. Pour le titrage, il est vivement recommandé d'utiliser les chiffres arabes ; les titres alphabétiques et alphanumériques ne sont pas acceptés ;
- ***une conclusion*** (rappel de la problématique, résumé très bref du travail réalisé, résultats obtenus, implémentation) en 400 mots au maximum ;
- ***liste des références*** : par ordre alphabétique des noms de familles des auteurs cités.

Références

Il n'est fait mention dans la liste de références que des sources effectivement utilisées (citées, paraphrasées, résumées) dans le texte de l'auteur. Pour leur présentation, les normes du CAMES (NORCAMES) ou références intégrées sont exigées de tous les auteurs qui veulent faire publier leur texte dans la revue. Il est fait exigence aux auteurs de n'utiliser que la seule norme dans leur texte. Pour en savoir plus, consultez

ces normes sur Internet.

Présentation des notes référencées

Le comité de rédaction exige les NORMCAMES (Initial du/des prénom(s) de l'auteur suivi du Nom de l'auteur, année, page). L'utilisation des notes de bas de pages n'intervient qu'à des fins d'explication complémentaire. La présentation des références en style métissé est formellement interdite.

La gestion des citations :

Longues citations : Les citations de plus de quarante (40) mots sont considérées comme longues ; elles doivent être mises en retrait dans le texte en interligne simple.

Les citations courtes : les citations d'un (1) à quarante (40) mots sont considérées comme courtes ; elles sont mises entre guillemets et intégrées au texte de l'auteur.

Résumé :

- ✓ Pour A. Pewissi (2017), le Womanisme transcende les cloisons du genre.
- ✓ M. A. Ourso (2013, p. 12) trouve les voyelles qui débordent le cadre circonscrit comme des voyelles récalcitrantes.

Résumé ou paraphrase :

- ✓ M. A. Ourso (2013, p. 12) trouve les voyelles qui débordent le cadre circonscrit comme des voyelles récalcitrantes.

Exemple de référence

Pour un livre

COLLIN Hodgson Peter, 1988, *Dictionary of Government and Politics*, UK, Peter Collin Publishing.

Pour un article tiré d'un ouvrage collectif

GILL Women, 1998/1990, "Writing and Language: Making the Silence Speak," In Sheila Ruth, *Issues in Feminism: An Introduction to Women's Studies*, London, Mayfield Publishing Company, Fourth Edition, pp. 151-176.

Utilisation de Ibid., op. cit, sic entre autres

Ibidem (Ibid.) intervient à partir de la deuxième note d'une référence

source citée. Ibid. est suivi du numéro de page si elle est différente de référence mère dont elle est consécutive. Exemple : *ibid.*, ou *ibidem*, p. x.
Op. cit. signifie ‘la source pré-citée’. Il est utilisé quand, au lieu de deux références consécutives, une ou plusieurs sources sont intercalées. En ce moment, la deuxième des références consécutives exige l’usage de *op. cit.* suivi de la page si cette dernière diffère de la précédente.

Typographie

-La *Revue Internationale de Langue, Littérature, Culture et Civilisation* interdit tout soulignement et toute mise en gras des caractères ou des portions de textes.

-Les auteurs doivent respecter la typographie choisie concernant la ponctuation, les abréviations...

Tableaux, schémas et illustrations

Pour les textes contenant les tableaux, il est demandé aux auteurs de les numérotter en chiffres romains selon l’ordre de leur apparition dans le texte. Chaque tableau devra comporter un titre précis et une source propre. Par contre, les schémas et illustrations devront être numérotés en chiffres arabes et dans l’ordre d’apparition dans le texte.

La largeur des tableaux intégrés au travail doit être 10 cm maximum, format A4, orientation portrait.

Instruction et acceptation d’article

Les dates de réception et d’acceptation et de publication des articles sont marquées, au niveau de chaque article. Deux (02) à trois (03) instructions sont obligatoires pour plus d’assurance de qualité.

Sommaire

Littérature -----	1
<i>Monoko-zohi</i> de Diégou Bailly : une écriture du brassage culturel et de la cohésion sociale	
François Tchoman ASSEKA	3
Le contraste de l'humanitaire dans le théâtre de Tiago Rodrigues	
Amadou COULIBALY	19
La guerre comme négation du vivre-ensemble chez les primates dans <i>Brazzaville Beach</i> (1990) de William Boyd	
Astou Fall DIOP & Aladji Mamadou SANE & El Hadji Cheikh KANDJI	39
Post-Brexit Immigration and the British Welfare State Political Discourse in Douglass Board's <i>Time of Lies</i>	
Ténéna Mamadou SILUE	65
The Representation of Violence in N'gugi wa Thiong'o's <i>Weep Not, Child</i> and <i>A Grain of Wheat</i>	
Komi Séna KPEDZROKU.....	85
Social Justice as a Key Tenet of Security and Sustainable Peace: An Analysis of Martin Luther King Jr.'s Speeches	
Mamadou DIAMOUTÉNÉ.....	103
Women's Self-Definition and Societal Hardships in <i>The Color Purple</i> by Alice Walker	
Cyriaque SOSSOU & Anne Nathalie Jouvencia Agossi AGUESSY & Casimir Comlan SOEDE.....	115
A Peaceful and Secured Environment in a Shifting and Multiracial World: A Literary Reflection on Rebecca Walker's <i>Black, White and Jewish</i> (2001)	
Seydou CISSÉ	135
American Female Leaders in Peacemaking: A Study of Jeannette Rankin, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and Hillary Clinton	
Agath KOUNNOU	151
Linguistique -----	173
Quels anthroponymes pour la culture de la paix ?	
Assolissim HALOUBIYOU.....	175
Plaisanterie à caractère phonique et lexical entre les parlers nawda	
Djahéma GAWA	191
The Semantic Landscape of "Peace": Exploring Collocational Patterns and Their Prosodic Implications in Corpora	

