

THE ROLE OF NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS IN
THE RE-PRODUCTION OF
COMMUNITY

(VOLUME ONE)

STEPHEN FEATHERSTONE

Submitted in accordance with the
requirements for the DEGREE of PhD
The University of Leeds
Department of Sociology

July 1986

ABSTRACT

The thesis involves empirical analyses of the language of a sample of popular, daily newspaper editorials, ie. those which consider the national steel strike of late 1979/early 1980. The method used (ie. a form of very detailed qualitative content analysis) requires that readers of the analyses have access to a full copy of all the editorials. This necessitated the production of appendices; they are bound in a separate volume.

The theory that newspaper editorials re-produce community involves the specific hypothesis that attempts to re-produce (ie. maintain/legitimate/defend) the existing allegiances associated with the newspapers and their readers take quasi-scientific forms. More specifically, it is argued that an emphasis on explicit argumentative processes draws attention to the important possibility that a crucial social process-attempts to re-produce a communal stock of knowledge in the face of threats posed by events and alternative interpretations-involves, amongst other things, analyses of an empirical instance (ie. the steel strike) which provide further evidence for the validity of a preferred stock of knowledge and reasoned adjudications between competing stocks.

It is suggested that whatever the limitations of the specific focus of the research (eg. the emphasis on explicit knowledge, the suspension of questions of ideology and truth value), it is worthwhile because it facilitates a development of our theoretical/empirical knowledge of some of the crucial social processes found in media language.

The concluding chapter distinguishes different forms of the re-production of community, assesses the senses in which the re-productive processes identified are quasi-scientific, and indicates the ways in which a variety of existing theories/findings- eg. common sense, consensus, evaluative/emotive ideas and images, inferential frameworks, ideology, populist language-could be supported and/or significantly developed via a consideration of the senses in which some media language is, amongst other things, quasi-scientific.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>VOLUME ONE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	i
The Language of Newspaper Editorials	i
The Sample and Appendices	i
The Importance of Specific Analyses of Media Language	ii
Footnotes	ix
<u>CHAPTER ONE THE ROLE OF NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS IN THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY: THEORETICAL ISSUES</u>	1
Introductory Comment	1
The Re-Production of Stocks of Knowledge as the Re-Production of Community	1
Media Language: The Re-Production of Stocks of Knowledge	1
The Re-Production of Community	4
The Re-Production of Quasi-Scientific Community	12
Forms of the Re-Production of Community	17
Footnotes	23
<u>CHAPTER TWO ANALYSING THE NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS: A METHOD AND METHODOLOGY</u>	25
Introductory Comment	25
Operationalisation of Hypothesis/Approach	25
Quantitative Content Analysis	29
Linguistic Methods	30
Qualitative Content Analysis: Procedures and Strategies	34
Practical Procedures	35
Footnotes	39
<u>CHAPTER THREE THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY: THE ECONOMICS OF THE STEEL STRIKE</u>	41
Introductory Comment	41
Daily Express Opinion	41
Daily Mail Comment	53
Mirror Comment	65

<u>CHAPTER THREE (Cont...)</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
The Sun Says	74
Footnotes	90
<u>CHAPTER FOUR THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY: PICKETS AND PICKETING</u>	93
Introductory Comment	93
Daily Express Opinion	93
Daily Mail Comment	109
Mirror Comment	121
The Sun Says	124
Footnotes	138
<u>CHAPTER FIVE THE DEFENCE OF COMMUNITY</u>	141
Introductory Comment	141
Resisting Sympathy for the Steelworkers	142
Resisting Sympathy for the Steelworkers as the Defence of Community	148
The Mirror's Invitation to have Sympathy for the Steelworkers	149
The Defence of Community: The Sun and the Mirror	152
Resisting Sympathy for the Steelworkers: The Express and the Mail	155
The Defence of Community: The Appeal Court and Secondary Picketing	163
Resisting Mr. Arthur Scargill's Response to the Judgment	164
The Express, the Mail, Mr. Scargill and the Defence of Community	175
The Mirror: Resisting the Threat of People Like Arthur Scargill	177
The Sun and the Appeal Court	182
Footnotes	185
<u>CHAPTER SIX THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY: THE STAR, TRADE UNIONISM AND THE STATE OF THE STEEL STRIKE</u>	187
Introductory Comment	187
Daily Express Opinion	187
Daily Mail Comment	193
Mirror Comment	199

<u>CHAPTER SIX (Cont...)</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Star Comment	206
The Sun Says	211
Footnotes	216
<u>CHAPTER SEVEN <u>FORMS AND LEVELS OF THE</u></u>	217
<u>RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY</u>	
Introductory Comment	217
The Communities	217
Daily Express Opinion	217
Placement and Contextualisation	217
Reasoned Adjudications Between Competing Descriptions, Perspectives and Policies	218
The Production of Knowledge: The Steel Strike as a Significantly Specific and Unique Event	222
The Interaction of Forms of Re-Production: Intimidatory Picketing	223
The Quasi-Science of Trade Unionism	228
The Re-Production of Community: The Appearance of Forms of (De) Legitimation in Quasi- Scientific Argumentative Processes	234
Non-Interventionist Policy: Descriptions, Perspectives, Policies and Adjudications	236
Daily Mail Comment	236
The Sun Says	237
Trade Unionism: The Mail and the Sun	240
Daily Mail Comment	240
The Sun Says	241
Intimidatory Picketing: The Express, the Mail and the Sun	242
Daily Mail Comment: Trade Unionism, Trade Union Leaders and Private Enterprise	245
The Sun Says: Similarity and Difference	251
Forms and Levels of the Re-Production of Community	252
Basic Inferential Frameworks	252
Daily Express Opinion	252
Daily Mail Comment	253
The Sun Says	253
Forms of (De) Legitimation	254
Quasi-Scientific Processes/Forms	255
The Appearance of Forms of (De) Legitimation in Quasi-Scientific Processes/Forms	257

<u>CHAPTER SEVEN (Cont...)</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
The Re-Production of an Inferential Framework and a Consensus	259
Mirror Comment: Fairness	260
Fairness- The Re-Production of Knowledge?	261
Trade Unionism: The Express, the Mail, the Mirror and the Sun	266
Star Comment	272
Quasi-Scientific Community: A Complementary Perspective	274
The Objectivity of Media Language	274
Common Sense, Evaluative Imagery and Quasi- Explanation	274
Ideology, Common Sense and Populist Language	277
Consensus	280
Inferential Frameworks	285
Concluding Comment	289
Footnotes	293
<u>BIBLIOGRAPHY</u>	297

VOLUME TWO APPENDICES

Appendix One	1
Appendix Two	4
Appendix Three	41
Appendix Four	73
Appendix Five	85
Appendix Six	94
Appendix Seven	128

INTRODUCTION

This introduction indicates the general nature of the research; describes and justifies the specific focus of the adopted approach to the sociology of the mass media; recognises the limitations of this approach; and indicates the significance and contribution of the research. The first chapter discusses the theory that newspaper editorials re-produce community,¹ develops a specific hypothesis and relates the theory/hypothesis to some of the existing literature; chapter two deals with methodological issues; chapters three, four, five and six present empirical analyses; chapter seven presents the conclusions. The seven appendices are bound in a separate volume (see volume two).

THE LANGUAGE OF NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS

The research focuses exclusively on the language of a sample of newspaper editorials and examines a specific hypothesis. It makes no reference to phenomena like the social and economic dimensions of the newspaper industry, the relationships between these dimensions and the broader socio-economic context, the organisation and working practices of professional journalists and it does not involve any contact with the readers of newspapers. In short the research analyses texts. This is not to say that other kinds of analysis are unimportant or that there is no conceivable relationship between the content of texts and the kind of phenomena alluded to above; it is simply to state the basic focus of the research. The strengths, weaknesses and more specific nature of this focus will be dealt with shortly.

THE SAMPLE AND APPENDICES

The research analyses nineteen editorials produced by the Daily Express, fourteen by the Daily Mail, fourteen by the Daily Mirror, six by the Daily Star and eighteen by The Sun. The editorials consider the national steel strike of late 1979/early 1980. Hereinafter the newspapers are referred to as the Express, the Mail, the Mirror, the Star and the Sun. The headings of the editorial columns are also used to refer to the newspapers: DAILY EXPRESS OPINION, DAILY MAIL COMMENT, MIRROR COMMENT, STAR

COMMENT, THE SUN SAYS. Each editorial and each part of each editorial is lettered and numbered (see appendices). This system enables clear reference to the editorials and will be explained in due course.

The method used (ie. a form of qualitative content analysis) requires that readers have access to a full copy of all the editorials. This necessitated the production of appendices. Each of the chapters which present empirical analyses considers a group of editorials and the appendix (in one case appendices) contains the editorials in the order in which they are analysed; in addition there is an appendix to the chapter which deals with methodological issues and a general appendix. The former contains the editorials referred to in that chapter, the latter contains all the editorials in the sample and is arranged in chronological rather than analytical order.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SPECIFIC ANALYSES OF MEDIA LANGUAGE

Hall et al express the commonplace argument that media language is an important object in the following way

"...the media are often presenting information about events which occur outside the direct experience of the majority of society. The media thus represent the primary, and often the only, source of information about many events and topics... (They) define for the majority of the population WHAT significant events are taking place, but, also, they offer powerful interpretations of HOW to understand these events."

(1978 pp. 56-57, original emphases)

It is, of course, important to recognise and is widely recognised that media language is not the only knowledge source. In Morley's (1980a) terms audiences are involved in different discourses and media discourses interact with the other discourses which play a part in the constitution of the individuals social and discursive position. Nevertheless it is clear that media language is an important knowledge source and plays a major role in the formation and development of public opinion. The study of it is the study of aspects of the forms and contents of social knowledge, public opinion and, more generally, social consciousness.² Those who argue that textual analysis does not provide a basis for an adequate sociological account of the mass media (eg. Murdock 1980) are right in the obvious sense that it

isolates language and is not in itself an analysis of all aspects of the mass communication process. However, it is difficult to see how analyses of the social consciousness provided by a major and influential knowledge source are not sociological or sociologically significant. More specifically, this research examines in detail the specifics (ie. forms, contents and sources of power) of some of the argumentative processes found in the editorials. This focus has the inevitable limitations which result from the isolation of language but its great strength is the possibility of providing detailed information about a crucial aspect of the mass communication process, ie. the forms, contents and power of attempts to re-produce (eg. maintain, legitimate and defend) existing social, political, economic and normative allegiances.

This claim can be illustrated and developed by considering the kinds of question raised and addressed by the research: do the editorials explicitly re-produce communal stocks of knowledge and thereby attempt to maintain sections of public opinion by explicitly demonstrating that a new event can only be understood in terms of a well established, familiar stock of knowledge?; if so, does the re-productive process involve a quasi-scientific or reflexive re-demonstration of the validity of preferences and invalidity of alternatives?; what, if any, are the forms of quasi-scientific knowledge, are there, for example, reasoned adjudications between competing stocks of knowledge or descriptions of what is the case as opposed to claims about what should or ought to be the case, do descriptions, recommendations and evaluations coexist and, if so, what are the relationships between them?; do the editorials involve and appeal to, for example, emotive, evaluative and common sense arguments as well as quasi-scientific ones?; what are the relationships between the different forms of argument and the different forms of legitimation?; do the editorials criticise and condemn particular events/persons in particular ways?; what are the similarities and differences between the forms, contents and power of different popular newspaper editorials? Answers to these kinds of question are important partly because they provide detailed information about the forms, contents and power of the social knowledge found in and invited by some media

language, ie. what is said, how it is said and how what is said is made plausible/compelling; and partly because the research raises a neglected issue- the possible quasi-scientific nature of re-productions of communal knowledge- and thereby aims to significantly develop our understanding of attempts to re-produce existing communal allegiances and our theoretical understanding of the specifics of media language. More specifically, it will be argued that a variety of existing concerns- eg. agendas, common sense, consensus, direct perception, evaluative/emotive ideas, images and identifications, inferential frameworks, ideology, populist language, real social relations-³ could be developed via a consideration of the possibility that a crucial social process, the re-production of existing allegiances and denial of legitimacy ~~to~~ alternatives, does not just involve, for example, evaluative, misleading or commonsensical accounts but rather analyses of an empirical instance which explicitly provide further evidence for the validity of previously validated knowledge and a reasoned adjudication between competing, well confirmed communal or shared stocks of knowledge. It may, of course, be the case that different forms of re-production coexist and interact or that re-productions of the kind alluded to are not a prevalent feature of the editorials. These are empirical questions. The immediate point is that whatever the limitations of the specific focus of the research it is worthwhile because it provides detailed analyses of the existence and nature of an important social process, and facilitates a development of our knowledge of the details of the forms, contents and power of the social processes found in media language. Moreover, information about these details is indispensable to more general theorising. To give a simple example: any concern with the general ideological role of the mass media or the ideological nature of social consciousness in general could be developed via a consideration of analyses which contribute to and develop the corpus of knowledge about precisely what is involved in media accounts of reality. Such analyses not only describe specific aspects of specific knowledge processes but also provide part of the basis for more general theorising in the sociology of the mass media and all sociology concerned with social consciousness. In the simplest terms a lack of

theoretical/empirical attention to the specifics of these processes would result in an impoverishment of our understanding of them and our more general theorising.

Hence while the adopted approach emphasises explicit knowledge, does not emphasise the notion of ideology and does not consider issues like the truth value of the editorials, the relationship between language and the broader socio-economic context (eg. Hall et al op cit, Murdock & Golding 1974), the reception or decoding of language (see below) and the organisation, working practices, goals and beliefs of media personnel (eg. Golding & Elliott 1979, Schlesinger 1978); it is crucially important not simply because media language is an important object but because it proposes a hypothesis which casts fresh light on the specifics of media language, and because an examination of this hypothesis will reveal detailed information which can be used to support and, if the hypothesis is proven, significantly develop both theories of the specifics of media language and more general theorising. This is not to argue that analyses of other aspects of the mass communication process are unimportant, that other approaches to the specifics of media language are illegitimate, that media language cannot be placed in and partly explained by broader contexts or that analyses of the specifics of media language must be given highest priority in all discussions of the mass media. It is simply to say that the forms, contents and power of media language are important phenomena and that the adopted approach to them has the theoretical and empirical benefits alluded to. Clearly, there are obvious senses in which textual analysis of the kind proposed de-contextualises media language, isolates it from a variety of social and institutional structures, contexts and determinants. However, as Hall puts it

"...it is worth reminding ourselves that there is something distinctive about the product... The apparatus and structures of production issue... in the form of a symbolic vehicle constituted within the rules of 'language'. It is in this 'phenomenal form' that the circulation of the 'product' takes place... It is also in this symbolic form that the reception of the 'product', and its distribution between different segments of the audience, takes place... Thus, whilst in no way wanting to limit research to "following only those leads which emerge from content analysis", we must recognise that the symbolic form of the message has a

privileged position in the communicative exchange... (W)hen the historical event passes under the sign of language, it is subject to all the complex... 'rules' by which language signifies... In that moment, the formal sub-rules of language are 'in dominance'... (T)he message-form' or the meaning dimension... is not a random moment', which we can take up or ignore for the sake of convenience or simplicity. The 'message-form' is a determinate moment... (However) it must... be perceived as a meaningful discourse and meaningfully de-coded. It is this set of de-coded meanings which 'have an effect', influence, entertain, instruct and persuade, with very complex perceptual, cognitive, emotional, ideological or behavioural consequences."
 (1973b pp. 1-3)

While Hall is referring to a particular approach to television discourse the argument is of general validity: media language is not the only legitimate concern of the sociology of the mass media, not the only "moment," but it is legitimate to focus on it because the specifics or complexities of language are crucially important phenomena.

The argument that it is decoded messages which "'have an effect'" raises an important issue. It is arguable that the actual decoding or reception of language is directly relevant to textual analysis (eg. Morley 1980a, 1980b). A central part of the general theoretical reasoning behind this argument is the incontestable proposition that texts can be read in different ways (eg. Hall 1973b, Morley op cit). Given this it can be argued that while a focus on media language is legitimate because the forms, contents and power of this language are crucial issues, the analysis of decoding is equally crucial. Combining analyses of encoding and decoding, so the argument might run, is not the only possible combination but it is an important one. This kind of combination is desirable: arguments about the nature and influence of media language can be supported and developed if definite evidence about decoding is available. There are four reasons why the research does not opt for this combination. Firstly, there are practical limits to the options available to individual researchers (ie. time and finance). Secondly, it will be argued that very detailed qualitative analyses are necessary to examine the hypothesis. The particular meaning of 'very detailed... analyses' will become apparent; for the moment the point is that the

production of such analyses is a long and complex process, consequently it is impossible to combine studies of language and other aspects of the mass communication process. Placing less emphasis on very detailed analyses would involve the loss of the methodological benefits associated with such analyses. Thirdly, as suggested, it will be argued that the approach makes significant theoretical claims. The potential benefit is detailed information about some of the social processes found in media language, a significant theoretical development of our theoretical understanding of media language and- by extension- a significant contribution to more general theorising about social consciousness. Placing less emphasis on detailed analyses of the forms, contents and power of these processes would involve the loss of potential theoretical benefits. Fourthly, the fact that textual analysis cannot assume a perfect fit between encoding and decoding does not mean that it is insignificant or misleading. As Hall (op cit) and Morley (op cit) have argued while it is important to recognise the existence and possibility of non-preferred decodings this should not obscure the fact that media language is an influential knowledge source/process which draws on and interacts with well established bodies of knowledge. Aspects of this feature of media language are dealt with in the first chapter. The immediate general point is that the media's attempts to influence majority public opinion will, for the reasons alluded to, tend to be successful. Indeed, as will become apparent, it is arguable that in the case of newspapers there is a particularly strong link with well established bodies of knowledge.

The above introduces the research, recognises the strengths and weaknesses of the adopted approach and, in general terms, justifies the specific focus of the research. In the first chapter the claimed strengths and significance of the focus are elaborated on via a development of some of the concerns of the existing literature. The focus, at least in general terms, has many of the characteristics of ethnomethodological or phenomenological projects, ie. the suspension of questions of ideology and truth value, and the emphasis on the internal workings of texts. However, the research does not aim to grind any particular theoretical axe and is atheoretical in

the sense that it is not concerned with the superiority or otherwise of grand theoretical traditions. The overall aim is to adopt certain strategies in order to develop the corpus of knowledge about the forms, contents and power of some of the important social processes found in media language.

FOOTNOTES

1. Throughout the thesis reproduce, reproduction, reaffirm and related words will be spelt as follows: re-produce, re-production, re-affirm. This usage emphasises the suggestion that pre-existing, familiar knowledge is being reused (ie. re-used).
2. This is not to assume that there is necessarily a correspondence between encoding and decoding (see Hall 1973a, 1973b, Morley op cit). It is simply to note the importance of media language and its social character. The issue of decoding is referred to at the end of this introduction (see pp. vi-vii). The first chapter specifies a particular argument about what is involved in the relationship between public opinion, newspaper language and those who produce and read it.
3. In order of presentation examples of work which employs these concepts are: Blumler & Gurevitch 1982; Brunsdon & Morley 1978, Hall 1977, Hall et al op cit; Chibnall 1977, Hall et al op cit, Murdock 1974; Brunsdon & Morley op cit, Connell 1980; Brunsdon & Morley op cit, Cohen 1973, Golding & Middleton 1982, Hall et al op cit; Glasgow University Media Group 1976, 1980, Halloran et al 1970, Hartmann & Husband 1972; Brunsdon & Morley op cit, Hall 1972, 1973a, 1973b, 1977, 1982, Hall et al op cit, Morley 1976; Hall 1983, Hall et al op cit; Brunsdon & Morley op cit, Hall et al op cit.

As will become apparent it is not being argued that the hypothesis and examination of it are directly relevant to all of these concerns: it is certainly not the case that the editorials are examined in detail from the standpoint of all of the concepts listed. Indeed questions of ideology and truth value are suspended. However, it will be argued that ~~the~~ hypothesis and the information generated could- to varying extents and degrees- support and/or develop a variety of existing concerns. The first section of chapter one briefly places the concerns of the research in the context of some of the existing literature and the second section develops specific aspects of this literature, a more general consideration of the relationship between the research and the existing literature is provided in the final section (see pp. 17-22). More specifically, for example, the simultaneous suspension of the question of ideology and relevance of the research to this question is dealt with on pp. 19-21. More generally, as will become apparent, the overall aim is to adopt certain strategies (ie. a very specific focus and the suspension of certain questions and issues) in order to develop our knowledge of media language and- by extension our more general theorising.

CHAPTER ONETHE ROLE OF NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS IN THE RE-PRODUCTION OF
COMMUNITY: THEORETICAL ISSUESINTRODUCTORY COMMENT

This chapter develops and supports the theory that newspaper editorials re-produce community; describes the significance of the theory and the way it draws on existing work; develops and supports a specific hypothesis about the re-production of community; describes the significance of the hypothesis and the way it develops existing work by addressing previously under emphasised issues.

THE RE-PRODUCTION OF STOCKS OF KNOWLEDGE AS THE RE-PRODUCTION
OF COMMUNITYMedia Language: The Re-Production of Stocks of Knowledge

The concept of a stock (s) of knowledge is, at a general theoretical level, associated with phenomenology and ethnomethodology (eg. Berger & Luckmann 1966, Garfinkel 1967, Schutz 1970). However, at a more particular level it has been used to conceptualise and research media language. Some of the works in question use related concepts and usages vary. Nevertheless it is arguable that it plays an important role in a number of theoretical and/or empirical analyses, that in certain respects a standard usage is present in these analyses, and that drawing on and developing some of the major concerns of these analyses is a profitable exercise.¹

One of the major themes is that media language uses familiar, pre-existing knowledge to understand 'new' events: it does not produce, construct or establish an understanding but rather re-produces, re-constructs or re-establishes a pre-existing understanding. Hence, for example, Hartmann and Husband argue that one of the characteristics which makes events newsworthy

"...is their ability to be interpreted within a familiar framework or in terms of existing images, stereotypes and expectations... The situation is one of continuous interplay between events, cultural meanings and news frameworks... Subsequent events that conform to the

expectations stand a better chance of making the news... (and) a new event may be interpreted in terms of existing images even if the existing image is not the most appropriate."
(op cit p. 445)

A related part of their argument is that the British cultural tradition provides a particular understanding of issues like race and that because the mass media operate within this tradition they will draw on and perpetuate the understanding provided by it. Hence they are using a number of similar concepts (ie. familiar framework, existing images, stereotypes and expectations, cultural tradition) to suggest that one of the ways in which media language understands events is by locating them in, to choose one of the concepts, a familiar framework. More specifically, this kind of understanding draws on, re-uses, re-affirms and perpetuates a particular familiar, established pre-existing understanding. Hall et al (op cit) argue that the provision of this kind of understanding is a basic and intrinsic feature of media language:

"If the world is not to be represented as a jumble of random and chaotic events, then they must be identified (ie. named, defined, related to other events known to the audience), and assigned to a social context (ie. placed within frames of meaning familiar to the audience). This process... is one of the most important through which events are 'made to mean'... If newsmen did not have available... cultural 'maps' of the social world, they could not 'make sense' for their audiences of the unusual, unexpected and unpredicted events which form the basic content of what is 'newsworthy'... This bringing of events within the realm of meanings means, in essence, referring... events to the 'maps of meaning' which already form the basis of our cultural knowledge, into which the social world is ALREADY 'mapped.' The social identification, classification and contextualisation of news events in terms of these background frames of reference is the fundamental process by which the media make the world they report on intelligible... (This process) BOTH ASSUMES AND HELPS TO CONSTRUCT SOCIETY AS A 'CONSENSUS.' We exist as members of one society BECAUSE- it is assumed- we share a common stock of cultural knowledge with our fellow men; we have access to the same 'maps of meaning.' Not only are we able to manipulate these 'maps of meaning' to understand events, but we have fundamental interests, values and concerns in common, which these maps embody or reflect."
(op cit pp. 54-55, original emphases)

As the quote suggests one of the ways in which Hall et al specify the issue of pre-existing, familiar understandings is in terms of

the assumption and construction of a consensus (see also, eg, Chibnall op cit, Murdock 1974). However, this is seen as a special case of a more general phenomenon: understanding new events by drawing on, re-using and perpetuating a particular, preferred "sedimented" stock of knowledge (see also Hall 1972, 1973a, 1973b, 1975, 1977, 1982, Smith et al 1975).² Another account of this kind of process is provided by the concept of an inferential structure or framework (eg. Glasgow University Media Group op cit, Hall et al op cit, Halloran et al op cit, Hartmann & Husband op cit, 1973). The essence of usages of this concept is that media language perpetuates inferential frameworks which structure and limit knowledge in a particular way; define phenomena and subsequent phenomena from the standpoint of the established or sedimented definition of what the issues are; define phenomena which challenge the assumptions or starting point of this definition as illegitimate or irrelevant; and ignore evidence which supports alternative definitions and/or contradicts preferred definitions.

There are, of course, significant differences between the analyses referred to and different analyses pursue different issues. Some of the major differences will become apparent, for the moment we can simply note that there is a body of literature concerned, in general terms, with the reproduction of stocks of knowledge. This phrase is an appropriate general description of one of the major concerns of this literature and the basic concern of this research: it emphasises the suggestion that media language understands new events by drawing on, re-using and perpetuating a particular, pre-existing, familiar and well established understanding of events, and thereby in some way ignores or de-legitimises alternative understandings. More specifically: it will be argued that newspaper editorials can be theorised as reproductions of community, as attempts to re-produce a communal or shared stock of knowledge and resist the appeals of threatening, alternative stocks; hypothesised that this process is quasi-scientific or has quasi-scientific dimensions; and suggested that this hypothesis develops our knowledge of the forms, contents and power of media language, and that an examination of it will reveal information about the existence

and role of various forms or types of re-production.

The Re-Production of Community

In his introduction to Smith et al (1975) Hall argues

"Though speaking to readers from a position outside their 'world,' and about topics on which it is well informed and they are relatively ignorant, the newspaper is, nevertheless, the product of a SOCIAL TRANSACTION between producers and readers. Successful communication... depends to some degree on a process of mutual confirmation between those who produce and those who consume... Newspapers must continually situate themselves within the assumed knowledge and interests of their readership... they must 'take the attitude of their significant others', their 'imaginary interlocutors'... Language, style and format are therefore products of a process of reciprocal symbolic interaction..."
(1975 p. 22, original emphasis)

Arguments about newspaper language and reciprocity must be qualified in the way suggested by Hall. However, the concept of reciprocity is a crucial one.³ It suggests that newspapers do not re-produce their own knowledge, impose knowledge or re-produce it in the hope that it will be considered acceptable and valid; rather they re-produce knowledge which is consistent with the newspapers view of the world and the views/expectations of readers. In general terms this is a re-production of community in the sense that readers are formulated as members of a community which shares a stock of knowledge, and are invited to re-join this community and thereby to re-produce a communal understanding of the world. This process can be specified and broken down as follows:

1) Newspapers address a particular section of the public and assume that they are addressing a community which shares a stock of knowledge as opposed to a random collection of individuals who may or may not accept the knowledge offered.

2) The assumption that there is a community of regular readers who share a stock of knowledge is an important determinant of the forms and contents of newspapers. As Hall et al put it

"Of special importance in determining the particular mode of address adopted will be the particular part of the readership spectrum the paper sees itself as customarily addressing: its target audience. The language employed

will thus be the NEWSPAPER'S OWN VERSION OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE PUBLIC TO WHOM IT IS PRINCIPALLY ADDRESSED: ITS version of the rhetoric, imagery and underlying common stock of knowledge which it assumes its audience shares and which forms the basis of the reciprocity of producer/reader."

(op cit p. 61, original emphasis)

3) As Hall (eg. 1973a, 1982) has pointed out the continued existence and perceived validity of (assumed) communal stocks of knowledge cannot be taken for granted because new events, situations or interpretations are problematic or potentially problematic; they may pose a direct threat to our preferred stock of knowledge and/or are threatening in the sense that they can be understood in more than one way (ie. non-preferred ways).⁴ Given this it follows that (assumed) communal knowledge has to be actively re-produced, ie. continuously articulated, maintained, perpetuated, legitimated and defended. This is not the only conceivable knowledge process but it is a crucial one. If knowledge is not re-produced it becomes ineffectual in that it lacks explanatory power; it can no longer inform, structure and mobilise communal allegiances and resist the appeals of alternative communal allegiances, it cannot inform, structure and legitimise actions, perceptions and social arrangements. Hence the re-production of community involves an attempt to draw on and re-use pre-existing, shared, familiar and established knowledge in a way which provides a preferred understanding of an event or interpretation, re-affirms the validity of a stock of knowledge, perpetuates it, and defends it against the challenge or threat posed by events and alternative knowledge.

4) The representation of the re-production of community (see overleaf) illustrates 1-3. For the purposes of clear illustration the diagram puts readers and new phenomena outside of stocks of knowledge. Obviously readers are continuously involved in discourses; they are not suddenly disengaged from discursive involvements. Similarly, events, situations and interpretations do not exist in a non-discursive vacuum, existing stocks of knowledge will provide sedimented and thereby powerful guidelines for understanding and making sense of them. However, the diagram illustrates the essential point: any successful re-production of community depends on the (re)

analyses of one discourse can reveal definite and detailed information about the relationships between different discourses, the nature of the belief system in general or the extent to which particular stocks of knowledge are specific to particular discourses. They may reveal information relevant to this kind of issue but in principle they are analyses of any attempts to re-produce particular sections of public opinion and, given the strong possibility of similarities between the newspapers (eg. Chibnall op cit, Hall et al op cit, Halloran et al op cit), a section of public opinion. The essential form of authorial address involved in this process is: 'we have a stock of knowledge which has been built up over a period of time, as you can see an analysis of the steel strike re-affirms the validity/superiority of this knowledge and the invalidity/inferiority of alternative knowledge.' This involves a one-sided reciprocity in the sense that authors initiate or are responsible for editorial communication, draw on and re-produce powerful and influential constructions of reality, and do the active and crucial work of re-production.⁶ However, it also simultaneously involves a more genuine reciprocity or community in the sense that authors attempt to re-produce existing communal or shared allegiances; and must take account of the nature, limits and constraints of these allegiances, developments in public opinion, the values, concerns, interests and experiences of the community, and the forms and styles of communal knowledge (eg. Hall/Smith et al op cit, Hall et al op cit, see also pp. 4-5). To suggest the coexistence of a one-sided and a more genuine reciprocity/community may seem evasive. However, to suggest that newspaper language simply expresses or reflects social, political, economic and normative allegiances is to ignore the power and influence of media language as maintainers, defenders, definers, legitimisers and developers of public opinion. On the other hand to suggest that newspaper language locates itself in public opinion in order to maintain and mould 'imposed knowledge' ignores the essentially reciprocal nature of newspaper communication.⁷ Put another way editors locate analyses in a section of public opinion in order to re-produce it, ie. maintain, legitimate, defend, justify, develop, expand and modify it.

5) Some work on the encoding-decoding relationship does not

just address the issue of non-preferred decodings but also suggests a more general critique of the above usage of the concept of the re-production of community (eg. Morley 1980a, 1980b, SP. No. 9).⁸ Specifically: it might be argued that it is not sufficient to simply recognise the limitations of what is ultimately an immanent or intra-textual approach to knowledge; it is, so the argument might run, necessary to address, as opposed to merely recognise, the fact that any single text-reader/community relation is part of a complex set of social, economic, institutional and discursive structures and relationships. According to this argument to define the re-production of community as essentially the maintenance and defence of shared allegiances- of a section of public opinion- ignores the fact that 'real' communities are re-produced by a complex set of discursive and extra-discursive relationships and structures. Relatedly, this kind of argument raises the question of precisely what kind of community is involved in newspaper language: is it, for example, being claimed that communal allegiances and the allegiances of communities are the same thing? As has been indicated it seems reasonable to suggest that in society there is a given (ie. existing, well established) set of social, political, economic and normative allegiances which are the allegiances of communities in the sense that public opinion is not a shapeless, random collection of temporal views about this, that and the other but rather, at least to a significant extent, a set of coherent, stable and evolving bodies of shared knowledge: familiar "maps of meaning" (Hall et al op cit, see also pp. 2-3). Given this and given 1-4 then there is a clear sense in which editorial communication is not simply a single text-reader encounter. It is not a particular encounter between a newspaper and a random, ever changing collection of readers who have a series of unrelated, fleeting encounters with various discourses; but rather the editorial attempts to re-produce given communal allegiances which may be partly the product of and/or relatable to a variety of factors, which may be in complex relationships with other discourses and which may influence significantly heterogeneous socio-economic groups but which are, nevertheless, some of the existing allegiances which constitute a section of

public opinion and thereby the knowledge of a language community which is distinctive because it prefers a particular stock of knowledge. It might be argued that this is too simple an argument. It is, so the argument might run, one thing to posit shared and significantly homogeneous bodies of knowledge and to suspend questions about broader discursive and extra-discursive structures, relationships and contexts, it is quite another to ignore the fact that the reader's involvement in these structures and relationships will influence both the nature and the effectivity of the encounter with editorial texts. According to this argument no one would want to deny that there is an sense in which this encounter is not a single text-reader encounter, but the fact of the matter is that its nature and effectivity is influenced by the involvement referred to. This raises the analytically distinct question of decoding.

6) As noted in the introduction it is important to recognise the possibility of non-preferred decodings; to recognise the potentially crucial difference between saying that editorial language re-produces communal knowledge and saying that it is assumed that communal knowledge is being re-produced. However, at a straightforward empirical level there is a strong connection between particular newspapers and particular loyal and regular readerships (eg. McQuail 1976). Moreover, as has been argued, newspapers do not simply 'throw knowledge at' readers but over a long period of time develop a reciprocal relationship with a community of readers; they continually draw on, interact with and develop existing and established bodies of knowledge. The suggestion that the assumed community does not exist or that the stock of knowledge is significantly uninfluential is, at one level, simply counter intuitive or incoherent; it implies that public opinion does not exist, or that it is utterly shapeless, random and volatile and that newspaper language is some form of private language which completely fails to identify and interact with public opinion. To give a simple example: the suggestion that the particular kinds of support for particular political parties associated with particular popular newspapers do not exist or are uninfluential makes, at least in general terms, little sense. More specifically, to suggest that attempts to

re-produce communal knowledge are necessarily and to a significant extent unsuccessful is to ignore the general power of media language and the more specific power which stems from a demonstrably successful relationship with a community of readers. Moreover, it must be stressed that this is not just a 'content relationship': it involves, for example, legitimations of arguments, usages and appeals appropriate to the forms and styles of the community, and evaluative/credible and thereby powerful identifications with the lives, concerns, interests, values and experiences of readers (eg. Hall/Smith et al op cit, Hall et al op cit, see also footnote 7). That newspaper language is uninfluential or does not identify with/position readers is, of course, not the argument made by work on encoding/decoding. However, the point of the above is to argue that in the case of newspapers there is not necessarily a sharp contradiction between phrases like re-productions of community and assumed re-productions of community. It must, of course, be recognised that the language can be decoded in non-preferred ways, that there is not necessarily a correlation between the textual language community and a socio-economic-linguistic community in Morley's sense (see p. 8 & SP. No. 9), that shared allegiances are not ipso facto the allegiances of specific language communities, that readers are involved in various discourses which may or may not be complementary, that particular stocks of knowledge are not totally self-contained and the mechanical, one-to-one product of a particular discourse, that particular discourses may not be "primary definers" (Hall et al op cit, pp. 57-59), and that it cannot be claimed that the editorials are perfect/totally exhaustive reflections of public opinion. Hence the proposed usage, like any usage, has problematic aspects but the allegiances embodied in the sample of editorials are some of the existing allegiances in society- central aspects of bodies of shared knowledge which have recognisable parameters and adherents, and which thereby can and must be conceptualised as the allegiances of language communities. To fail to do this is, in essence, to fail to address the long term, reciprocal nature of newspaper language and the coherence of sections of public opinion. Moreover, it can be plausibly argued that attempts to re-produce given, shared and communal allegiances will tend to be successful because, in the

ways described, newspapers continuously and powerfully aim to interact with and develop existing, influential bodies of shared knowledge. Put another way- given the possibility of mediations of editorial language- there is a sense in which it is precisely the existence and possible attractiveness of other discourses which makes the re-production of community such a crucial social/sociological process. To simply assume that 'what is taken for granted is taken for granted' is to expose existing perceptions, evaluations, justifications and legitimations to pressure from events and other discourses; if they and the social arrangements involved in them are to be maintained and developed then it is necessary to continuously and actively re-produce them.