Albert Omolegbé KOUKPOSSI & Blandine Opêoluwa AGBAKA & Innocent Sourou KOUTCHADE.....	205
Teaching English for Sustainable Peace: Integrating Language and Security Strategies in ECOWAS Education System	
Coffi Martinien ZOUNHIN TOBOULA	219
Sociologie et droit -----	239
Dispositifs de lutte contre la cybercriminalité dans l'espace ouest africain : réflexions pour une lutte beaucoup plus efficace	
Donatien SOKOU.....	241
Les fêtes <i>N'do-biti</i> chez les Akaselem, <i>Assaku</i> et <i>Itchombi</i> chez les Biyobè : des stratégies de la cohésion sociale dans les régions centrale et de la Kara du Togo	
Houéfa Ablavi HOUEDANOU-AKOTCHOLO & Nourou TCHALLA & Atiyihwè AWESSO.....	259
Le Conseil de Sécurité de l'ONU face aux défis sécuritaires de l'Afrique	
Assataclouli BAKOUSSAM.....	275

LITTERATURE

Post-Brexit Immigration and the British Welfare State Political Discourse in Douglass Board's *Time of Lies*

Ténéna Mamadou SILUE

Université Alassane Ouattara, Bouaké (Côte d'Ivoire)

silue_tenena@yahoo.com

Reçu le : 07/01/2024 Accepté le : 29/04/2024 Publié le : 25/08/2024

Abstract

In post-Brexit Britain, immigration is linked to the ideas of threat, insecurity, socio-economic and political hardships. Many British political elites regard the control of British borders as a means of ensuring the country's socio-economic welfare. The idea of a prosperous and safe Britain is constantly imagined without the presence of migrant populations. The study builds on Karl Marx and Engel's (1957) understanding of the concept of ideology that claims that the ruling class uses ideology to create a false consciousness among the working class, this study suggests an analysis of Douglass Board's *Time of Lies*. Specifically, the study first argues that post-Brexit hegemonic ruling class deploys a false discourse on immigration to represent migrants as an obstacle to the welfare of Great Britain. Then, the study concludes that Brexit referendum revives the Thatcherite's ideological fixation as a source of threats and insecurity.

Key words: Brexit, British, Ideology, immigration, security, Thatcherism, welfare state.

Résumé

Dans la Grande-Bretagne post-Brexit, l'immigration est liée aux idées de menace, d'insécurité, de difficultés socio-économiques et politiques. De nombreuses élites politiques britanniques considèrent le contrôle des frontières britanniques comme un moyen d'assurer le bien-être socio-économique du pays. L'idée d'une Grande-Bretagne prospère et sûre est constamment imaginée sans la présence de populations migrantes. L'étude s'appuie sur la compréhension du concept d'idéologie de Karl Marx et d'Engel (1957), selon laquelle la classe dirigeante utilise l'idéologie pour créer une fausse conscience au sein de la classe ouvrière. L'étude soutient d'abord que la classe dirigeante hégémonique post-Brexit déploie un faux discours sur l'immigration pour représenter les migrants comme un obstacle au bien-être de la Grande-Bretagne. Ensuite, l'étude conclut que le référendum sur le Brexit ravive la fixation

idéologique thatchérienne des migrants comme source de menaces et d'insécurité.

Mots clés: Brexit, britannique, idéologie, immigration, sécurité, thatchérisme, État-providence.

Introduction

The issue of immigration has constantly been politicised since the Brexit referendum vote. Many British politicians have championed the discourse of border control as a means to achieve a status of a welfare society. How do we get a welfare state condition in a Britain struggling with illegal immigration? This question of a welfare society still worries post-Brexit Britain given that politicians often see immigration as the root cause of social precarity and insecurity.

In this wise, the plethora of academic works published in this post-Brexit era paid much attention to immigration during the Brexit vote. In an article entitled “An analysis of the anti-immigration discourse during the official 2016 Brexit referendum campaign”, Hélène Grinan-Moutinho, shows the way in which Brexiters have shaped the discourse on European immigration to influence people’s choice in vote. In this work Hélène furnishes convincing evidence of the way in which Brexiters’ anti-immigration discourse had indeed a significant role in shaping beliefs among the public and, hence, in voters’ support for Brexit vote.