7) Editorials are distinctive in that they are the places where newspapers openly and freely express an opinion or viewpoint. Relatedly, they comment on and develop primary news stories and consequently, as Hall et al (op cit) have pointed out, contextualisation and generalisation are more likely to be found or visible in them. Hence it might be argued that it is more appropriate to focus on the parts of the newspaper in which the re-production of community is likely to be less visible. However, editorials are a strong test of the hypothesis. As indicated it emphasises the possibility that the language is quasi-scientific in the sense that it analyses an empirical instance in a way which explicitly provides further evidence for the validity of a stock of knowledge and a reasoned adjudication between competing stocks. Applying it to popular newspapers and to that part of the newspaper associated with judgment, evaluation, policy proposals, recommendations, campaigning and open bias will provide a strong test of it. Moreover, the nature and specificity of these processes is intrinsically interesting.

8) As has been indicated it is not being argued that stocks of communal knowledge do not change. Obviously at an abstract level successful communication is only possible if there is some continuity. Hence, for example, a popular newspaper which adopted the vocabulary associated with a 'serious' newspaper would not be able to maintain the essential continuity. However, the nature of more substantive levels of continuity and

discontinuity is not entirely an empirical question. Stocks of knowledge derive power and legitimacy from the continuous (re) demonstration that they can account for new phenomena and resist the appeals of alternatives. This could and may well involve continuous expansions, developments or modifications of the stock of knowledge. However, if there is significant discontinuity; no continuous (re) demonstration that new phenomena in some sense re-affirm (are explicable by, can be accommodated by, are consistent with, can be related to, expand/develop/modify) a preferred stock of knowledge and cannot be adequately understood by alternatives, then knowledge ceases to be a coherent, legitimate and defensible body of thought. True it may be the case that at particular times or in the face of particular events/interpretations a major or radical change in the stock of knowledge is necessary. Put another way there may be periods or occasions when production rather than re-production is the paramount issue. However, the existence and nature of this kind of change can be treated as empirical questions; similarly, given clear criteria for recognising continuity/discontinuity in editorials which focus on a specific event (see chapter two first section), the details of more minor changes should be apparent. Though, of course, the identification of long term (ie. decades) continuities and discontinuities requires research which examines media language over a long period of time (eg. Smith et al op cit).

The Re-Production of Quasi-Scientific Community

The existing literature provides a variety of concepts and formulations which could be used to develop theories and analyses of the re-productive process. The emphasis on quasi-scientific community is significantly different but, as suggested, the overall aim is to consider the possibility of various forms of re-production; and to complement, modify and significantly develop a variety of existing emphases rather than radically challenge or reject them (see next section).

The emphasis on quasi-scientific knowledge involves an explicit definition of the re-production of community. This is a limited approach but is valuable because it draws attention to an under emphasised form of re-production. For the purposes of

illustration it will be assumed that the following two statements are comprehensive summaries of the forms and contents of two editorials.

- a) 'Analysis of the steel strike suggests that it is the latest in a series of events which re-affirm the validity of the knowledge that strikes are undesirable and illegitimate because of X,Y,Z. True it has been argued that strikes are legitimate and there are reasons why this argument can be seen as valid. However, analysis suggests that there are reasons why this argument is invalid and reasons why our argument is both valid and superior.'
- b) 'Analysis of the steel strike affirms the validity of the knowledge that it is undesirable and illegitimate because of X,Y,Z.'

Despite the brevity and simplicity of these statements they illustrate essential points. Both could be counted as re-productions of knowledge. The first explicitly provides further evidence for the validity of a stock of knowledge and a reasoned adjudication between competing stocks. The second could be re-productive because it implicitly provides this kind of analysis. According to this argument statement b) could only be described as non-re-productive, as a particular statement about a particular strike, if it was isolated from the definitions, meanings and understandings sedimented in familiar stocks of knowledge. It may be re-productive, so the argument rightly runs, because a generalisation (ie. the steel strike is another example of an undesirable/illegitimate strike, strikes cannot be understood in any other way) could be sedimented in a 'particular' statement. Similarly, Murdock (1980) in his reply to Anderson and Sharrock (1979) argues that apparently particular statements about youth have to be placed in the context of the emergence of stereotyped images of youth in the 1870-1914 period, and the subsequent prevalence of such images in media and lay understandings. Moreover, it has to be stressed that apparently particular statements may not just be the latest in a series of similar statements, they could also be saturated with sedimented connotations. For example:

"...meaningful categories (become) so routine that they seem the natural way of making up newspapers. (They embody) ...those taken for granted, 'seen but unnoticed background features and expectancies' by means of which people share

a collective world of cultural meanings." (Hall 1975 p. 19)

Clearly, if texts which appear to provide particular/specific arguments are seen in the context of other texts and/or sedimented cultural meanings then it may be that they are in fact providing re-produced or other forms of generalised knowledge. True it is not necessarily the case that the explicit/implicit distinction will always be clear cut, but it is clearly the case that an explicit approach will not facilitate the recognition of all the meanings embodied in the editorials. Hence the existence of implicit meanings, the legitimacy of implicit definitions of the re-productive process and the limitations of an explicit approach cannot be doubted. However, an explicit definition is equally plausible and raises an important issue.

There is a definite sense in which statements like a) provide a particularly powerful, compelling and convincing form of knowledge. They invite the following kind of argument: 'we have a stock of knowledge which states, amongst other things, that strikes are undesirable and illegitimate because of... . This knowledge has been built up and continually validated over a longish period of time- analyses of a succession of events have (re) demonstrated the validity of our knowledge. Moreover, it is (re) demonstrably superior to alternatives and there are good reasons why it is (re) demonstrably superior. Hence it does not consist of mere opinions, beliefs, assertions, evaluations, recommendations, criticisms, prejudices and so on. As you can see an analysis of the steel strike re-demonstrates the validity/superiority of our preferences and the invalidity/inferiority of an alternative. This strike is the latest in a series of events which unequivocally provide further evidence for the validity of our knowledge.' The power of this kind of invitation lies in the way it explicitly re-demonstrates or re-affirms the validity of knowledge which has been validated in the past, locates a particular, recent event in an ongoing and historically valid tradition of analysis. It re-produces quasi-scientific community in the sense that it does not imply, state or assert the claims of an unreasoned stock of knowledge, but rather re-demonstrates that these claims are valid and reasoned and provides a reasoned adjudication between competing arguments; analyses an

empirical instance in a way which provides further, reasoned evidence for the validity of preferences and invalidity of a threatening alternative.

It might be argued that implicit re-productions could also be quasi-scientific in the sense described. However, there is a strong connection between what has been called quasi-scientific knowledge and explicitness. An essential part of the form and power of this kind of knowledge is the way it explicitly provides a reasoned re-demonstration of the validity and superiority of a stock of knowledge. To imply this kind of analysis is a different form of knowledge. It relies on, albeit powerful, implications; in contrast, a clear re-demonstration that an event is the latest in a series of events which must be understood in one way and cannot be understood in any other way explicitly provides irrefutable, reasoned evidence and takes the reader through a series of logical stages, ie. we have a stock of knowledge... this knowledge has been built up and validated... a reasoned analysis of the steel strike and a reasoned adjudication between competing arguments re-demonstrates... clearly... . A community which claims and wants to offer reasoned, re-demonstrably superior knowledge can only justify this claim and realise this aim if it continuously, clearly and reasonably re-demonstrates through analysis the validity, defensibility and superiority of a stock of knowledge. If it fails to do this it cannot claim to be and demonstrate that it is a reasoned or quasi-scientific community. Put another way the aim of re-production in the sense described is not simply to re-produce knowledge or assume/imply particular kinds of knowledge, but rather to explicitly re-affirm and develop a tradition of analysis which clearly re-demonstrates the rational grounds for preferring one stock of knowledge and rejecting others. This is not to say that explicit re-productions of the kind described are the only possible forms of quasi-scientific knowledge or the only possible features of newspaper editorials, that explicit re-productions are ipso facto quasi-scientific, or that other forms of knowledge are not powerful and do not have quasi-scientific dimensions. It is simply to say that the kind of quasi-scientific knowledge described is a possible feature and

a very powerful form of knowledge, and that an explicit approach draws attention to this important form of knowledge. This research examines the hypothesis that the editorials explicitly analyse an empirical instance in a way which provides a re-demonstration of the validity of knowledge and a reasoned adjudication between competing arguments- a reasoned defence against the threats posed by events and alternative arguments.

It might be argued that simply to identify evidence for this kind of process is not necessarily to identify knowledge which is logical, reasoned, reflexive or quasi-scientific in any strong sense. Much- the argument rightly runs- depends on questions of the following kind: precisely what is involved in the provision of further evidence?; how and in what ways is the validity of knowledge re-demonstrated?; what kinds of reason and evidence are provided?; how and in what ways are competing arguments assessed? These are crucial questions. However, the point of the hypothesis is not to equate any form of explicit re-demonstration/adjudication with logic/reason/reflexivity, not to suggest that 'any old' form of explicit re-production is ipso facto quasi-scientific, not to suggest that the editorials might be true/valid accounts in any strong scientific/philosophical sense or some form of genuine reflexive inquiry as opposed to, for example, evaluative, emotive and commonsensical accounts (eg. Hall et al op cit, see next section for an elaboration). The point is simply to raise and sharply state the possibility that they appear to be and claim to be quasi-scientific. Clearly, questions about forms of explicit re-production are crucial, but equally clearly if there are senses in which readers are invited to provide further, reasoned evidence for the validity/superiority of preferences and invalidity/inferiority of alternatives then it will be possible to argue that communal stocks of knowledge are in a clear sense quasi-scientific and extremely powerful because they are quasi-scientific. Hence the above provides a hypothetical framework which raises the possibility of the quasi-scientific nature of the language and which can be confirmed, falsified or refined by empirical investigation. It may be that some forms of explicit re-production are particularly reasoned and non-evaluative; that some of them have a quasi-scientific dimension but are also evaluative and

commonsensical; that different forms coexist and interact. These are empirical questions. The immediate point is that if forms of re-production of the kind described exist or coexist/interact with other forms then our knowledge of the social processes involved in media language will have been significantly developed.⁹

Forms of the Re-Production of Community

The existing literature has tended to neglect the possible quasi-scientific nature of media language. However, this emphasis can be related to and could develop a variety of existing emphases.¹⁰ One emphasis partly consists of analyses of the themes, images, ideas, categories, definitions, agendas, understandings and frameworks found in media language (eg. Brunsdon op cit, Chibnall op cit, Cohen op cit, Glasgow University Media Group op cit, Golding & Middleton op cit, Hall et al op cit, Halloran et al op cit, Hartmann 1975/76, Hartmann & Husband op cit, McQuail 1977, Morley 1976). Some of the more particular features of these analyses will become apparent. However, they are alike in that they under emphasise the possibility that knowledge is complex in the sense that it re-demonstrates through analysis the superiority of preferences and inferiority of alternatives. This is not to say that 'themes, images, ideas, categories... frameworks' do not exist or are uninfluential, but rather that some media language may be both complex and reasoned in the sense described and highly resistant to falsification because it is quasi-scientific. If readers are invited to re-produce knowledge in the way suggested then they are not invited to argue A, claim B, understand A in terms of B, or to define X in terms of Y and to reject Z; they are invited to re-demonstrate that it is unequivocally the case that X is Y and to provide reasons why B is both valid and superior to C.

A specific and significant dimension of some of the work referred to is the emphasis on the realism/objectivity of media language and the way it identifies issues/analyses with readers/viewers. Hence, for example, Connell (op cit) has demonstrated that part of the power of television is the way it positions the viewer as a "witness" to a seemingly external and objective reality. This kind of analysis is developed by Brunsdon and

Morley (op cit); they suggest that direct, empirical perception of a seemingly objective and irrefutable reality both identifies with the common sense perspective of viewers (ie. concerns, interests) and appeals to their lived personal/commonsensical experience of reality. Similarly, Hall et al (op cit) emphasise the unreflexive use of sedimented common sense ideas/images which evaluatively identify issues with the lives and interests of readers, and draw on/reflect their lived personal/commonsensical experience and understanding of reality. A related though distinctive form of identification defines actions, events or interpretations as illegitimate because a THEY threaten OUR interests; WE are threatened by a THEY who adversely effect/threaten worthwhile social, economic, political and normative structures.¹¹ Hence, for example, a central dimension of usages of the notion of consensus suggests that certain phenomena are defined as being against OUR national interests- as threats to the social structure or order- and are thereby excluded from definitions of what is reasonable, acceptable, legitimate, appropriate and permissible (eg. Hall 1973a, Hall et al op cit). The work referred to neglects the possible quasi-scientific nature of knowledge- indeed it emphasises unreflexive knowledge- but it makes related and important points about the specifics of media language, ie. realism/objectivity as a source/form of power/validity, identifications with the lives/interests of readers/viewers as forms of power. The hypothesis develops some of these points by suggesting that readers are not simply positioned as witnesses to or direct perceivers of an external reality or as hearers of 'balanced' pro-con debates (eg. Hall 1973a), but rather as reflexive analysts of reality and competing arguments. They are in a position not simply to observe an "out there" (Connell op cit, p. 155) reality or to weigh up pros and cons, but to re-demonstrate through analysis the validity of a previously confirmed theory and adjudicate between competing theories. Furthermore, the hypothesis suggests that the language may have a significant non-evaluative, non-experiential and non-commonsensical dimension; it may not, for example, just involve direct perceptions and definitions of a THEY who threaten OUR interests and thereby must be defined as illegitimate, but rather a re-demonstration through analysis of the

validity of the knowledge that they are involved in illegitimate activities, the provision of reasons why these activities are illegitimate and an adjudication between competing accounts of these activities. This is not to make a sharp a priori contrast between quasi-scientific knowledge on the one hand and direct empirical perception, common sense and evaluative identifications on the other. It is simply to say that this latter kind of emphasis could be developed via a recognition of the possibility that some media language or some dimensions of some media language may be reflexive in the sense described by the hypothesis. Conversely, it may be that the emphasis of the hypothesis has to be modified via a recognition of the role and importance of other forms of re-production. There may be forms and levels of explicit re-production which involve and appeal to themes, images, ideas, categories, a consensus, empirical perceptions and evaluative/experiential identifications with the reader; but there may also be forms and levels which are quasi-scientific and/or quasi-scientific forms may coexist/interact with other forms.

The significance of quasi-scientific knowledge can be further illustrated by a brief consideration of the notion of an inferential framework/structure. The examination of the hypothesis may reveal information which suggests that particular newspapers and popular newspaper discourse in general re-produce inferential frameworks of the kind suggested by the literature (see p. 3). However, if the hypothesis is proven then our knowledge of what is involved in the re-production of inferential frameworks could be developed by, for example, the recognition of the ways in which frameworks include reasoned adjudications and thereby reasoned considerations of evidence which challenges the preferred framework, re-demonstrations of the unequivocal validity of the claim that certain actions and interpretations are illegitimate, reasons why the only relevant issue is X, reasons why A has to be understood as a problem and not as a legitimate activity.

A lot of existing work emphasises the notion of ideology (eg. Brunson & Morley op cit, Chibnall op cit, Glasgow University Media Group op cit, Hall 1972, 1973a, 1973b, 1977, 1982, 1983, Hall et al op cit, Morley 1976). This research does not emphasise this notion but nor does it reject or

completely ignore it. It is a complex, multi-faceted and highly debated notion and, consequently, a proper account of the ideological nature/role of the editorial language would involve making ideology the major issue and thereby less concern with other possible significant features of the language. Hence it is not being argued that communal stocks of knowledge are not ideological but rather the question of ideology is suspended to facilitate the investigation of other important features of the language. This suspension can be qualified in three ways. Firstly, if ideology is defined in an atheoretical and relatively unproblematic manner then there is no good reason why the re-production of community cannot be formulated as the re-production of ideological community. If, for example, ideology is defined as a set of beliefs which are current and influential and which involve a preference for and legitimation/defence of particular stocks of shared knowledge, then clearly any analysis of the re-production of community is ipso facto the analysis of the re-production of ideological community. Secondly, the findings could be used to develop notions of ideology. Hence, for example, it has been argued that media language is ideological in the sense that it provides common sense accounts which disguise 'real social relations' (eg. Brunson & Morley op cit, Hall 1977, Hall et al op cit); translates elite definitions into populist language (eg. Hall 1983, Hall et al op cit); re-produces dominant ideology (ies) which legitimate existing social arrangements and understandings (eg. Hall 1973a, 1977, 1982, Hall et al op cit); re-produces limited consensual definitions of values/interests and de-legitimises alternative understandings (eg. Chibnall op cit, Hall 1973a, Hall et al op cit). The findings will not necessarily have a direct bearing on all of these issues. However, they could, for example, provide empirical support for the emphasis on the re-production of consensual knowledge and/or develop theories of ideology by indicating that- for example- populist language, the consensus and the disguising of real social relations takes particular, very powerful forms. Thirdly, the findings may be relevant to the consideration of specific ideologies: for example, Hall (1983) has argued that popular newspapers played a crucial role in the popularisation of "Thatcherism" and Hall et al (op cit) have described the general

development of and changes in stocks of knowledge in the 1960's-1970's. Clearly, analyses of popular newspaper editorials dating from the late 1979/early 1980 period may reveal information relevant to the consideration of the forms, contents and power of these ideological processes.

Similarly, the research is not critical in the sense that it does not consider the truth value of the editorials but does not deny the legitimacy of this approach. A lot of work casts doubt on the truth value of media language. This is not to say that it operates with simple notions of bias/distortion but simply that in general terms the inaccurate and misleading nature of media language is a major concern. More specifically, for example, the provision of misleading, stereotypical accounts of persons, events and issues (eg. Cohen op cit, Golding & Middleton op cit); inferential frameworks which prefer particular/limited explanations and ignore evidence which supports alternatives and/or contradicts preferences (eg. Glasgow University Media Group op cit, Hall et al op cit, Halloran et al op cit, Hartmann & Husband op cit); the failure to consider the real social and structural determination of events and experience, conflicts of interests and structural conflicts between groups/classes (eg. Brunson & Morley op cit, Hall 1973a, Hall et al op cit). The point of the hypothesis is not that the media language is not misleading or in some sense inaccurate, but rather that in the senses described it may appear to be and claim to be an accurate, reasoned and re-demonstrably valid/superior account. Again, placing less emphasis on this possibility would mar the investigation of a significant possible feature of the media language. Again, while the findings may not be directly and comprehensively relevant to the work referred to they could provide empirical support for aspects of it and/or develop it by indicating that, for example, stocks of communal knowledge may be misleading but also appear/claim to be accurate, reasoned and re-demonstrably superior.

The more general point is that a range of existing emphases could be developed via consideration of the possibility that some media language is quasi-scientific. It may be, for example, that the editorials re-produce a negative inferential framework or "agenda" (Blumler & Gurevitch op cit) which de-legitimises

strikes/strikers and emphasises the adverse effects of the agency of strikers (eg. Glasgow University Media Group op cit, Kress & Hodge 1979, Morley 1976), re-produce knowledge which popularises elite ideologies (eg. Hall 1983, Hall et al op cit), re-produce a consensus and de-legitimise challenges to it (eg. Chibnall op cit, Hall et al op cit), re-produce knowledge which is in some sense commonsensical and powerful because it evaluatively identifies analyses/issues with readers or because it identifies folk devils/scapegoats and thereby articulates anxieties and worries (eg. Cohen op cit, Hall et al op cit). However, they may also analyse an empirical instance in a way which provides further evidence for the validity of a pre-existing, well confirmed understanding and reasoned adjudications between competing understandings. On the other hand different forms and levels of re-production may coexist and/or interact. However, if the hypothesis is proven to a significant extent then it will be possible to argue that some sections of public opinion are, at least in part, quasi-scientific and powerful/highly resistant to falsification because they are quasi-scientific. Hence the limited focus on the internal workings of texts and the suspension of questions of ideology and truth value are not theoretical dogma, but rather strategies which raise a neglected and significant question. A question which is inherently worthwhile and relevant to a number of other theories of media language- including more general theories- and by extension to more general theories of social consciousness (ie. the forms, contents and power of ideology/populist language). This is not to say that the application of the approach will reveal information about all the features of the editorials, that the findings will be directly and comprehensively relevant to all the existing emphases discussed, or that it will be possible to provide a comprehensive and exhaustive account of the relationship between the findings and any particular emphasis. It is simply to say that the application of the approach/hypothesis will reveal significant and detailed information about argumentative processes which *may*- in varying ways and to varying extents- be relevant to and could develop a variety of existing emphases.

FOOTNOTES

1. In accordance with the overall aim of the research it is not being suggested that it is possible, useful or desirable to read these analyses from an ethnomethodological or phenomenological standpoint. The suggestion is *simply* that a focus on the concept of a stock of knowledge is a useful way to formulate and develop some of the major concerns of these analyses.
2. For an application of the concept of "sedimentation" (eg. Berger & Luckmann op cit) to newspaper language see Hall 1975. The concept emphasises ingrained, taken for granted and unreflexive knowledge. Usages in the literature referred to tend to emphasise- and this research stresses- that the maintenance of what is taken for granted requires active and continuous work. ie. It cannot be assumed that 'what is taken for granted is taken for granted,' rather it is necessary to continuously articulate, maintain and legitimate preferred stocks of knowledge- to defend them against the threats posed by events and alternative stocks of knowledge.
3. See p. 7 and footnote 7 for qualification, see also Hall 1973a.
4. There is a potentially important difference between concepts like assumed stocks of knowledge and stocks of knowledge; the former emphasises the possibility of erroneous encodings and/or non-preferred decodings (eg. Hall 1973a, 1973b, Morley 1980a). It will be argued (see pp. 9-11) that while a perfect 'fit' between encoding/decoding cannot be assumed there is a sense in which, in the case of newspaper language, there is not necessarily a sharp contradiction between the two concepts.
5. As noted, see footnote 2, there is a sense in which there is a contradiction between a notion of a familiar stock of knowledge and notions like an active battle to re-produce familiar and shared stocks of knowledge. As should now be apparent the suggestion here is that the crucial social process of re-producing communal knowledge involves continuous work; a battle or struggle to re-produce communal allegiances in the face of threatening phenomena. However, this is not to say that stocks of knowledge do not change (see pp. 11-12), nor is it to say that textual analysis can reveal definite information about 'actual' authorial intentions or motives (see footnote 6).
6. The suggestion that newspaper language involves an attempt to identify and draw on a stock of knowledge in order to actively re-produce it implies arguments about authorial intentions/motives. More specifically, it is arguable (see p. 11) that editorials are the places where the newspaper freely and openly attempts to state and develop the preferences of the community. However, definite and detailed information about authorial intentions/motives cannot be gained from textual analysis. It is possible to say that media language reflects an intention or attempt to

re-produce a stock of knowledge and that this is one of the encoded features of the language, but it is not possible to determine how authors view the knowledge offered or what their actual intentions/motives are. ie. 'I am stating the obvious,' 'I am speaking for and on behalf of a section of public opinion,' 'I must defend our preferences against the threat posed by X,' 'I am stating a view which is accepted by our community but which I consider to be erroneous,' 'I am stating/defending a popular version of a reasonable/unreasonable argument,' 'I am deliberately re-producing a misleading stock of knowledge.'

7. The inseparability/coexistence of the 'two' forms of reciprocity is reflected in the fact that identifications with the reader are an important source of power/validity. For example, Hall et al (op cit) argue that media language is powerfully/credible partly because it evaluatively identifies issues/analyses with the values, concerns, interests, experiences and lives of readers. This process draws on/reflects these phenomena but simultaneously legitimates, perpetuates and develops particular limited, established stocks of knowledge. The issue of evaluative identifications and the "positioning" of the reader or viewer (eg. Brunson & Morley op cit, Connell op cit) is related to the concerns of this research on pp. 17-19.
8. This kind of critique essentially focuses on the limitations of de-contextualised textual analysis. In a sense there is nothing to add to the defence of the research against this kind of criticism (see Introduction). However, reiteration in a more specific form will underline the defence and elaborate on the linguistic but nevertheless crucial/sociological usage of the concept of the re-production of community.
9. A by product of the explicit approach is the possibility of providing clear cut evidence for the re-production of knowledge. Given that the absence of explicit re-productions does not mean that knowledge is not being re-produced this may seem a dubious advantage. However, it will be possible to provide clear cut evidence for the existence or otherwise of explicit re-productions. (see chapter two first section for an operationalisation of the concept of explicit re-production)
10. This is not to suggest that the existing literature discussed is necessarily concerned with re-production. It is simply to relate it to the concerns of this research, in particular to raise the question of different forms of the re-production of community.
11. Evaluating phenomena in this way is a classical rhetorical device or argumentative form/process (see Aristotle 1941, **LOSSWELL 1971**, Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969). As suggested (see below) one particular analysis of this process in the sociology of the mass media identifies re-productions of a consensus (see also the identification of "folk-devils", Cohen op cit, Hall et al op cit).

CHAPTER TWOANALYSING THE NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS: A METHOD AND METHODOLOGYINTRODUCTORY COMMENT

This chapter operationalises the hypothesis/approach, considers some available methods of textual analysis, outlines a method for analysing the editorials and considers the methodological issues pertinent to such an analysis. The aim is to provide a practical methodological framework; one which can be used to examine the hypothesis and, more generally, examine the re-production of community as defined in chapter one. Hence the discussion of available methods and methodological issues is not intended to be comprehensive or exhaustive; it is pragmatic in the sense that it is premised on questions like what is the most appropriate/efficient way to examine the hypothesis, apply the approach, and address the relevant methodological issues? There is no attempt to address questions of the following kind: what are the features and theoretical/methodological strengths of all available methods?; how have different researchers and traditions employed and modified particular methods?: what are the strengths/weaknesses of the various attempts to resolve the theoretical and philosophical problems relevant to textual analysis?

The chapter has four main parts: the operationalisation of the hypothesis/approach; the discussion of some available methods in the light of this operationalisation; the provision of a method; and a specific/practical guide to the application of the method.

OPERATIONALISATION OF HYPOTHESIS/APPROACH.

For analytical purposes it is possible to distinguish statements which invite readers to consider specific/particular arguments, statements which invite readers to make generalisations and ones which invite them to re-produce a stock of knowledge. To give a simple example: if an author suggests that the steel strike damaged the economy and demonstrated that interventionist economic policy is the best policy it will be assumed that he/she is not re-producing knowledge. The first statement will be

treated as a specific argument about the steel strike; the second as an argument which sees the strike as a demonstration of the validity of a generalisation. It will be argued that knowledge is only being re-produced if texts explicitly invite the following kind of argument: the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which demonstrate the validity of X,Y,Z; the steel strike shows that past and present are similar because of... ; the steel strike re-affirms that strikes, wages and economic policy have to be understood in terms of... . In the case of reasoned adjudications/defences it will be argued that they are only present if the author explicitly invites arguments which have the following kind of structure: argument- reasons why it is valid; counter/alternative/threatening argument- reasons why it is valid; conclusion- reasons why alternative argument is ultimately inferior/invalid and preferred argument valid/superior. If readers are not offered materials which invite them to make the above kinds of argument it will be argued that knowledge is not being explicitly re-produced. However, if an editorial (s) which offers specific and/or general knowledge reiterates knowledge re-produced in another editorial (s) then this will be counted as a re-production of knowledge. In the light of the analytical distinction between specific/general/re-produced knowledge this kind of editorial is not in itself a re-production of knowledge, but it is a re-production in the sense that it re-affirms knowledge re-produced in another editorial.

It might be argued that this weakens the emphasis on explicit knowledge. However, it seems reasonable because the knowledge in question is clearly and explicitly re-produced in one or more editorials and because each editorial is only part of a continuous analysis of the steel strike. It might also be argued that to identify an editorial which, for example, suggests that the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which demonstrate X,Y,Z is not necessarily to show that the newspaper has actually understood previous events in a particular way. It is, for example, possible that the steel strike is the first time the author has 're-demonstrated' X,Y,Z. This is extremely unlikely: to successfully re-produce community it is necessary to draw on and re-affirm a stock of knowledge, inconsistencies

have to be introduced and explained and should therefore be visible to the analyst. Put another way to argue that the steel strike is a re-demonstration of X,Y,Z is to refer and appeal to a series of confirming instances; authors could not retrospectively formulate previous events as instances of X,Y,Z unless this new dimension or development of the stock of knowledge was introduced and explained, a failure to do this and/or an attempt to 'produce re-produced' knowledge would involve or lead to a breakdown in editorial communication.

As should be apparent for the purposes of analysis the possibility that specific and general arguments/knowledge implicitly re-produce knowledge will be ignored. This facilitates a clear and rigorous application of the approach. However, the concluding chapter will include a consideration of any major anomalies produced by the analytical distinctions. If knowledge is re-produced in the ways described above it will be argued that there are good reasons for pursuing the argument that the editorials re-produce quasi-scientific community; that is, analyses of an empirical instance which provide further evidence for the validity of a well confirmed stock of knowledge and reasoned adjudications between competing arguments. As suggested in chapter one this is not to ignore questions about forms and kinds of analysis, re-demonstration, further evidence, reason and adjudication; not to equate any form of re-demonstration and adjudication with reason/science/reflexivity; not to assume that any form of explicit re-production is ipso facto quasi-scientific; and not to make a sharp a priori contrast between explicitly re-produced knowledge and, for example, evaluative, emotive and common sense knowledge. It is simply to say that the operationalisation provides a framework which raises the possibility of the quasi-scientific nature of knowledge: it clearly facilitates the identification of re-productions of knowledge which in some sense explicitly analyse an empirical instance (ie. the steel strike) in a way which provides further evidence, re-demonstrations and reasoned adjudications. The precise nature of these analyses- the forms and levels of explicit re-productions- is an empirical question.

Moreover, the operationalisation solves the practical problems posed by the need to provide detailed consideration of

the following issues: the existence and nature of explicit re-productions; the possibility of different forms of explicit re-production; the existence/nature of adjudications, the possibility of different forms of adjudication and the relationship between adjudications and other forms of re-production; the forms, contents and power of explicit re-productions; the similarities and dis-similarities in the forms, contents and power of different newspapers; the possibility of different types and levels of explicit content; the relationship between the findings and the concepts/formulations found in the existing literature. Detailed analyses of 71 editorials which attempted to simultaneously comment and elaborate on all of these issues would be chaotic and confusing. The operationalisation of the approach in terms of a basic distinction between the production of knowledge (ie. specific/particular and general arguments) and the re-production of knowledge facilitates the following division of labour. Three of the chapters which present empirical analyses (3,4,6) will analyse a group of editorials and concentrate on establishing the existence or otherwise of explicit re-productions which provide further evidence for the validity of a stock of knowledge, and will indicate- as opposed to commenting and elaborating on- what is involved in any such re-productions. The final parts of these chapters will provide a brief review of the contents of any re-productive processes. The other chapter which presents empirical analyses (5) will concentrate on describing any adjudications of the kind described. None of these chapters will elaborate on forms and levels of re-production or relate them to existing concepts and formulations: in essence they provide data, rigorously but largely descriptively establish the existence or otherwise of explicit re-productions and descriptively indicate the more precise nature of any such processes. The concluding chapter (7, Forms and Levels of the Re-Production of Community) will draw together and review the analyses, identify and elaborate on any distinctions between forms and levels of re-production which emerged during the actual analyses- in particular assess the extent to which there are senses in which the re-productive process is quasi-scientific- and relate the findings to the existing literature.

QUANTITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS ..

Quantitative content analysis emphasises the quantification of textual categories (ie. themes, concepts, arguments, definitions, see Beardsworth 1980, Hartmann op cit). This research is concerned with the details of the forms, contents and power of argumentative processes as opposed to the frequency and distribution of categories. The inappropriateness of the method can be illustrated by a simple example. In S7 (see appendix one) the author describes the activities of steel strike pickets as violent and threatening (S7:4), prefaces this description with praise for the Home Secretary's response to these activities (S7:2-S7:3), and follows up this praise/description with a contrast between the Home Secretary's response and the inadequacy of Labour Prime Minister's response to a previous instance of undesirable industrial action (S7:5).¹ This analysis of part of S7 could be extended and supported in detail, but despite its brevity and simplicity it clearly illustrates the way in which categories combine to produce a qualitative and multi-faceted argumentative process. The author does not, for example, simply praise one response to a particular activity; condemn another response to a different instance of a similar activity; or define industrial action in a particular way. He/she provides a contrastive description of two different but similar responses to two different but similar activities; more specifically, readers are invited to re-produce the knowledge that one of the issues in industrial disputes is the relative merits of responses to the problem (ie. violent/threatening/blockading behaviour) posed by trade union activities. The more general point is that the question of whether or not an argumentative process is re-productive in the sense described in this research can only be answered via an examination of the complex ways in which textual categories appear in and contribute to overall argumentative processes (see next section for an elaboration).

This is not to say that recurrence is not an important issue. The extent to which particular meanings are present is obviously an important question and the method cannot only be used to identify categories (eg. Golding & Middleton op cit, Hartmann op cit), but also to supplement other kinds of analysis (eg. Brunsdon & Morley op cit) and identify the general range

and kinds of media output (eg. Williams 1962). However, given the concerns of this research it is not an appropriate method.

LINGUISTIC METHODS

There is a body of work which has attempted to formalise the analysis of media texts; that is, specific linguistic concepts and techniques are used to analyse the text as a complex whole, or at least to analyse parts of the text larger and more complex than words, sentences or themes. Hence, for example, Fowler (1977), Fowler et al (1979), Hodge (1976), Hodge and Kress (1974), Kress and Hodge (op cit) and Kress and Trew (1978) are, collectively, a group of linguists concerned to add a sociological dimension to linguistic analysis and a linguistic dimension to sociological analysis. They have applied a range of concepts to a range of texts and many of these analyses are specifically concerned with newspaper language (eg. Hodge 1979, Kress & Hodge 1979, Kress & Trew 1978, Trew 1979a, 1979b). At first sight this kind of work is an extremely strong candidate for use in this research. In essence its potential strength is that it is sensitive to the complexities of argumentative processes/forms and facilitates analyses which are objectively and rigorously grounded in technical accounts of how language works. There are, however, problems involved in using it in this research.