Likewise, in “Political discourse on immigration in the UK and the USA from the 1950s to the 1980s” S. Malby discusses the correlation between the British political parties’ policy and the anti-immigration movement in the United Kingdom from 1970s to 1980s. Malby’s claim is that the 1980s British political discourses favour the sentiment of anti-immigration. Above all, in his article: “The Representation of BAME Communities in the Brexit resistance”, M. P. Aouanes, sees Black and minorities ethnic communities as representing not only the voice of remainders in the Brexit vote, but also the cultural diversity of a multicultural Britain. In a similar stance, O. Schmidtke in “Winning Back Control’: Migration, Borders and Visions of Political Community”,

examines the governance of migration and borders as a contested political issue in Britain.

If the aforementioned works predicate the exclusive anti-immigration trends during the Brexit referendum vote, D. Board's *Time of Lies* emphasises its deceptive, manipulative political dimension after Brexit vote. D. Board's rendition of post-Brexit immigration relates the ideological stratagem deployed by British politicians to represent migrants as a source of insecurity and social welfare impasse for the United Kingdom.

Time of Lies, is a story of Boris Gaunt (BG), the British prime minister promises to provide a welfare living condition to his people after Brexit. His brother, Bob Zack and Patrick, a civil servant at defence secretary, comes to see that BG's policies are focused on the setting up of drone technology to halt the surge of continental immigration from Europe and Africa. Also, Kathy, a civil servant at defence secretary, decries BG's vigilant police forces as they are monitoring the movement of immigrant in the fictional society.

This study focuses on the post-Brexit British politicians' ideological construction of immigration as a source of insecurity and socio-political unhappiness in D. Board's *Time of Lies*. In this regard, the study seeks to demonstrate the way politicians have ideologically tied Britain's socio-political welfare to immigration. The study builds on K. Marx and F. Engel's (1957) understanding of the concept of ideology that claims that the ruling class uses ideology to create a false consciousness among the working class, this research suggests an analysis of D. Board's *Time of Lies*. Specifically, the research first argues that post-Brexit hegemonic ruling class deploys a false discourse on immigration to represent migrants as obstacles to a British state welfare. Then, the research concludes that Brexit referendum revives the Thatcherite's ideological fixation of immigration as a source of threats and insecurity.

1. Hegemonic Discourse on Immigration

In the *German Ideology* (1996, p. 23) K. Marx argues that "in all ideology men and their circumstances appear upside down as in a camera

obscura". In this statement K. Marx views ideology as rooted in contradictory relations, specifically operating to distort and thus justify the exclusion and marginalisation of a particular group in the society. In this sense, this section examines the way in which the British politicians deploy ideological inversion, concealment and manipulation in *Time of Lies* to make immigration unmatchable with a welfare state philosophy in a post-Brexit society.

The hegemonic discourse on immigration is entrenched in the ideology of neoliberalism. As an ideology of free trade movement, neoliberalism encompasses an inherent distortion, simply because its proponents stand against the immigrants' rights to movements. And when the British politicians resort to border militarisation with a view of offering a welfare state, they divest from the neoliberal principle of immigrants' right to stay, hence ideological distortion. The hegemonic discourse framework is compatible with the neoliberal socio-economic agenda, in that it divests from the single market principal that enables immigrants to stay. Actually, this distortion of neoliberalism comfortably aligns with politicians' discourse that frames immigrants as hurting native workers, and justifies building material and legal walls.

In *Time of Lies*, immigration is first represented as a socio-political burden through a discourse of ideological inversion. Political elites try to depict immigration as hampering their welfare state political principle. In fact, elites defend an anti-immigration policy as a way to improve the citizens' social condition. In D. Board's fiction, the narrator informs the reader about this political disinformation on immigration through the political promise made by Bob Grant or BG, the British prime minister as follows:

Tonight-you'll see a new force for Britain. Experience a new energy for Britain. Admire a new ambition for Britain. Our country great once more. Let me tell you how. For forty minutes with no autocue, Bob Grant ranged over, the economy, the constitution, defence, foreign policy, health, education and welfare. He served up a substantial first course – a new class of citizenship for Britons born in this country to British-born

parents or parents serving in the armed services and police. For them priority (2017, p. 98).

This quotation begins with a promise of an effective socialist program for British citizen through phrases such as “Experience a new energy for Britain. Admire a new ambition for Britain” (2017, p. 98). The welfare social discourse of this statement is destined to specific Britons as the narrator says: “British-born parents (...) for them priority” (2017, p. 98). In the selection of this category British born parents, one may note an ideological principle that consists in excluding immigrants. By prioritising native Britons for his social program, Bob Grant is strategically showing that emigrants’ presence hampers the development of individual’s social condition.