The problems can be illustrated by considering the fact that there is no necessary one-to-one relation between linguistic forms and argumentative forms/processes. Hence, for example, a key linguistic form is the way in which texts represent causality (ie. agent-process-affected links). More specifically, an application of this concept to S7 would suggest, amongst other things, that in S7:2-S7:4 the author uses a transactive model; that is, he/she specifies agent (steel strike pickets), process (violence and threats), affected (people who want to work). The usefulness of this kind of analysis is that it raises an important sociological issue (ie. the representation of causality), provides a technical, objective and external reference point for the analysis of this issue (ie. a particular linguistic form is present therefore a particular argumentative form/process is present (ie. a causal one)), and could be used to rigorously

breakdown, layout and represent the meaning of the text as a whole (ie. tables and matrices which represent the overall textual use of transactives/non-transactives, see Trew 1979a). However, as Trew (ibid) points out, analyses and breakdowns of texts in terms of linguistic forms tend to ignore the complexities of texts; they have to be supplemented by- and complexities have to be restored by- qualitative analyses. For example, in the case of S7 and from the point of view of this research transactive and other forms of linguistic analysis would have to be minimally supplemented via a consideration of the following: the author is considering two different but similar agent-process-affected links, equating past and present, contrasting two different but similar responses to two different but similar links, re-producing the knowledge that one of the issues in industrial disputes is the adequacy of responses to the problem posed by trade union activity, deriving a perspective from descriptions (ie. industrial action takes certain forms and must therefore be understood as a problem), assuming rather than establishing that violence and threats have occurred (ie. to begin by praising a response to violence/threats is to assume- and premise the discussion on- the argument that it can be taken for granted that violence/threats is an adequate description). Clearly, an analysis of transitivity would not in itself reveal all this information. Linguistic forms are overdetermined in the sense that the transactive parts of S7 can not be understood simply in terms of transitivity (ie. one of the transactives must be understood in terms of and related to the assumption of an agency, the provision of a problem perspective, the contrast between... and so on). It might be argued that it is possible to use or identify a range of linguistic forms. However, this would simply result in a list of analyses which would have to be supplemented and inter-related. Moreover, this assumes that each linguistic form is a discrete and self-contained entity, and that the overall argumentative process is simply the sum or mechanical aggregate of a number of self-contained linguistic forms. This is clearly not the case: if, for example, a transactive is not understandable simply in terms of transitivity and is an integral part of other linguistic forms, then one-to-one correlations between particular

linguistic forms, particular argumentative processes, a group of discrete linguistic forms and an overall argumentative process are impossible.² Relatedly, and as indicated, there is an obvious sense in which there is no one-to-one relation between particular linguistic forms and particular meanings. Hence, for example, Trew (ibid) identifies different meanings or ideologies in different newspapers but does not establish, or claim to establish, a close relationship between particular linguistic forms and particular meanings/ideologies. His marriage of for example immanent linguistic analysis and sociological analysis involves demonstrating how some transactives reflect ideology A, others ideology B, still others ideology C. This does not necessarily make the analyses less significant or valid but it does mean that there may not be a special advantage to be gained from the use of linguistic methods. If there is no strong relationship between particular linguistic forms and particular argumentative forms/meanings then saying that this transactive sentence has this or that meaning and is part of this or that argumentative process is essentially no different from saying that this sentence has this or that meaning and is part of... . The linguistic analysis does not significantly add to the qualitative analysis; the latter (ie. this sentence suggests that A caused B and is part of a contrast between) is more efficient and directly sociological than the linguistic + qualitative analysis (ie. this sentence is transactive and is part of a relational contrast, it suggests that A caused B and is part of a contrast between C & D).

It might be argued that the above misses the point: namely, there is no one-to-one relation between linguistic forms and argumentative forms/processes but linguistic analysis provides a clear and rigorous procedure for conducting analyses. In other words the fact that it is necessary to supplement analyses based on the identification of linguistic forms is not a weakness of the method but part of the method: the initial essentially linguistic analysis provides a rigorous and clear breakdown of the text. However, as suggested, the point of the above is that this assumes that other forms of analysis do not provide rigorous and clear procedures and/or that linguistic analysis is the best/most efficient way of breaking down the text. Put

another way it is not necessarily an argument for linguistic analysis but rather for rigorous analysis. The possibility of a more direct, efficient analysis can be illustrated by briefly considering the following analysis of S7: in S7 the author describes... , prefaces this description with... , follows up this praise/description with a contrast between... (ie. see p. 29). This analysis identifies the overall structure of the first half of the text and indicates the ways in which the various features of this part combine to produce a more general argumentative form/process. Subsequent analyses could repeat this process and elaborate on the forms and contents of the text. The end result would be a more direct, efficient analysis of, from the point of view of this research, the relevant features of the text. In other words the breakdown of the text and the analyses of it tend to merge; whereas with linguistic analysis there would be a two-fold and potentially wasteful strategy, ie. this sentence suggests that A caused B as opposed to this sentence is transactive, it suggests... . This kind of efficiency is especially important in research which has to consider in detail 71 editorials and is not just concerned with very particular and relatively simple argumentative processes (ie. causality). Clearly, as long as qualitative analysis of the kind alluded to can provide procedures for validating interpretations and strategies for breaking down and following the evolution of argumentative processes, then there is no particular advantage to be gained from the use of linguistic methods. It might be argued that there can be no better validation and analytical procedure than that provided by linguistic analysis (ie. an analysis of language therefore linguistic analysis). However, as demonstrated, linguistic analyses have to be supplemented by qualitative analyses: high level validity of the kind referred to would only be possible in any strong sense if there were one-to-one relations between linguistic forms and argumentative processes/meanings; linguistically based analysis has, to a significant extent, to be validated qualitatively.

Aspects of the above can be generalised: particular forms of qualitative content analysis- the recurring structures

found in media language (eg. Morley 1976), the structures and connotations of vocabularies (eg. Glasgow University Media Group op cit), the premises or frameworks which media language is based on or presupposes (eg. Brunsdon & Morley op cit, Hall 1973a, Hall et al 1976), the ideas/images which inform and structure content (eg. Hall et al 1978)- would not necessarily be irrelevant to the analysis of explicit argumentative processes but would not in themselves identify the various features of these processes or the way in which they combine to produce a multi-faceted overall process; they would by definition identify only those processes which they identify.³ For the purposes of this research what is required is a form of qualitative content analysis which identifies the ways in which various features combine to produce a multi-faceted, overall and explicit argumentative process; in particular, it is necessary to provide procedures for validating interpretations and strategies which clearly and rigorously breakdown or follow the evolution of relevant argumentative processes.

QUALITATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS: PROCEDURES AND STRATEGIES

As indicated there is a sense in which qualitative content analysis is just a collective name for a variety of analyses of different kinds and levels of form/content. However, the basic procedure adopted- and the one adopted in this research- is the provision of a series of analyses which are supported by references to and analyses of extracts from the texts being analysed. The length of the extracts, the extent to which every analysis is supported by explicit references to extracts and the complexity and kinds of references to and analyses of extracts varies considerably, but the general strategy is to support analyses via references to and analyses of extracts.⁴ Hall (1975) proposes a particular kind of extract based analysis but also highlights the essential features of the method. He contrasts "literary-critical, linguistic and stylistic methods..." (p. 15) and quantitative content analysis:

"Both methods are based on a long preliminary soak, a submission by the analyst to the mass of his material... content analysis uses this process... to define categories and build a code... whereas literary, stylistic and linguistic analysis uses (it)... to select representative examples which can be more intensively analysed. The error

is to assume that... (the latter)... is merely intuitive and unreliable. Literary/linguistic types of analysis also employ evidence: they point, in detail, to the text on which an interpretation... is based; they indicate more briefly the fuller supporting or contextual evidence which lies to hand; they take into account material which modifies or disproves the hypotheses...."

(ibid p. 15)

To avoid confusion: Hall is not referring to the kind of linguistic analysis discussed in the last section, he is suggesting that the complexities of textual processes can be examined via qualitative analyses of the kind associated with traditional literary criticism. In so doing he identifies the method and validation technique which is used but not always explicitly stated in a lot of qualitative analyses of media language (see footnotes³⁺₄): namely, the provision of detailed analyses of extracts from texts which indicate in detail why, how and in what ways a particular interpretation is valid, the extent to which the evidence supports it, the extent to which interpretations have to be modified or abandoned, and so on. Clearly, this kind of method would be a good way of analysing the complexities of argumentative processes. For example, a representation of S7 which merged a breakdown and analysis of the structure of the text would display the details of the argumentative processes and be warrantable in the ways indicated; specifically, readers could check and inspect detailed analyses of the original text.

More specifically, this research will adopt the unusual strategy of providing analyses which are based on explicit and public references to the whole text as opposed to extracts from it. This is desirable because only this procedure can allow a comprehensive inspection of the validity of analyses.⁵ This may seem a strange claim. One possible objection is that the scientific community is governed by norms which require honesty and integrity, consequently an opportunity to check analyses against whole texts is only necessary when there are good reasons for believing that some kind of deliberate misinterpretation has occurred; when, as is usual, deliberate misinterpretation is not an issue detailed analyses of extracts are sufficient. Another objection is that the 'extract method' provides detailed analyses of representative extracts, summaries of the whole

and general statements about the forms and contents of texts; analyses, summaries and statements which indicate in detail how, why and in what ways hypotheses are valid/invalid. Hence there is no significant difference between detailed analyses of representative extracts and detailed analyses of whole texts. However, if analysts provide access to complete copies of all the texts and detailed analyses which literally take the reader through the text and clearly demonstrate in detail how, why and in what ways hypotheses are valid/invalid, then it should be possible to establish a body of empirical findings whose status is absolutely clear. This is not to naively assume that all questions are unequivocally empirical, that texts have a single unequivocal meaning, that findings are irrefutable or that there is no relation between particular findings and particular theoretical concerns/perspectives. It is simply to say that given an operationalised approach/hypothesis (ie. production/re-production) and a concern with argumentative processes which are not just features of particular parts of texts, then the best way to proceed is to take the reader through the whole text and... (see above). The use of this method facilitates a clear specification of the basis of the analyses; that is how, why and in what ways they were arrived at and are valid. True it would be possible for readers to propose analyses other than those relevant to the hypothesis but the basis of the analyses made should be clear.

It might be argued that the proposed method does not fulfil crucial requirements. Given, so the argument might run, a practical procedure for breaking down, following and taking the reader through the text (see next section), a crucial question remains unanswered- what is the theoretical basis of the method? Is the validation of analyses, as opposed to practical procedures for establishing them, simply a matter of inter-subjective agreement? If so how can the analyst claim to have accurately identified lay encodings and invited decodings? If there is no more particular validation procedure then is it not better to use methods which have a clear external reference point (ie. linguistic methods)? The concept of members competence can be used to address these issues.⁶ A working definition of the concept is: lay authors and lay and professional readers

are members of the same linguistic community in that they can understand the meaning of ordinary (ie. non-technical) language, this shared knowledge or linguistic competence makes the successful encoding and decoding of preferred meaning possible. Lay authors (ie. editors) can encode meanings which invite lay readers to decode texts in particular ways, and lay readers can decode in the way intended and professional readers (ie. sociologists) can recognise these preferences because authors and lay/professional readers are, at a certain level and in a certain way, members of the same language community. In a sense this argument is unproblematic. As Hall (1973a) has pointed out while there is some evidence for literal misunderstandings of texts, the fact of the matter is that there is a clear and obvious sense in which the majority of readers can understand what is being preferred because they are familiar with the norms of ordinary language. However, the use of the concept of shared linguistic competence and the assumption of a language community have to be qualified. Firstly, it is not the case that all the analyses or all aspects of the analyses will necessarily refer to knowledge common to lay authors and lay/professional readers. For example, if the analyst identifies reasoned adjudications between competing arguments which involve the analysis of a THEY who threaten OUR national interests, then he is in part identifying an argumentative form/rhetorical device which may not be visible to lay authors and readers. Readers may not argue that the author is using a form of argument which is powerful because it constructs a THEY; similarly, lay authors may not say 'I will use this form of argument in order to...'. However, the way in which readers are invited to read texts is a major concern. If stocks of knowledge are quasi-scientific and are powerful because they are quasi-scientific then ipso facto readers must be in a position to argue, legitimate and defend in a quasi-scientific manner. For example, readers may not be in a position to argue that the identification of a THEY is a powerful argumentative form but they must be in a position to argue that their stock of knowledge is compelling because it is clearly the case that X threatens the national interests. Clearly, from the point of view of this research, while the nature of lay stocks of knowledge is a crucial issue analyses will not be

limited to the articulation of lay competence.

Given a concern with lay stocks of knowledge (ie. as opposed to aspects of lay stocks of knowledge which may or may not be visible or apparent to lay authors and readers) then the articulation of shared competence will be the theoretical basis of the determination of meaning. As suggested there is an obvious sense in which this is unproblematic. For example, the argument that strikers have often damaged the economy is, because of shared competence, understandable as the argument that... . The meaning of this argument may be unclear in the sense that the extent of generalisation involved in 'often' is uncertain. However, we could not, for example, refer to the linguistic form of the argument to clarify this matter nor could we refer to the number of times the word 'often' occurs. The fact that the argument is essentially transactive or that it occurs a certain number of times tells us nothing about the extent of generalisation. The fact that we could count the number of times the argument that strikers damage the economy occurs is beside the point: the 'often' argument is a qualitative generalisation and counting the number of more particular arguments itself involves recognising these arguments as arguments that... . The argument is understandable and the extent of generalisation determinable only by reference to shared competence (ie. competence suggests that 'often' means that damage is common and not atypical). As suggested the argument that other methods are superior is essentially an argument about practical strategies. If qualitative or quantitative formalisations of texts have, from the point of view of this research, to be supplemented and ultimately validated by qualitative interpretations then, practical strategies aside, analyses of preferred meanings involve qualitative analyses which are possible because of shared competence.

This raises the second point: namely, that while there is a sense in which language is shared, competences and language communities may be specific. As Hall (ibid) argues without some kind of shared competence or general language community communication would be impossible, but this does not necessarily mean that different cultures, groups or subgroups share the same codes and competences. Indeed as Morley (SP. No. 9) has

argued there may be significant variations within particular subgroups. That competence/language is specific in the sense suggested and that this is a legitimate/worthy object of investigation is undeniable. However, in the case of this research the issue is not particularly relevant. Given the general powerful influence of newspaper language, the more specific power/influence which stems from a demonstrably successful relationship with a community of readers and the reference to and re-use of familiar, well established knowledge, then it is not unreasonable to posit a language shared by lay authors and readers. This is not to say that all aspects of popular newspaper language are consistent with all the competences of all their regular readers or that it is not mediated by specific competences/languages; it is simply to say that the section of public opinion which the newspapers regularly and successfully influence will be competent in the norms of ordinary language which the newspaper uses. The decoding of the language- the possibility that it is mediated by specific competences/languages- is a separate issue (see pp. 8-11) in the sense that, literal misunderstandings apart, the majority of non-preferred decodings or mediations are not the result of misunderstandings of language but rather ^{involve} different responses to what is said (eg. "negotiated" or "oppositional" decodings, Hall 1973a, 1973b, Morley 1980a). Moreover, popular newspapers are public mediums and must therefore be rooted in public norms of ordinary language; consequently, they will not be incomprehensible to the majority of non-regular readers or to professional text analysts. Given a certain level of literacy and the competence which stems from socialisation analysts can familiarise themselves with the forms and contents of popular newspapers and publicly demonstrate preferred meanings. This is not to say that popular newspapers do not use language in distinctive ways only that because of the essentially public nature of the language particular usages will be visible and comprehensible to analysts. Hence while there is a sense in which the assumption of a shared language is problematic it is by no means unwarranted, and does not involve a denial of the specificity of competence or the possibility of the mediation of the language by competences/languages (again see pp. 8-11).

True, in the last instance, the analyst can never be certain that he/she has completely and exhaustively identified the relevant preferred meanings; unless he/she is a genuine member of a community (ie. utterly familiar with and immersed in any particular usages) there will always be an element of doubt. However, in the case of modern popular newspapers there are no serious problems; they are not, for example, historical, esoteric or specialist texts. Moreover, as suggested, more 'formal' methods would involve a similar element of doubt in that, at least from the point of view of this research, they would involve qualitative interpretation.

PRACTICAL PROCEDURES

The above has suggested that for the purposes of this research a qualitative analysis of the relevant complexities of the whole is more efficient than quantitative or qualitative formalisations; that the general theoretical basis of the method is the articulation of shared competence; that qualitative analyses of the whole should and can be rigorous and public. The validity of the method is dependent on the provision of a clear and rigorous practical procedure for analysing the whole text; a procedure (s) which is sensitive to the relevant complexities of texts and which clearly/rigorously demonstrates to the reader the validity or otherwise of the operationalised hypothesis. The following are the essential practical components of the method.

1. A necessary, though not sufficient, component is the quoting of parts of the editorials and the provision of analyses of these parts. To give a simple example. In S7 (see appendix one) the author begins by suggesting that "THANK HEAVEN that Home Secretary Willie Whitelaw has had the guts to demand that the law should be enforced against steel strike pickets who go too far" (S7:2). An analysis of this part would be- This part suggests to the reader that the Home Secretary has rightly asked for the law to be enforced against steel strike pickets. This analyst has used competence to provide this reading and has assumed that shared competence is such that readers will see its validity. In other words it is assumed that the analyst's task is complete, a reading which articulates shared competence has been offered for inter-

subjective validation. If the analyst had felt that the reading was insufficiently grounded, he would have provided further support and would not have stopped providing support until he was satisfied that claims were clear, justified and well supported. He could, to give a simple example, have added either of the following: has rightly (ie. "THANK HEAVEN..." = rightly); has rightly (ie. "THANK HEAVEN..."). These additions provide further support by indicating that rightly is a correct reading because competent readers will equate THANK HEAVEN and rightly.

The above is a very simple example but it demonstrates general principles. The analyst will support claims about quoted parts; the type and extent of support will vary but the principle is that the support clearly indicates the nature, basis and validity of readings.

2. The provision of analyses of isolated parts is, of course, insufficient. It seems reasonable that the argumentative processes relevant to this research tend to evolve in a linear manner; that is, the first two parts reveal more of the meaning of the overall process than the first part taken in isolation, the first three more than the first two, the first four... . This is not to adhere to a crude ontology of texts it is simply to make what seems intuitively to be a generally valid assumption. Given this, except in special circumstances, the initial quote will be the first part of an editorial or a combination of early parts; analyses of the first part (s) will be followed by analyses of subsequent parts. These later analyses will add to and develop the earlier ones; later analyses continue an unfinished analysis and the end result is an analysis of the whole. Obviously the precise way in which analyses are built up will vary but quote/analysis/quote/analysis/quote/analysis is the basic format. In addition where necessary summaries and reviews of analyses will be provided (ie. half way through an editorial, at the end of an editorial, when the contents of one editorial have to be related to other contents).

3. To quote and analyse every single part of 71 editorials, even if several parts are often quoted together, would be impractical. The analyses would not be endless but they would be extremely

cumbersome. Hence on occasions parts of parts (ie. words, phrases or sentences) or whole parts will not be quoted. It might be argued that this runs counter to the principles of the method. The analyst must work through and take the reader through the whole part by part otherwise the basis and validity of analyses of overall argumentative processes will be uncertain. However, the vast majority of parts will be fully or almost fully quoted, only those parts which do not contribute significantly to the overall process will be omitted and readers will be aware of what has been omitted and can therefore check judgments about significant contribution. Moreover, the analyses will involve working through the whole, except in very special and notified circumstances parts will not be treated in isolation from the context in which they occur.

4. Analyses will, of course, be made from the point of view of the approach/operationalised hypothesis, see p. 28 for the division of labour between chapters 3,4,5,6,7.

5. What follows is an extended illustration of 1-5, it consists of an analysis of one of the Express editorials.

In E2 (see appendix one) the author begins by suggesting that "THE PROPOSED elimination of 52,000 jobs in the steel industry is a shocker. It will affect all the major steel-making centres... especially South Wales, where bitter memories of the grim 1930s are already being revived" (E2:2). This part suggests to the reader that the prospect of lost jobs is disturbing (ie. "...shocker...") because steel communities will be adversely affected. In the next part it is suggested that "Nor is this the end of the story. Sir Charles Villiers is thinking in terms of a further 20,000 redundancies. Obviously Bill Sirs, whose Iron and Steel Trades Confederation will bear the brunt..., has got to fight his corner" (E2:3). This part further emphasises the issue of lost jobs and invites the reader to see a critical trade union response (ie. fighting a corner) as understandable (ie. "obviously..."). The author proceeds by qualifying this invitation: "But what, in fact, can he do? There is certainly a case for the view that British Steel management has been bad and short-sighted over the years... (but) there is too much... plant which will never be profitable

again... If the industry is to be in future viable, then all this has to be cut out" (E2:4-E2:5). In the light of the earlier parts these parts suggest that while a critical trade union response is understandable there is nothing that can be done, viability is the important thing and depends on a cut in jobs (ie. cutting unprofitable plants= cutting jobs).

The overall intention in E2:2-E2:5 seems to be to suggest to readers that those who are concerned about lost jobs must adopt a realistic attitude; that is, accept that viability is the issue and that lost jobs are inevitable. In the rest of the editorial the author reinforces and develops this argument. It is suggested that "In short, what we have is a hard and ruthless operation designed to make our steel industry internationally competitive... these painful changes... should have been made gradually... . But as happens all too often in British industry, necessary changes are not made until they have to be put through in a desperate rush and in the worst possible economic conditions... Sir Charles Villiers is right to concentrate production... in only the most modern plants, with strictly rational manning levels. Strike action over the 2 per cent pay offer- or days of protest- can make no difference. And the story of British Steel will be the story of other British industries in the next few years" (E2:6-E2:8). These parts suggest that painful changes are necessary and that attempts to challenge or resist them are pointless/unrealistic because only these changes can ensure future viability. They also invite the reader to make generalisations, ie. delayed changes are typical of British industry and necessary/painful changes will have to be made in other industries. Moreover, there is some re-production of knowledge involved in the suggestion "But as happens all too often in British industry, necessary changes are...". This invites the reader to equate past and present, re-demonstrates that in British industry necessary changes are often delayed. However, it is not a particularly strong appeal to a series of confirming instances and there is no evidence for re-production in the other parts of E2; they offer particular arguments about, to use a general term, the steel industry. True the suggestion that "...the story of British Steel will be the story of other British industries in the next few years" offers the reader a

non-specific argument but it does not re-produce knowledge. It does, however, lay the basis for future re-productions, (ie. the author's future comments could fulfil his/her current predictions).

The above simply illustrates the bare bones of the method and procedure, in practice the analysis would be part of a series of analyses and the various forms and contents would be described and commented/elaborated on in various ways (see, p. 28 for division of labour). This may seem an extremely tedious method; however, given the approach (ie. the details of the specifics of certain argumentative processes), the need for a clear and rigorous procedure which fulfills the requirements of the operationalised approach/hypothesis and validates analyses, and the benefits to be gained from a rigorous/public examination of the whole then it is both worthwhile and necessary.

FOOTNOTES

1. The presentational features of this example are used in the actual analyses. Each editorial has a letter, a main number and qualifying numbers preceded by colons. The letter is the initial letter of the newspaper (ie. S), the main number identifies a whole editorial in a chronological sequence (ie. S1, S2, S3...), the qualifying numbers refer to the parts of a particular editorial (ie. S7:1, S7:2, S7:3, S7:4...). In all cases the parts are naturally occurring paragraphs, ie. they faithfully reflect the editor's paragraphing of his/her text.
2. This is not to say that there are no correlations or that the issue of correlations- and the use of linguistic methods in general- cannot be fruitfully pursued and developed. As will become apparent the argument is simply that from the point of view of this research the absence of one-to-one correlations means that linguistic methods are less efficient.
3. This may seem an obvious statement. However, there is a sense in which qualitative content analysis is just a general label for a variety of analyses of different kinds and levels of form/content. For example, Brunson & Morley op cit, Chibnall op cit, Cohen op cit, Connell op cit, Glasgow University Media Group op cit, Hall 1973a, Hall et al 1976, 1978, Morley 1976, Smith et al 1975- are all works which either employ qualitative methods or have a significant qualitative dimension, but the theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches employed lead to a variety of analyses of forms/contents. As suggested many of these strategies are relevant to this research but to adopt a priori a particular strategy or collection of strategies would not necessarily produce a method which efficiently facilitated a consideration of the various features of the explicit argumentative processes. Hence, for example, the premises and images found in the editorials may be important features but may not be the only ones and may interact with others. Consequently, a more general strategy for 'seeing what is empirically involved in the process^{es}' is required.
4. Examples of work adopting this strategy are those given above. However, it must be stressed that in practice they provide various kinds of analyses: the 'extract method' is the basic procedure/principle. Anderson and Sharrock's (op cit) critique of "radical media/cultural studies" (ibid p. 367) involves extensive criticism of this method. (NB. footnote 1. to their article indicates that by this term they mean virtually all the analyses of content referred to in this research). More specifically, for example, they suggest that the work in question ignores the forms and contexts in which extracts appear and selectively analyses extracts which do not reveal the meaning of the whole. Murdock's (1980) reply persuasively argues that they misrepresent the work in question; for example, while the detail of the analyses and extracts varies

it is extremely difficult to see the validity of the claim that texts are crudely used "...in illustrative service of preconceived themes." (ibid p. 373) Examples of very detailed usages of the extract method include Brunsdon & Morley op cit, Glasgow University Media Group op cit, esp. vol. 2, Smith et al op cit.

5. This is not to argue that this procedure is a necessary condition for any valid analysis, but rather- as will become apparent- that in the case of this research it is the basis of a clear and rigorous analysis. In the light of footnote four a **related** point is that the adoption of it means that disputes about the representativeness of extracts and the ways in which analyses were arrived at could be avoided, or at least minimised.
6. This concept is associated with ethnomethodology and is thereby linked to a particular set of theoretical/methodological concerns, assumptions and arguments. The argument which follows detaches it from this particular tradition and simply suggests that an atheoretical version of the concept is central to the proposed method. Whether or not ethnomethodologists would sanction this neutralised usage is irrelevant. From the point of view of this research the point is that some important remarks can be 'borrowed' and put in a more general context (Atkinson & Drew 1979 & Turner 1974 are the sources drawn on).

CHAPTER THREE

THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY: THE ECONOMICS OF THE
STEEL STRIKEINTRODUCTORY COMMENT

Four of the newspapers offer a consideration of what can be called the "economics of the steel strike" (e.g. the merits and effects of the steelworkers' pay claim, the economic consequences of the steel strike, the relationship between the strike and the economic fortunes of the steel industry, the relationship between the pay claim, the strike and the Government's economic and industrial policy).¹ In a sense this is not a very satisfactory category; it draws together a number of diverse arguments and economic perspectives. Moreover, different newspapers emphasise different issues to different extents. However, there are a number of editorials which, in general terms, invite a consideration of the economic dimensions of the steel strike.² This chapter examines these editorials (see appendix two). Each newspaper will be analysed in turn.

DAILY EXPRESS OPINION

Under the heading "This winter's bumpy ride" (E1:1), the Express introduces the steel strike to readers by suggesting that "LAST WEEK saw us jumping out of the miners' frying pan into the steel workers' fire" (E1:2).³ It is then suggested that "The short-lived euphoria over the miners' settlement- despite the fact that it was at a dangerously high 20 per cent- has been followed by anxiety over a possible steel strike that would paralyse much of British industry" (E1:3). These introductory

parts invite the reader to see the threatened steel strike in the context of the settlement of the miners' pay claim. They suggest to the reader that pay claims past and present can be understood as problems (i.e. frying pan into the fire). This is a re-production of knowledge in the sense that the author is suggesting that knowledge about a past event (i.e. the miners' settlement) can be applied to a recent event (i.e. the steelworkers' pay claim/threatened strike). The suggestion is that the general argument- pay claims are problems- can be applied to both events (i.e. E1:4 clearly suggests that a disputed pay claim is the cause of the threatened strike). True it is not necessarily the case that the author is suggesting that all pay claims can be understood in this way, he/she is only equating one past and one recent event (i.e. two pay claims not pay claims in general). However, there is some re-production of knowledge. Clearly, to suggest that the pay claim/threatened strike can be understood as similar to the miners' pay settlement is to produce knowledge by re-producing knowledge. Readers are invited to understand a past and a recent event in terms of the same knowledge, to see the similarities between past and present.

The author proceeds by suggesting that negotiations in the steel dispute have not reached an advanced stage (E1:4) and that despite the findings of a survey recent pay claims and settlements are high (E1:5-E1:6). It is then suggested that "The Government has always known that it would have to keep its seat belts tightly fastened during this winter's bumpy ride of wage claims" (E1:7). This part, as does the title- "This winter's bumpy ride" (E1:1)- suggests that the Express has formulated a number of wage claims as problems (i.e. not just the miners' and the steelworkers' claims). To suggest that the Government knows it has to resist this winter's bumpy ride of wage claims is to suggest that there have been potentially problematic (i.e. "...bumpy ride...") wage

claims in previous winters. To suggest this in the context of the steelworkers pay claim/threatened strike is to suggest that the steelworkers' claim is the latest of this particular winter's problematic claims. Clearly, the phrase "...this winter's bumpy ride of wage claims" invites the generalisation- pay claims are problems. More specific phrases would be: during this winter there will be...; in the next two months...; the steelworker's pay claim is... . The author does not indicate the time period covered by this generalisation. However, it is clear that he/she is suggesting that there have been a series of winters characterised by problematic pay claims. Hence it would seem that the Express is understanding the steelworkers' pay claim/threatened strike by drawing on a stock of knowledge about wage claims. Readers are invited to see the threatened steel strike as the latest in a series of events which demonstrate the validity of the knowledge that wage claims are problems.

Four suggestions indicate the reasons why the author regards wage claims as problematic: the suggestion that "... the miners' settlement... was... a dangerously high 20 per cent..." (E1:3); the suggestion that "... a possible steel strike would paralyse much of British industry" (E1:3); the suggestion that "... as the Chancellor has said, the present 18 per cent average of pay settlements can only lead to hundreds of bankruptcies and hundreds of thousands unemployed" (E1:6); and the suggestion that "... if our economic performance is to improve significantly within the next six months, it is crucial not only that pay rises moderate but that public spending and monetary growth are brought under control now" (E1:9). The significant feature of all these suggestions is that they seem to offer local as opposed to re-produced knowledge; that is, they involve specific arguments about specific events (i.e. the miners' settlement... , a possible steel strike... , the present

18 per cent... , ... within the next six months...).⁴

In other words in E1 there is no re-production of knowledge about why wage claims are problematic, only a re-production of the knowledge that they are problematic. True the reader can use the argument that wage claims sometimes lead to strikes and the argument that high wage claims adversely effect industry, employment and economic performance to consider the nature of the wage claim problem but there is no evidence that this is re-produced knowledge. There is, for example, no invitation to adopt a historical perspective on economic performance or the relationship between wage levels and employment.

Hence the only firm conclusion which can be drawn from the analysis of E1 is that the Express draws on a stock of knowledge about wage claims to provide an understanding of the steelworkers wage claim which suggests that it, like some previous wage claims, can be understood as a problem. In E3:8 the threatened steel strike is formulated in the following way "Certainly the prospect of beginning another New Year with another crippling industrial dispute can dent the spirit of even the most invincible optimist".⁵ This part suggests to the reader that the steel strike would be the latest (i.e. another) in a series of crippling New Year industrial disputes. In so doing it re-produces the knowledge that the New Year is often characterised by problematic (i.e. crippling) industrial disputes. Clearly, the author is not providing new knowledge but understanding the steel strike in terms of the old knowledge that crippling industrial disputes often occur in the New Year. Readers are invited to understand the steel strike in these terms and thereby to re-affirm a stock of knowledge. More generally, in the light of E1 readers are reminded that the winter/New Year is the time when the wage claim/ industrial dispute problem recurs.

The use of a stock knowledge about the industrial disputes problem is also a feature of E4. The author

begins by suggesting that "TODAY Britain could begin the 1980s with the most disastrous industrial dispute since the coal strikes of 1974. A long drawn out steel strike could cripple British industry if it is accompanied by action from the train drivers... and... dockers..." (E4:2-E4:3). These parts suggest to the reader that the steel strike is the latest in a series of disastrous industrial disputes and, given certain conditions, potentially the most disastrous in the series (i.e. the phrase "...most disastrous..." suggests that disputes past and present have been/are more or less disastrous; the argument that effective secondary industrial action would make the steel strike crippling suggests that it is potentially the most disastrous dispute). Clearly, in E4:2-E4:3 the author is drawing the reader's attention to the similarities between the past and the present, reproducing the knowledge that industrial disputes are problematic because they have disastrous effects on industry. The invitation to place the steel strike in a historical context is continued in the suggestion that "There will, however, be one important difference between a steel strike and the coal strike, not to mention the "winter of discontent" of last year. There will be no General Election this year. The Government will not fall" (E4:4). While this part announces a difference between a steel strike and previous strikes it also invites readers to consider a similarity. Namely, that one aspect of disastrous disputes is that they are threats to Governments. To suggest that the difference between a steel strike and previous strikes is that the Government will not fall is to suggest that a steel strike like some previous strikes would be a threat to a Government (i.e. something which brings the Government down). Clearly, the fact that the author suggests that in practice the steel strike will not effect the Government does not falsify the knowledge that strikes are often threats to Governments.

Taking E3 and E4:2-E4:4 together it would seem that the Express has a stock of knowledge about industrial disputes which suggests that they are threats to Governments and are problems because they have disastrous/crippling effects on industry. Readers are invited to see the steel strike as the latest in a series of events which demonstrate the validity of this stock of knowledge. In E4 the author proceeds by inviting the reader to consider in detail the economics of the steelworker's wage claim. It is suggested that the situation testing the Government's nerve is that despite the fact that the steel industry loses approximately £1 million a day "... the steelworkers are demanding a wage increase of around 17 per cent- which is the going rate of inflation" (E4:5). It is then suggested that "The money is not there. Only if the Government printed more money, or raided the taxpayer, could more cash be produced. It will not happen. Why should it? Most people's wages are limited by what their firm or industry can actually earn. Why should the steelworkers occupy a privileged position? (E4:6-E4:7). These parts suggest to the reader that the best approach to the steelworkers wage claim is to tie a wage increase to earning power and to refuse to allow unearned increases (i.e. one's which are paid for by printing money or by providing taxpayer's money). This recommended approach to the steelworkers' wage claim is reinforced in the suggestion that "... the assumption that their living standard should be maintained- as some sort of God-given right- irrespective of the real economic value of what they produce, is wholly unreal" (E4:8). The use of the phrase "Most people's wages..." suggests that the author is inviting generalisation, suggesting that tying wages to earning power/the real economic value of the product should be a general principle rather than a specific response to a specific wage claim (i.e. a principle which should be applied to all, or at least most, wage claims not just to the steelworker's claim).