The emigrants’ contribution to the British welfare economy is eschewed through ideological inversion. As Bob chooses a British born family as the focus of his policy, there is an ideological inversion that consists in presenting immigrants as insignificants to Britain’s interest. On this account, K. Marx (1976, p. 82) believes that ideologies are undoubtedly social, and often associated with group interests, conflicts or struggle. By prioritising the native British in his social program, Bob is indirectly exposing his class conflicts with immigrants’ population as he targets ethnic population in these terms:

Britain’s Great! ‘Course we are. You want to know why? You need to be told? Then fuck off mate. Get out of my country. We don’t want you. I don’t give a fuck if you were born here. (...). Britain’s great if you cut off their bollocks and shoved them where the sun don’t shine. I say fuck off to the lot of them. This country’s for people who know it (D. Board, 2017, p. 26).

In these lines, the Prime Minister Bob directly associates Britain’s prosperity with the eviction of immigrants, or nonwhite British born citizens. Through his political slogan “Britain’s Great!” (2017, p. 26), that is to restore Britain’s welfare security, Bob finds it necessary to expel immigrants from Britain as he puts it “get out of my country” (2017, p. 26). Indeed the ideological nexus that is established between Bob’s political manifesto “Britain’s Great” and the immigrants is that of

distortion or inversion which Marx refers to us as “false consciousness”. In fact, this ruling class’ representation of migrants as a threat to Britain’s greatness is a false discourse that consists in making the working population believes the elites’ categorization of ethnic population.

And conversely, in *Time of Lies* ideological distortion or inversion is part of the plot structure and somehow exhibits or even controls the relationships of power and dominance between groups (ruling elites and immigrant population). In fact, the Prime Minister Bob’s ideological approach to nonwhite population characterises the power dimension of the hegemonic discourse in the shaping of a false discourse on its neoliberal precepts. The immigrants’ marginalisation parallels with the breaching of the neoliberal commitment in post-Brexit Britain. This is what the narrator is referring to when he says: “We’ve ripped up the single market rule book already and no-one’s done anything about it. Result! But everyone knows a showdown is coming (..) after the tory Brexit fiasco”(2017, p. 56). Here, it emerges that the scratching of the single market book is akin to a violation of the neoliberal principle of the individual’s freedom to move. And the narrator depicts this lack of support for free market as inherent to the hegemonic forthcoming discourse on immigration which he refers to as a “showdown” (2017, p. 56). From this stand point, Bob’s discourse combined then, this discourse of immigration and hegemonic power manipulative skills, as it divests from neoliberalism to account for the marginalisation of minorities in British society.

Indeed, the Prime Minister Bob’s discourses are ideologically based in terms of political invention. Languages such as “get out of my country, fuck off them” (2017: 26) are used by British ruling elites to persuasively convey ideologies or what Marx terms as “camera obscura” (1976, p. 23) about immigration to British born citizen. In D. Board’s fiction, ideological inversion is visible through the emigrants’ misrepresentations by the elite group. This means that emigrants’ ideological distortion allows the ruling elite to organise the multitude of social beliefs about immigration, for citizens, and to act accordingly. In that epistemological sense, Bob’s word: “This country’s for people who know it” (2017, p. 26)

is a specific argument for, and explanations of, specific political arrangements, to influence the British people's understanding of immigration and Britain's prosperity.

Bob's categorising language: "This country's for people who know it" (2017, p. 26) is an ideological invention designed to shape citizens' cognitive sense against immigrants' presence in Britain. Arguing about this cognitive function of political ideology, Stuart Hall says:

By ideology I mean the mental frameworks — the languages, the concepts, categories, imagery of thought, and the systems of representation — which different classes and social groups deploy in order to make sense of, figure out and render intelligible the way society works (S. Hall, 1996, p. 26).

From S. Hall's definition, we may observe that language or words embody ideological representation of our society and allow individual to make sense of social realities. Language or words are powerful tools that help the hegemonic elite to convey its representation of individual group in society. On this account, from Alan, a retired banker's perspective, *Time of Lies* relates the hegemonic elite's ideology of insecurity to us. In a discussion about the British government policies on emigrants' access to housing, Alan encapsulates the elites' representation of immigration in the following terms:

BG said something two months ago about taking over empty houses, but it wasn't clear they meant it. Alan's confusion worsened. Are they on the left or on the right? They want to slash benefits but take over empty homes. They want to spend more on defence (...) they're against immigration (..) for Black people (D. Board, 2017, p. 50).

Here, the connection between security and immigration is raised through Alan's statements. We learn that the ruling elites are promoting anti-immigration policies, as they squash migrants' houses and social benefit. In Alan's statements "they want to spend more on defence (...) they're against immigration for Black people" (D. Board, 2017, p. 50), we denote the ideology of insecurity that is working in Britain. The pronoun "They"

is indicative of British government and the Prime Minister BG. In Alan's opinion, these political elites are considering to halt immigration on account of insecurity. That is to say immigrants represent a threat for Britons' security.

In BG's explanation or definition of the British government housing policies, there is an explicit need to secure the country through sentences such as: "They want to spend more on defence" (D. Board, 2017, p. 50). This necessity to provide the armed forces with more financial means is akin to protect Britain against the threat of insecurity coming from immigrants. As Bob Grant wants to find better homes for Britons through the reinforcement of security forces, there is an implicit appeal to devise a new ideological policy of immigration. In Alan's words, British government's immigration policy is ideologically constructed on the marginalisation of migrants.

In other words, Alan's statement: "They're against immigration for Black people" (D. Board, 2017, p. 50) may indicate that ideologies are not merely defined in cognitive terms, but also in terms of social groups, group relations, institutions and at the macro-level. Alan's declaration: "they're against immigration" (2017, p. 50) corroborates this institutional constructed representation of immigrants as a threat to society. By opposing immigration, BG's government strategically unveils its evil side to British society. In D. Board's fiction immigration is politically constructed as fomenting insecurity. This is why the narrative brings us to sympathise with the BG's government's border control repressive ideological forces known as the vigilance in the following lines:

The finale-strong borders controlled immigration, safe streets, (...) the vigilance guard our greatness and protects our hopes, barked Bob, adopting a fierce tone. 'That greatness and those hopes don't belong to BG but to the whole country!' the crowd roared back the Britain's great refrain. 'The role of the vigilance is stepping up. It will take time to build up our armed forces as we have promised. But I pledge that from tonight the vigilance will be there in support, a powerful extra force, at the service of the whole country. The vigilance has been training, and is ready, for this larger role (D. Board, 2017, p. 99).

Here, the language: “Strong borders controlled immigration, safe streets, the vigilance guard our greatness” (D. Board, 2017, p. 99) is constitutive of the hegemonic group’s reality on immigration to Britain. The quotation is not simply a thought on border controlled police force: “the vigilance” (2017, p. 99), but is also an expression of the idea of insecurity. In this sense the “vigilance” (2017, p. 99) stands as Bob’s repressive ideological force which aims is to safeguard Britons against the threat from immigrants. The representation of the vigilance is imbued with ideological inversion or concealment. In fact by presenting this police force as the hope of Britain, the narrator encapsulates immigrants as the source of Britain’s socio-economic disasters. It is an ideological constructs aiming at legitimising the security forces’ use of coercive measures to track down immigrants.

Time of Lies is widely narrated and centered on the figure of the Prime Minister Bob Grant or BG. The reader is very often meant to share Bob and his government’s discourse on the security forces and immigration. In fact, Bob idealises the role of the vigilance force in its handling of immigration. This too much idealisation of the security force in a sentence such as: “the vigilance guard our greatness and protects our hopes, barked Bob, adopting a fierce tone” (2017, p. 99) echoes both the social and mental strategies put in place to bring the collective people join the armed forces in the fight against immigration. Bob is the character in the book who is allowed to deliver an official account on the armed forces’ role in immigration issue. We, the readers, may suspect that what Bob has to report about the repressive ideological forces: “the vigilance” (2017, p. 99) is not always without a touch of self-interest or the occasional hint of malice on immigrants’ representation. Indeed, the novel itself does seem to recognise this ruling class’s dominant idea on immigration as false idea. This is illustrated through the narrative voice of the Prime Minister’s brother, Bob Zack, as he decries his brother’s policies in these terms:

Psychologists warned us that Bob is a dangerously unpredictable man. I think you know that better than any of us. He is part of mindless politics which has weakened every democracy in the world. That mindless is dangerous. Ask

him how the government will avert any of the impending disasters? I have. Bob grins and says, 'Britain's great. End of' Zack winced (2017, p. 174).

Along this quotation, Zack refers to Bob's policy on immigration as: "mindless politics which has weakened democracy" (2017, p. 174). The term "mindless politics" stands for Bob's ideology on immigration that does not reflect the socio-economic interest of the minorities' group. In this sense the phrase "mindless politics" is akin to Marx's notion of "false consciousness" which usually refers to group ideologies that do not reflect the 'objective' socio-economic interests of a group. On this account Zack's statement: "He is part of mindless politics" (2017, p. 174), may suggest that the British government's immigration policy or ideology is a socio-political representation of Bob's basic evaluative and self-serving beliefs of the immigrants' role in Britain. This is reminiscent of what Karl Marx and Engel echo about ideologies as self-serving principles involved in the explanation of the social and economic worlds in particular. Bob's mindless politics vis-à-vis immigrants amount to a 'false' or misguided ideology. And this false consciousness is the result of a mixture of ignorance, indifference, manipulation or compliance with mass media as we read British media representation of immigrants in these terms: "A copy of the Daily Mail lying on the next seat says Britain will be swamped after European chiefs bring in an extra 20 million migrants from Asia and Africa (...). Demi, I feel your pain (...) there are ... problems" (2017, p. 80). What is at stake here is that the British newspapers: "the Daily Mail" is shaping consciousness about immigrant as the source of future insecurity. Through the sentence "Britain will be swamped (...) in an extra 20 million migrants (...) there are problems" (2017, p. 80), the media embarks upon Bob's consciousness that is the belief that immigration has to be halted to secure Britain's socio-economic prosperity. Indeed, the Daily Mail's use of false consciousness to represent immigration in post-Brexit Britain denotes ignorance of the 'real' social facts, for instance about the interests of Bob's government social arrangements, policies or practices.