To suggest that the steelworkers should not be privileged in the sense that their wages, like most people's, should be tied to earning power is to suggest that tying wages to earning power is the best approach to wages in general. That the author considers the recommended approach to the steelworkers' wage claim to be an appropriate approach to wages in general is confirmed by the suggestion that "The world is not like that. And Britain has got to learn that lesson if it is ever to pull itself up again" (E4:9). In the light of E4:6-E4:8 this part suggests to readers that the country's fortunes will only improve if it is realised that wages have to be related to the real economic value of the product. Put another way it suggests that providing unearned wages/maintaining living standards regardless of the value of the product is unrealistic and will prevent an improvement in the country's fortunes.

The overall intention in E4:5-E4:9 seems to be to suggest that the steelworkers' wage claim is unrealistic and contradicts the principle that wages should be related to earning power/the real economic value of the product. Clearly, in so suggesting the author seems to be proposing a general approach to wages and, at least by implication a general economic strategy (i.e. the implication of the suggestion that accepting the recommended general approach to wages will enable Britain to "... pull itself up again" is that economic success for Britain depends on the application of the wages tied to earning power principle). However, while the author clearly seems to be understanding the steelworkers' wage claim by proposing a general approach to wages and a general economic strategy, there is no evidence that this involves a re-production of knowledge. True the author's argument is not a local one, however, the invited generalisation does not seem to be a re-produced generalisation. There is, for example, no clear invitation to adopt a historical perspective on the relationship between wages and earning power.

Taken in isolation the argument about the effects of a long steel strike in E4:10 also lack a re-productive dimension. It is suggested that "A long strike would not only damage British industry in general. It will hit the long term future of the steel industry. Some plants that close may never re-open." While this part seems to offer local knowledge it is a re-production of knowledge in the sense that it re-affirms knowledge by specifying two of the ways in which the steel strike could be disastrous/crippling. In the two concluding parts of E4 it is suggested that "Many recent industrial disputes have shown how long it takes for workers to make up again the wages that were lost. In short, everybody will lose. Is it too late for rationality to come in and take over" (E4:11-E4:12). The first of these parts reminds readers that industrial disputes adversely affect workers. The second, via the suggestion that everybody loses, draws together the suggestions that industry in general, the steel industry and the steelworkers will be adversely affected by a long strike. While the first part is re-productive in the sense that it points to a similarity between previous strikes and the steel strike, it may not be a significant part of the Express' stock of knowledge. This is so because the claim that it takes workers a long time to make up lost wages seems to be used to provide support for the claim that everybody loses, it is not, or does not seem to be, an intrinsically important argument but rather a argument which provides support for another argument. However, the argument is re-productive.

In E4 the fact that workers in a loss making industry were demanding a high wage increase was formulated as "...a test of the Government's nerve" (E4:5). A similar formulation is found in E5. It is suggested that the picketing/secondary industrial action which is taking place cannot be justified but is, until a Bill becomes law, legal (E5:2-E5:5). It is then suggested that "In the meantime, we can expect to see picketing employed

ruthlessly in support of the steelworkers' industrial action... it seems certain that they are on to a loser. The Government, which could easily step in to provide more cash, appears to be determined to sit it out whatever the cost" (E5:6-E5:7). The author proceeds by suggesting that a General Election is not imminent, that the Government has a big majority and that "... it is clear that Mrs. Thatcher and Sir Keith Joseph can hold out longer than can the steelworkers- provided they keep their nerve" (E5:8). These parts re-affirm the knowledge that the steel strike, like previous strikes, is a threat to the Government of the day, a threat which this particular Government can resist. As in E4 the Express' stock of knowledge is given a local modification. The author is suggesting that while the knowledge that strikes threaten Governments is still valid the current Government can resist the threat. The references to picketing/secondary industrial action in the earlier parts of E5 suggest that these activities are one of the means by which strikers threaten Governments. A lot of the Express editorials refer to this kind of activity. These editorials are analysed fully in the next chapter. For the moment it is sufficient to briefly consider the references in E4 and E8. In the first case it is suggested that effective secondary industrial action could make the steel strike a crippling dispute (E4:3), the most "... disastrous... dispute since the coal strikes of 1974" (E4:2). In the second case it is suggested that various forms of industrial action (E8:8) can be used to "... lawfully, mount a blockade against the country's economic life far more severe than anything imagined... by Hitler's U-boats..." (E8:7). Clearly, for the Express industrial action, to use a general term, is considered to be one of the means by which strikers threaten Governments and damage industry/the economy.

Having suggested that the Government can resist the threat posed by the steel strike the author proceeds by

suggesting that "What will happen to a virtually bankrupt steel industry in the meantime is another matter. How many jobs will be left when all this is over?

Productivity in the steel industry may not be as low as has been made out, because the French and Germans do the sums on a different basis from us. Even so, the £1,000,000-a-day losses of the British Steel Corporation show that the industry is simply not earning the money to pay the wages that are being demanded" (E5:9-E5:11). These parts re-affirm knowledge by specifying one of the ways in which the steel strike has damaging effects and suggest that regardless of arguments about productivity figures the fact is that the principle that the steelworkers wages have to be related to the earning power of their industry applies.

These issues are also raised in E6. The author begins by suggesting that the steel strike will probably escalate into a dispute which involves non-steel unions (E6:2-E6:3) and a general confrontation between the TUC and the Government (E6:5). It is then suggested that trade union action not a Government U turn is responsible for this situation (E6:6-E6:7). The author proceeds by inviting a focus on the economics of the steel strike. It is suggested that "Through the increasing confusion and complication of the dispute, one thing stands like a stone. Because of the dramatic collapse of the world steel market and its resultant inability to pay off its debts, the Steel Corporation is, to all intents and purposes, bankrupt. It simply has not got the money to pay its employees more if they do not earn their pay rises by increased productivity. Nor can the Government afford to keep on subsidising industries that do not break even or make a profit. The unions are surely capable of understanding the fundamental economic sense of this- and so of ending a strike that is a gift to our foreign competitors while crippling further our declining industries, like steel" (E6:7-E6:12). As well as re-affirming the Express' stock of knowledge about the

damaging effects of strikes these parts prefer a particular economic theory; namely, that the steel-workers have to earn their pay rises via productivity and that the Government should not subsidise industries which are not viable. There are no indications that this knowledge about pay rises and loss-making industries is re-produced knowledge. It would seem that in E6, as in E4, the author is providing a local analysis which stresses that it is important to earn wages and not to use subsidies. True in E6, as in E4, there is some invitation to generalise (i.e. "... subsidise industries...") but this generalisation does not involve the re-production of knowledge.

Clearly, there is a relationship between the re-produced and non-re-produced knowledge found in the Express. For example, in E4 it is suggested that the situation testing the Government is that an unearned wage increase is being claimed (E4:5-E4:7); in E5 it is suggested that the Government can resist the option of providing unearned cash (E5:7-E5:8); and in E1 it is suggested that high wage claims adversely effect industry, employment and the country's economic performance (E1:6 and E1:9). Clearly, in these parts non-re-produced knowledge re-affirms the re-produced knowledge that wage claims are a problem and/or the re-produced knowledge that industrial disputes adversely effect industry/the economy and threaten Governments. However, as has been demonstrated, there is no evidence to suggest that the Express' preferred economic theory- that is, the viability of particular industries, industry generally and the nation is dependent on a refusal to allow subsidies and a close relationship between wages, productivity and earning power- is re-produced knowledge. A relevant point here is that the analysis of E2 in chapter two indicated that the author is inviting the argument that the necessary changes designed to make the steel industry viable (e.g. closing

uneconomic plants, concentrating production in modern plants, having rational manning levels) will have to be made in other industries (E2:8). This argument reaffirms some of the main dimensions of the Express' preferred economic theory and suggests that if industries are to be viable this theory will have to be applied in the future. It will be recalled that a similar suggestion is made in E4: namely, that the country's economic fortunes will only improve if it is realised that wages have to be related to the real economic value of the product (E4:8-E4:9). This kind of suggestion can be seen as an initial step in the formation of a future stock of knowledge. Given that the author is preferring a particular economic theory and indicating the desirability of applying this theory in the future it follows that this theory is a good candidate for inclusion in a future stock of knowledge.

The Express' existing stock of knowledge primarily consists of the knowledge that past and present are similar because wage claims are problems and because industrial disputes adversely effect industry/the economy and threaten Governments. This statement can be qualified in three ways. Firstly, as the analysis of E2 demonstrated, the author re-produces the knowledge that "... in British industry, necessary changes are not made until they have to be put through in a desperate rush and in the worst possible economic conditions" (E2:7). Secondly, E4:11 can be read as a re-production of the knowledge that industrial disputes involve a loss of earnings which is difficult to make up. Thirdly, the author points out that industrial action is one of the things which bring about the adverse effects associated with industrial disputes. There are no indications that the author is suggesting that some wage claims or industrial disputes cannot be understood in the terms provided by the stock of knowledge. Hence it seems reasonable to assume that he/she considers this

knowledge to be an adequate and comprehensive description of all wage claims and industrial disputes (i.e. all claims and disputes in the period covered by the stock of knowledge).

DAILY MAIL COMMENT

The Mail introduces readers to the threatened steel strike by suggesting that it is possible to have sympathy for the steelworkers. It is suggested that "You have to have a balance sheet, instead of a heart, not to feel some sympathy for the men who work in this industry" (MA1:3) The author proceeds by indicating reasons why it is possible to feel sympathy: jobs have been lost (MA1:4); more jobs may be lost (MA1:4); and they have been offered "... a mere 2 p.c." (MA1:6) pay rise. This invitation to see that it is possible to have sympathy for the steelworkers is followed by the suggestion that "So Mr. Bill Sirs, the moderate leader of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation, feels driven to stand and make a fight of it" (MA1:7). This part suggests to readers that the threatened strike is a reaction to lost jobs and a low pay offer. In the light of the invitation to "... feel some sympathy..." for the steelworkers the suggestion is that the threatened strike is an understandable reaction to adverse circumstances. The author proceeds by suggesting that "... the poor chap and his 85,000 members are not even fighting with their backs to the wall. Behind them is nothing except the abyss. It is suicide. Sheer suicide." (MA1:8-MA1:9). These parts suggest that while it is possible to have sympathy for the steelworkers a strike in their defence would be suicidal.

The author proceeds by indicating why strike action would be suicidal. It is suggested that "If they do succeed in shutting down the industry, losses currently running at £1 million a day will become even more cataclysmic. That, in turn, must mean even more redundan-

cies" (MA1:10). It is then suggested that even "... if a strike were to produce a substantial improvement in basic pay..." (MA1:11) there would be more redundancies: "One steelman's pay rise would be another steelman's one-way ticket to the dole queue. They can't win" (MA1:12). This formulation of the suicidal nature of the proposed strike defines it in terms of adverse effects (i.e. closing the industry leads to worsened financial losses and more redundancies) and suggests that even if the strike is "successful" the steelworkers' will still suffer. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the author is re-producing knowledge. Both MA1:10-MA1:12 and MA1:2-MA1:9 seem to be providing local knowledge, specific arguments about specific events (i.e. The proposed strike is suicidal. An improvement in basic pay will mean redundancies). There is no use and/or re-affirmation of a stock of knowledge: no reference to the past or to the similarities between the past and the present. Nor is there any evidence for the re-production of knowledge in the rest of the editorial. After referring to the possibility that many trade unionists may not want to be involved in a hopeless strike (MA1:13-MA1:15) the author suggests that "The hard truth is that there is only one way forward for British Steel: fewer men, many fewer men working more productively, far more productively" (MA1:16). It is then suggested that the low productivity of British steelworkers (MA1:17) is the reason "...why the steel corporation... is offering its workers next to nothing on basic pay, but up to 10 p.c. extra for those who can and will work more efficiently" (MA1:18). The author proceeds by suggesting that "It would be utterly dishonest, however, not to concede that improved productivity will also create yet more redundancies... For the world is in recession and already cluttered up with surplus steel nobody wants to buy" (MA1:19-MA1:20). Like the earlier parts these parts only make specific

arguments about the economics of the steelworker's pay claim and the steel industry, they lack any re-productive dimension. In the context of the earlier parts they suggest that while it is possible to have sympathy for the steelworkers the truth of the matter is that the realities of the "... balance sheet..." (MA1:3) have to be faced.⁶ For the Mail these realities are: that increased financial losses resulting from a strike would mean more redundancies; that increases in basic pay in a loss-making industry means increased redundancies; that the steel industry will only be viable when manning levels are reduced and productivity increased; that British steelworkers are relatively unproductive, consequently pay rises must be linked to increased productivity; that job losses are inevitable whatever happens.

The concluding parts of MA1 are as equally specific as the earlier parts. It is suggested that "Because, when times were not so bad, successive Governments could not summon up the courage to back the tough measures required to make British Steel viable and competitive, the painful changes are having to be pushed through now, when the economic weather is foul. A national steel strike will not avert these changes. It will only render them more traumatic" (MA1:22-MA1:22). Again, these parts seem to provide local knowledge about the economics of the steel strike. They suggest, in the light of the rest of the editorial, that while it is possible to have sympathy for the steelworkers the realities of the balance sheet make painful changes inevitable. Clearly, in MA1 there is no evidence to suggest that the author is re-producing knowledge. Readers are only invited to consider local arguments and knowledge.

Similarly, MA2 only provides local knowledge. The author begins by suggesting that the strike will

probably go ahead (MA2:2) and that the "... grievance is that British Steel's offer of a 2 p.c. rise is 'unrealistic'" (MA2:3). It is then suggested that the steelworkers "... are quite right, but not in the sense they mean. For, given the hopeless productivity of the British steelworkers, and the fact that the corporation is losing a million pounds a day, what is surely unrealistic is to offer any wage increase at all" (MA2:4-MA2:5). These parts re-affirm some of the arguments found in MA1. They suggest that low productivity and heavy financial losses make a low or zero offer inevitable. The author proceeds by suggesting "... what possible purpose will a strike in January serve? It can only result in reduced orders and, therefore, less jobs at a time when customers are few, and world steel capacity far exceeds the demand. The awful truth is that nobody owes the British Steel workers a living" (MA2:6-MA2:7). Like the earlier parts these parts re-affirm some of the arguments found in MA1 but are local arguments about the economics of the steel strike. In the terms of MA1 they suggest that the strike would be suicidal (i.e. lost jobs, reduced orders) and that the steelworkers have to earn a living through efficient production.

In general what emerges from MA1 and MA2 is the local knowledge that a high pay offer cannot be made and that a strike in support of higher pay is illegitimate because the steel industry is not functioning efficiently. Clearly, there is some continuity between MA1 and MA2 but no re-production of knowledge. There are, for example, no invitations to adopt a historical perspective on loss making industries, unrealistic pay claims, the relationship between pay and productivity or the need to earn a living.

There is, however, evidence for the re-production of knowledge in MA3 and MA4. In MA3:6-MA3:8 it is

suggested that "Already... the steel furnaces are being banked down and vast tracts of British industry are ringing the weeks on the calendar that could lead to crisis and closure by early February. There is a wintry sense of déjà vu... of, 'Oh God, here we go again'. What reason have we to think that the steelmen and other desperate and determined groups of trade unionists in the early 80s will not bury Mrs. Thatcher and her hopes of regenerating Britain as surely as the miners and the local authority workers saw off Ted Heath and Jim Callaghan in the 70s?"⁷ These parts suggest to the reader that the steel strike is potentially the latest in a series of strikes which have led to crisis/closure and which have been desperate/determined threats to elected Governments. Clearly, the use of the phrase "... here we go again..." invites readers to remember that strikes which lead to crisis/closure and which threaten Governments have occurred before, and to formulate the steel strike as another example of this kind of strike. This re-production of the knowledge that strikes threaten Governments and the viability of British industry suggests that this knowledge has been valid for a decade and may continue to be valid in the 1980s. The suggestion that Mrs. Thatcher may not be burnt (MA3:10) announces the welcome possibility that the Mail's knowledge may cease to be valid. Clearly, the praise for Mrs. Thatcher in MA3:10-MA3:14 suggests that the author does not want her and her hopes for regeneration burnt. Readers are expected to re-affirm a stock of knowledge and praise a person who may falsify the knowledge that trade unionists... .

In MA4 the author begins by suggesting "HUSTLE, bustle- what a busy, busy time it is for this country's scurrying trade union leaders" (MA4:2). He/she proceeds by suggesting that "Mr. Len Murray, lugubrious and self-important is here, there and everywhere. Liaison committees are being set up. Guidelines agreed.

International brotherhood invoked. Savour the moment. For this is one of those rare occasions when you can witness the Great British trade union movement acting with a sense of national purpose and a will to achieve a common goal... an 'own-goal'. The wrecking of the economy... the brothers... really do feel involved in the steel strike. They respond to the challenge of closing down furnaces and foundaries; of fighting to preserve unproductive jobs" (MA4:3-MA4:9). These parts provide general knowledge. The nature of this knowledge becomes clearer when MA4:3-MA4:9 are considered in the light of the concluding part. It is suggested that "Here mobilised, is a truly impressive display of that force for negative action which has the hallmark throughout the world of organised British labour. United they fail" (MA4:10). This part suggests that the actions of trade union leaders/the trade union movement during the steel strike are a good example (i.e. "... a truly impressive display...") of the actions of organised labour in general. Clearly, the earlier suggestion that "... this is one of those rare occasions when you can witness the Great British trade union movement acting... to achieve... (the) 'own-goal' (of) ... wrecking the economy" (MA4:7-MA4:8) is ironic. The author is in fact suggesting that occasions when it is possible to witness the negative action of the British trade union movement are commonplace. Hence MA4 invites readers to see the steel strike as the latest in a series of events which demonstrate that one of the distinguishing features of the actions of trade union leaders/the trade union movement is that they adversely effect the viability of particular industries and industry in general (i.e. closing down furnaces/foundaries, preserving unproductive jobs, wrecking the economy).