Such media ignorance may result from widespread indifference and apathy, which may again result from oppression or partial satisfaction with the status quo on immigration. Or the Daily Mail may be inculcated through biased information or by other forms of ideological manipulation by dominant groups. In that sense the newspaper is compelled to comply with the false consciousness of the dominated Bob's government group. In fact, it implies the acceptance of the hegemonic ideology, for instance as those beliefs that misrepresent immigrants as the allegedly natural source of Britain's insecurity and economic hardships. Actually, this ideological representation of immigration may be drawn back from past historical discourse of Thatcherism, since features of Thatcherite immigration policies permeate D. Board's novel.

2. Thatcherism and Post-Brexit Anti-Immigration Policies

As a neoliberal ideology, Thatcherism beheld individual British self-entrepreneurship as a condition to reach a welfare society (P. Jenkins, 1988, p. 12). To achieve this goal of a neoliberal welfare society, Thatcher restricted the entry to Britain. The entrance of the ethnic community was halted with a view of protecting white British socioeconomic safety. This protection of citizens' financial and social security was conducted through a tough anti-immigration border control policy. Thatcher's anti-immigration policy has been re-energised in post-Brexit fiction, for several novelists have drawn on fictitious events relating some of Thatcher's immigration paradigms. In this section, building on Marx's notion of ideology as a socioeconomic construct of a dominant group philosophy, we seek to demonstrate the ways in which the ruling hegemonic class anti-immigration stand reflects a Thatcherite palimpsest discourse on immigration in *Time of Lies*

During the 1980s, immigration had returned to the fore in Thatcher's policies. She asked the British security forces to halt ethnic minorities' immigration. This restriction of immigration was explicitly mentioned by the prime minister during the Conservative party meeting as follows:

The rights of all British citizens legally settled here are equal before the law whatever their race, colour or creed. And their opportunities ought to be equal too. The ethnic minorities have

already made a valuable contribution to the life of our nation. But firm immigration control for the future is essential if we are to achieve good community relations. It will end persistent fears about levels of immigration and will remove from those settled, and in many cases born here, the label of ‘immigrant (Thatcher, February 12, 1978).

Actually, the closing sentences of this quotation emphasise immigration restriction as a new Thatcherite political doctrine. The prime minister correlates immigration control with the British people’s social security concern. This Thatcherite articulation of immigration with socioeconomic issue is reworked in D. Board’s Post-Brexit fiction.

What connects *Time of Lies* to the Thatcherite immigration issues is its contextual and referential emphasis on the reality of Britons’ life and political intrigues in the 1980s. Admittedly, *Time of Lies* is written against the Brexit era and its diegetic time of reference insists on Thatcherite ideological muddle which the reader is encouraged to see through the novel’s protagonist prime minister, Bob Grant or BG’s account of the post-Brexit society. We are alerted to it early on, as we come to realise that Bob Grant or BG hardly tolerates the entry of the ethnic population in Britain. His home secretary, Zaf asks the British Border Force to stop migrants and refugees’ entry in these terms:

Zaf hand over to the police chief. About 5 am our time the first rumours begin to circulate on social media; at 5.45am the 24/7 government news centre calls Kent police, who know nothing. The moment the lights go on for the police or the UK Border Force is 8.30am when half the Kent Red Cross turn out with blankets, tea and biscuits. Someone called them to come out for a train smash. (...) we’re embarrassing enough on our own (...) hundred of refuges escape (the vigilance are after them) (2017, p. 229).

Indeed, the sentence: “we’re embarrassing enough...the vigilance are after them” (2017, p. 229) encapsulates post-Brexit leader’s distress with border security issue. This leadership’s discontentment over cross-border migrants is emblematic of Thatcherite political rhetoric: “But firm immigration control for the future is essential” (February 12, 1978). This

Thatcherite political rhetoric on immigration is echoed in the narrative as Zaf puts it: “the second option was to tell the British public that the end (...) had been announced by Thatcher as early 1980. To fail to live up to her legacy in this respect would have been political suicide” (2017, p. 281).

Here, Zaf’s monograph traces the influences of Thatcher on post-Brexit immigration policy. It shows a correspondence between the representation of immigration under Thatcher and the representation of immigrants under Bob Grant, the post-Brexit fictional prime minister. And through the declarative statement “To fail to live up her legacy would have been political suicide” (2017p. p. 281), *Time of Lies* encourages us to assert that the Brexit novel can perform a Thatcherite ideological function. While imagining the Thatcherite security condition of the nation, the novel allows Bob Grant’s government to present the “vigilance force” (2017, p. 229) as the chief protector of Britain’s financial and social security.

By connecting the vigilance force’s action with Thatcher’s legacy on immigration, Bob Grant’s government implicitly indicates the compliance of their ruling doctrine with Thatcherism as a political ideology. And as Bob government calls on this vigilance force to vigilate immigration, there is an ideological attempt that is to keep Britain white and stand against equitable inclusion of immigrants in the mainstream British society. In this sense, the vigilance force is an expression of Thatcherism relations with immigration. In Marx and Engels’ sense, Bob’s vigilance force stands as the metaphor of “camera obscura”. Marx and Engel summarise the metaphor of camera obscura as an attempt of ideologists to distort or manipulate any social reality. On this account when Bob Grant’s Home secretary says: “we’re embarrassing enough...the vigilance are after them” (2017, p. 229), it veils the manifestation of a social and financial discourse of anger with coloured people at British border. This social and financial discourse of anger is observable in the Prime Minister Bob’s speech as he praises the vigilance in the following terms:

Fellow Britons:

On Saturday the European Commission and the Government of France treated six thousand immigrants as pawns in a game. The game's point was to make fun of Britain. The first thing for me to say is that all those individuals, whether they are migrants or refugees, are safely in our care. A big thank you to the vigilance, the police and all the great people of Kent, for rising to that challenge (...) the immigrants (2017: 247-248).

Along these lines the Thatcherite fixation of immigrants as source of financial and social instability is established through Bob's thanksgiving discourse to the vigilance. Marx and Engel's "camera obscura" logic is perceptible in Bob's praise to the police force. As Bob says "thank you to the vigilance... for rising to that challenge the immigrants" (2017, p. 248), we may note that the British government is struggling with financial and social challenges through preventive militarization of its borders.

Indeed, Bob's militarisation of border exposes a fear of socioeconomic conflict. This border militarisation is an ideological feature of Thatcherism, given that the Thatcherite elites have always seen a risk of conflict and security dilemma with immigration. In fact, these elites were scared of migrants because they could upset the social order and lead to socioeconomic instability. The same palimpsest discourse is presence in Bob's words when he says "The first thing for me to say is that all those individuals, whether they are migrants or refugees, are safely in our care. A big thank you to the vigilance, the police" (2017, p. 248). If Bob deems to be in security, it is because the police force "the vigilance" has arrested the migrants. Immigration and safety are opposites, but 'the vigilance force' (technically known as Bob's police force in the narrative) secures the government, thus making migrants sound as an ideological threat. Once again we have a Thatcherite pattern of migrants as others.

In a Thatcherite society, immigration is always likely to be ludicrous. The Brexit novelist D. Board loves his political character, like Jonathan Coe in *The Closed Circle* but he also delights in making them espouse

Thatcherism. The political characters are likely to be tough and adamant with migrants, and are thus always a rich source of nonsensical political fiction. The political character, Bob is bound to halt immigration, since how can Thatcherite political elite attain a welfare state Britain with immigration?

In the Marxist tradition, the role of the vigilance force encompasses a social function which consists in vindicating the interests of the ruling class over migrants' interest. In a similar stance, Marx and other Marxists state that ideologies are distorted pictures of social reality, which seek to justify a particular type of society in the interest of a particular ruling group. In D. Board's understanding, Bob's vigilance force is distorting social reality by justifying the hegemonic rule with principles of Thatcherism as we read:

What might happen to this country's security if BG were elected (...) let me stick to what I know—defence. (...). A theatre in which we prove ourselves that Britain is always Britain, that our summer weather, that our country hasn't changed and that people, beer and walks in the country are safe (2017, p. 175).

Along these lines, there is a Thatcherite nationalistic claim project behind Bob's election as the narrator puts it "we prove ourselves that Britain is always Britain" (2017, p. 175). This statement is reminiscent of Thatcher's nationalistic discourse on immigration when she says in an interview: "this country might be swamped by immigration" (Hugo Young, 1989, p. 23). In the narrator's observation about Britain's future after Bob's election, *Time of Lies* underscores this Thatcherite nationalistic discourse on race relations. Thatcher's articulation of a strong national, or rather nationalistic, discourse — through policies of strengthening and centralizing the state results in an excessive assertion of British identity. This sense of Britishness is referred in the narrator's word: "Britain is always Britain" (2017, p. 175). This strong assertion of a nationalistic sense is imbued in a discourse of security.

Besides, *Time of Lies* delivers a Thatcherite caricature of immigration, a creed which is actually responsible for the housing policy reforms in

post-Brexit England. Bob, the prime minister and founder of the movement, "Britain Great" (2017, p. 27), is opposed to the distribution of council houses to migrants. This housing restriction to immigrants echoes Thatcherism, for Margaret Thatcher thought it was "quite wrong" for immigrants to get council houses ahead of "white citizens" (Hugo Young, 1984, p. 23). In *Time of Lies*, when D. Board recalls this Thatcherite exclusion of immigrant in housing distribution policy, he makes Angela, a media director, emphasises the necessity to provide council houses for white British in these terms:

From noon today only Britons will be able to buy homes in the dark blue zones. From next January, only Britons will be able to own homes there. In the light blue zones local authorities will be able to decide whether to copy. And clap your eyes on this we mean only Britons who have paid proper income tax for the last three years. (...) in this next twenty-four hours, this government will deliver more affordable homes for Brits in places we want to live than any government in my lifetime (D. Board, 2017, p. 123).

In these statements, the Britons' housing issue is framed as the priority for the government. The phrase: "Britons only" (D. Board, 2017, p. 123) is inferred from the ways in which the state defines and treats immigrants' housing issues. In this respect, the statement: "this government will deliver more affordable homes for Brits in places we want to live than any government in my lifetime. (Board, 2017, p. 123) has the insignia of the identity claims that the Thatcherite elites use to support their racialised housing policies. As the narrator (2017, p. 123) argues: "British homes for British citizens" (2017, p. 47), there is a claim to abide by Thatcher's idealised immigration caricature as she said in an interview that: "It is true that Conservatives are going to cut the number of new immigrants coming into this country, and cut it substantially, because racial harmony is inseparable from control of the numbers coming in (Thatcher, February, 1978)". The call for a racial harmony is a way to show that the government wants to diminish the ethnic minorities' access to social service. And Bob's decision to prioritise only Britons is a palimpsest discourse of the Thatcherite appeal for substantially harmony in race relation.

Conclusion

This study has sought to show that the post-Brexit hegemonic class has shaped an anti-immigration narrative that focuses on defending an ideology of a welfare British state. It has revealed that the control of border and the restriction of immigrants' entry into the country are supposed to pave the way for Britain's prosperity in a post Brexit society. As a result, this study has examined D. Board's *Time of Lies* to reflect on the political ideology, which is deployed to represent immigration as a threat to Britain's socio-economic safety and security. This has also resulted in the use of K. Marx and F. Engel's (1957) notion of ideology to create a fake consciousness.

As K. Marx and F. Engels view ideology as a distortion of reality by the elites, my rhetorical argument is that post-Brexit hegemonic ruling class deploys a false discourse on immigration to represent migrants as obstacles to a welfare state. In this sense, I arrive at the conclusion that Brexit referendum revives the Thatcherite ideological fixation of immigrant as source of threats and insecurity.

The study pointed out that in *Time of Lies*, the welfare state discourse derives its legitimacy from Thatcherite political values and beliefs shared by the ruling fictional Prime Minister, Bob Grant or BG. The welfare state discourse is enshrined in the institution such as the British Police Force known as the Vigilance. As a Tories Prime Minister, Bob makes the Border Force exploit a Thatcherite rhetoric, whose core message was centred on recovering control of the scale of immigration. The preservation of the security at the border was a compelling argument that the ruling Bob government put forward as condition to reach a status of welfare state in the novel.

As a matter of fact, the narrative adopts an accusing tone vis à vis immigrants of taking advantage of the British homes. The housing crisis not only permeates individual fictional narrative in *Time of Lies* but also points to immigration as the culprit for the Briton's housing shortage. Throughout, Bob's adamant support of the police force, D. Board's

fiction advocates stricter immigration controls, postulating furthermore that a reduction in immigration is needed to ease the strain on housing.

References

- AOUANES Marie Perriere, 2022, "The representation of BAME communities in the Brexit resistance," in *Observatoire de la société britannique*, London: Open Edition Journals.
- BOARD Douglass, 2017, *Times of Lies*, London: Lightning Books Ltd.
- GRINAN Moutinho Hélène, 2022, "An analysis of the anti-immigration discourse during the official 2016 Brexit referendum campaign," in *Observatoire de la société britannique*, London: Open Edition Journals.
- HALL Stuart. (1988) *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*. London: Verso.
- HALL Stuart, 1996, "The problem of ideology: Marxism without guarantees," in D. Morley and K.H. Chen (eds.) *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, Pp. 25-46.
- HUGO Young, 1989, *One of Us: A Biography of Margaret Thatcher*, London: Pan MacMillan.
- JENKINS Peter, 1988, *Mrs. Thatcher's Revolution: The Ending of the Socialist Era*, New York: Harvard University Press, First Edition.
- KARAPIN Roger, 1999, "The Politics of Immigration Control in Britain and Germany: Subnational Politicians and Social Movement", *Comparative Politics*, London: Open Edition Journals.
- MALBY Samuel, 2022, "Political discourse on immigration in the UK and the USA from the 1950s to the 1980s," in *Observatoire de la société britannique*, London: Open Edition Journals.
- MARX Karl and ENGELS Friedrich, 1974, *The German Ideology*, London: Arthur.
- MORRIS Smith (2022) "Nationality and Borders Bill: Government faces Conservative rebellion over controversial asylum and immigration reforms", *Sky News*. Online : <https://news.sky.com/story/nationality-and-borders-bill-government-faces-conservative-rebellion-over-controversial-asylum-and-immigration-reforms-12572348> retrieved on 30 August 2022.

- SCHMIDTKE Oliver, 2021, "Winning Back Control': Migration, Borders and Visions of Political Community" in *International Studies*, London: Sage Publications.
- SCHMIDTKE Olivier, 2015, "Contemporary Regionalism as a New Form of Civic Nationalism in Europe? A Critical Evaluation of the Scottish Referendum on Independence," *Public Policy and Economic Development*. London: Sage Publications.
- THATCHER Margaret, 1978, "Speech to Young Conservative Conference," online : <https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/103487>, retrieved on 30 August 2022.
- <https://www.labour-party.org.uk/manifestos/1970/1970-labour-manifesto.shtml> retrieved on 30 August 2022.