Clearly, in contrast to MA1 and MA2, MA3 and MA4 provide re-produced rather than local knowledge. What

emerges from these two editorials is that the author is re-producing the knowledge that the actions of trade unionists during strikes are a threat to Governments and the viability of particular industries and industry in general. (i.e. trade unionists: "...Bill Sirs and his steelmen..." (MA3:5); "...groups of trade unionists..." (MA3:8); "...trade union leaders..." (MA4:2); "...trade union movement..." (MA4:7); "...brothers..." (MA4:9)). A number of the Mail editorials consider the actions of agents like trade unions/trade union leaders. However, of those not analysed to date only three are primarily concerned with the "economics" of these actions.⁸ In MA11 the author begins by suggesting that a private steel firm "Shut down by secondary strike action... is losing £½ million a week... Chairman Derek Norton says that while this crippling dispute lasts he will refuse to pay taxes and insurance... worth £2 million a month... Mr. Norton and his firm are victims crying out for justice. Not only are they victims but they are also the breadwinners for the nation. It is they and their like who support the State, subsidise its welfare needs and foot the bill for its follies. Yes, it is the money squeezed out of what wealth can still be created by such private enterprise which pays for schools, hospitals, debt-ridden nationalised industries and even handouts to the families of strikers" (MA11:3-MA11:8). These parts invite the reader to use an incident during the steel strike as an occasion to make a generalisation. They suggest that private enterprise in general, not just Mr. Norton and his firm but "...they and their like...", finance public spending and ensure a healthy welfare state. In the last two parts the author invites further generalisation. It is suggested that "The banners behind which our unions march still proclaim the brotherhood of man. Some brotherhood when the only solidarity they can show is to bite the hand that feeds them" (MA11:9-MA11:10). These parts suggest that unions in general, "...our unions..." not just the steel unions or

the unions involved in the secondary strike action, adversely effect the economic viability of private enterprise and thereby threaten the viability of the welfare state.

Hence it would seem that one of the intentions in MA11 is to invite the reader to make a general contrast between the positive actions of private enterprise and the negative actions of trade unions. The author is using a particular instance (i.e. a private steel firm "Shut down by... is losing...") to produce and support a general contrast between trade unions and private enterprise. This is a re-production of the knowledge that the actions of trade unionists have adverse effects in the sense that it re-affirms some of the knowledge re-produced in MA3 and MA4. To suggest that firm is losing money and withholding taxes and insurance because of a crippling dispute is to re-affirm the knowledge that during strikes the actions of trade unionists threaten the viability of particular industries. It is not clear whether MA11 offers re-produced knowledge as opposed to being a re-affirmation of knowledge found in other editorials. There does not seem to be a reference to the past or to the similarities between the past and the present.⁹ The author seems to be simply producing a generalisation. Consequently, the contribution of MA11 to the stock of knowledge, or at least the stock of knowledge identified so far, is probably limited to the above re-affirmation. Nevertheless it does not seem unreasonable to suggest that readers may add social damage to their stock of knowledge about the adverse effects associated with the actions of trade unionists during strikes (i.e. threaten particular industries, industry in general and thereby social expenditure). However, there is no definite evidence for this addition. One thing which MA11 clearly does is to specify an activity which causes the damage associated with the actions of trade unionists (i.e. secondary strike action).

It is now possible to see parts of MA1 and MA2 as re-affirmations of part of the Mail's stock of knowledge. As was seen both of these editorials, amongst other things, formulate the proposed strike in terms of adverse effects on the viability of the steel industry. Given MA3, MA4 and MA11 this formulation is a re-affirmation of the knowledge that the actions of trade unionists during strikes adversely effect particular industries.

In MA13 the author begins by suggesting that "IN an apparently desperate move to cripple the British Steel Corporation and force Sir Charles Villiers and the Government to go back to the negotiating table, the steel unions are to start picketing the customers" (MA13:2). After drawing the readers attention to Mr. Moss Evans' support for the actions of the steel unions (MA13:3) the author proceeds by suggesting that "This escalation of the strike was evidently cooked up by the TUC chiefs who are worried that the Thatcher policy of no surrender may be paying off, and that if it does, it may have a ripple effect throughout industry, reducing both their bargaining power and prestige" (MA13:4). In the light of MA3 the opening parts of MA13 remind the reader that the distinguishing features of trade union activity during strikes is that it damages particular industries and is a threat to the Government of the day (i.e. the argument that the secondary picketing aims to cripple the BSC suggests an escalation of damage not just potential damage). There is a sense in which the author is clearly suggesting that, at least in the case of the steel strike, damaging an industry and threatening a Government are related rather than distinct aspects of trade union activity. However, in MA3, as in the Express, threatening Governments seems to be defined as bringing them down and there is a difference between bringing a Government down and bringing it back to the negotiating table. Nevertheless MA13:2-MA13:4 does suggest, or at least

imply, a relationship between damaging an industry and threatening a Government.

After suggesting that the escalation is dangerous and may be unsuccessful (MA13:5-MA13:7) the author provides a more specific analysis of the economic consequences of the escalation of the strike. It is suggested that a successful strike would be catastrophic (MA13:8): "The more steel-users are ruined, the less demand there will be for steel when the strike is over. Those customers who survive will look around for substitutes or alternative supplies which are more reliable, so the market for British steel will be permanently reduced and more jobs will be on the scrap-heap" (MA13:9-MA13:10). If these parts are taken in isolation they provide local rather than re-produced knowledge. They suggest that a successful strike will adversely effect some of the industries who use steel, the steel industry and the job prospects of the steel-workers. However, Mail readers have a stock of knowledge which suggests that one of the distinguishing features of trade union activity during strikes is that it causes damage to particular industries and industry in general. Hence MA13:9-MA13:10 is a re-affirmation of part a stock of knowledge. A further re-affirmation is provided in the concluding part. It is suggested that "We must hope that despite this raising of the temperature of the strike, the steel bosses and Tory ministers alike will keep their cool and their nerve" (MA13:14). This part re-affirms the knowledge that the actions of trade unionists during strikes threaten Governments and reinforces the implied relationship between damaging an industry and threatening a Government.

The last of the editorials which deals with what has been called the economics of the steel strike begins with the suggestion that "THE Government will not

intervene in the steel strike" (MA5:2). It is then suggested that "... yesterday... Sir Keith Joseph explained why there are to be no beer and sandwiches this side of the industrial grave. His arguments were bleak and convincing. At present, other British workers, through their taxes, are providing £1,800 in subsidy a year for every steelworker in employment. This simply cannot go on" (MA5:2-MA5:4). These parts suggest that the Government will rightly (i.e. rightly-convincing arguments) not intervene because intervention will involve continued subsidies to the steel industry. After further criticism of interventionist/subsidy policy and support for the Government's non-interventionist policy (MA5:5-MA5:7) the author proceeds by making a more general statement about non-intervention. It is suggested that "For many years, Sir Keith has preached. Now he must practice... He must sit on his hands immobile hour after hour, day after day, week after week and, it may be, month after month, while the industrial crisis grinds on. What he must on no account do- and nobody understands it more profoundly than the anguished guru of Mrs. Thatcher's Government- is plunge his hands into the public purse to buy off the strikers" (MA5:8-MA5:9). These parts suggest that the policy of non-intervention is a good policy because it does not involve spending public money to subsidise workers/settle strikes. They also reproduce the knowledge that a non-interventionist/non-public money policy is a good policy. To suggest, in the context of support for this policy, that Sir Keith must practice what he has preached for years is to suggest that this policy was appropriate in the past and is still appropriate today.

It will be recalled that part of the knowledge produced in MA1 and MA2 is that the steel industry will only be viable when the steelworkers work more efficiently and/or earn their wages via increased productivity.

Given this knowledge and the critique of subsidised working in MA5, it seems reasonable to assume that the Mail prefers a non-interventionist policy because it prefers the following theory: efficient, productive working leads to economic viability, subsidised working threatens economic viability because it is inherently inefficient/unproductive (i.e. unearned/public money has to be used to support industries and/or workers). It follows that MA1 and MA2 re-affirm a stock of knowledge which suggests that a non-interventionist policy provides the best approach to wages, strikes and industry in general. In conclusion the author suggests "The phoney skirmishing is over. The real test of will between the unions and this new Government, which happens to be Tory, has begun" (MA5:10). In the context of the earlier parts this part suggests that there have been a series of conflicts between the unions and Governments, conflicts which threaten Governments in that they test their will to refuse to subsidise workers by providing public money. To suggest that "... this new Government, which happens to be Tory..." is having its will to resist the use of public funds to subsidise workers tested by the unions during the steel strike is to suggest that previous Governments have had their wills tested in a similar way. Hence for the Mail strikes, past and present, not only threaten the existence of Governments but also test their will to resist interventionist options. This latter piece of knowledge not only defines strikes in a particular way it also re-affirms the knowledge that interventionist policy is good policy; a policy which should have been applied in the past and which should be applied today.

The Mail's stock of knowledge suggests that past and present are similar in two respects. Firstly, the actions of trade unionists during strikes damage particular industries and industry in general, threaten Governments in the sense that they can bring them down and test their ability to resist interventionist options.

Secondly, a non-interventionist/non-public money policy is the best approach to wages, strikes and industry in general. This statement can be qualified in three ways. Firstly, secondary strike action is seen as a cause of the damage associated with the actions of trade unionists. Secondly, readers might add damage to social expenditure to their knowledge of the effects of the actions of trade unionists. Thirdly, readers might see damage to industry and threatening a Government as related rather than distinct aspects of the actions of trade unionists. As in the Express the author does not indicate any definite exceptions to the stock of knowledge.¹⁰ Hence it seems reasonable to assume that it is considered to be an adequate and comprehensive description of all events in the period covered by the stock of knowledge.

MIRROR COMMENT

The Mirror's introduction to the economics of the steel strike begins by inviting the reader to consider the way the steelworkers have not received a fair deal. In MR1:2 it is suggested that "IT'S not just a two per cent. wage rise the steelworkers are being offered. With today's price increases it's also a 15 per cent. cut in their standard of living". This part suggests to the reader that the steelworkers have not received a fair deal because the pay offer does not really constitute an improvement. To suggest that the pay offer is in effect a cut in living standard is to suggest that it is unfair. The next two parts of the editorial reinforce the unfairness argument by suggesting that the offer is only unavailable to "... those lucky enough to keep their jobs" (MR1:3) and that "Communities dependent upon steel are being devastated by closures. ... (They) fear mass unemployment" (MR1:4). These parts suggest to the reader that some steelworkers have not received a fair deal because they and their communities are being adversely effected by closures/job losses.

The intention in the first section of MR1 (MR1:1-MR1:4) seems to be to invite the reader to use the notion of fairness to sympathise with the steelworkers. Readers are offered knowledge which invokes sympathy for the steelworkers because it indicates the way they have been unfairly treated and effected. The reader is invited to recognise that the steelworkers deserve sympathy because low offers, job losses and closures are unfair. The notion of unfairness is used in the rest of the editorial. Readers are invited to see Sir Charles Villiers' argument that trade unionists cannot be protected from reality (MR1:5) from the steelworkers point of view: "... for 50,000 men whose jobs are going that sounds like the skipper saying: "The ship's sinking. Throw some more men overboard"" (MR1:6). This part invokes the notion of fairness by suggesting that Sir Charles Villiers is treating the steelworkers unfairly, he is simply throwing them overboard. The author proceeds by listing some of the things the steelworkers can see: "They see Sir Charles agreeing with the Government to end a £300 million a year loss within a few months- and doing it at their expense" (MR1:7); "They see another loss-making industry, coal, offering miners 20 per cent. more. They see derisory cuts in the Civil Service which mean that no one will actually lose a job" (MR1:8); "They see the Cabinet pursuing irrelevant changes in trade union law while production falls unhindered and unemployment rises unchecked" (MR1:9). It is then suggested that the steelworkers consider these things to be unfair and that "... they regard a two per cent. wage offer as a final insult" (MR1:10). In conclusion the reader is invited to see the steelworker's sense of unfairness as an explanation of the threatened strike: "That's why we're faced with the threat of a national steel strike from January 2" (MR1:11). The suggestion here is that the threat of a strike is an understandable reaction to unfair treatment/policies. The more general suggestion

in MR1:5-MR1:11 is that the notion of fairness can be used to understand the actions of the steelworkers and the actions/policies which effect them. Readers are provided with an account of the steelworkers perceptions which invokes sympathy for them. The author seems to be saying: we can see what the steelworkers can see, we sympathise with them and understand why they have threatened the strike.

The overall intention in MR1 seems to be to invite the reader to use the notion of fairness to understand the actions/situation of the steelworkers and the actions/policies which effect them. However, there is no evidence to suggest that the Mirror is re-producing knowledge. There are, for example, no arguments which suggest that the use of the notion of fairness to understand the situation and actions of occupational groups is part of a stock of knowledge. Clearly, MR1 is a local text.

The author begins MR2 by suggesting that "THE British Steel Corporation plan for survival will mean disaster for a third of its workforce and the communities in which they live... Parts of South Wales, the North-East and Scotland will know unemployment at levels not seen since the 1930s" (MR2:2 and MR2:4). These parts develop the argument that the steelworkers deserve sympathy because they have been unfairly treated by reminding the reader of the devastating effects of sackings/closures (i.e. develop and remind in the sense that they re-affirm one of the arguments made in MR1). The author proceeds by suggesting that "The sackings and closures will cost the Corporation £250 million. With luck, it will save the Corporation a loss of £300 million a year" (MR2:5). This part could be read in two ways, either as an invitation to consider the financial benefit of sackings/closures to the Corporation or as an invitation to consider the smallness of the financial benefit (i.e. "With

luck..."). The author's general intention is made clearer by the suggestion that "But the cost of keeping men in employment will be transferred to social security, to keep them in unemployment" (MR2:6). This part suggests to the reader that the British Steel Corporation's plan is illogical because nothing is ultimately gained by it, the money saved will be paid out in social security benefits. Taking MR2:5 and MR2:6 together the suggestion is that even if the plan saves the British Steel Corporation money, little or no money will actually be saved. In the light of MR1 and the earlier parts of MR2 the more general suggestion, or at least implication, is that the unfair sackings/closures are not necessary, nothing will be gained, jobs will be lost and communities will be devastated.

In the next part the author turns his/her attention to Sir Charles Villiers' claim that "He had to "do his duty"" (MR2:7). It is asked "Duty to whom? To the industry, which has gone from bad to terrible under his chairmanship? To the workers, whom he is abandoning? To the taxpayer, who will still foot the bill in the end? Or to the Government, which has told him what to do?" (MR2:8). This part as well as criticising Sir Charles Villiers' and implying criticism of the Government (i.e. their instructions led to the plans), also remind the reader that the steelworkers are being treated unfairly (i.e. abandoned). In conclusion the author asks "When Sir Charles is doing his duty, shouldn't he consider including himself among the 53,000 who are going to lose their jobs?" (MR2:9). Again, these parts combine criticism of Sir Charles Villiers (i.e. given his performance he should sack himself) with a sympathy invoking reference to lost jobs. The suggestion is that if Sir Charles Villiers wants to be fair he should sack himself as well as large numbers of his employees.

The overall intention in MR2 seems to be to re-affirm

the argument that the steelworkers have been unfairly treated and to criticise Sir Charles Villiers and the British Steel Corporation's "... plan for survival..." (MR2:2). Clearly, there is no evidence for the reproduction of knowledge. Like MR1, MR2 is a local text. The author provides a specific consideration of specific issues. However, there is thematic continuity between MR1 and MR2. As well as providing sympathy invoking references to lost jobs and damaged communities, both editorials also invite criticism of Sir Charles Villiers/the British Steel Corporation and the Government (i.e. specific criticism of current actions/policies).

In MR3 the author begins by suggesting that "THE steel strike which nobody wants and which the country can't afford will have to be settled around the negotiating table sooner or later... Sir Charles Villiers, who has chaired British Steel deeper and deeper into disaster, is at least right about that" (MR3:2-MR3:4). It is then suggested that the initial low pay offer started the dispute (MR3:5), that the offer was subsequently raised in a confusing manner (MR3:6-MR3:7), that if the latest offer is what it seems to be (MR3:8) "... it IS worth talking about" (MR3:8), and that "With 52,000 jobs being lost in steel this year the unions will want to know how many more men must go to pay for the rises of those who stay... they must decide whether the price is too high" (MR3:9). These parts suggest while it is possible to criticise Sir Charles Villiers for starting a strike the country cannot afford and for handling the pay offer badly, a potentially fair offer has been made and should be discussed. In so suggesting the author is re-affirming some of the arguments and knowledge found in MR1 and MR2. Readers are invited to criticise Sir Charles Villiers/the British Steel Corporation and to use the notion of fairness to understand the steelworker's pay claim.

The author proceeds by suggesting that "For its part, the Government must come clean about its policy for loss-making state-owned industries... in the end... decisions on pay are its decisions. If two per cent was the original limit for the steel men why were the miners offered 20 per cent? And what about the railways? Like coal and steel they lose money. How much is British rail going to be allowed to offer the engine drivers?" (MR3:10-MR3:12). These parts invite the reader to use the notion of fairness to criticise the Government and sympathise with the steelworkers. They suggest that the Government has applied a pay policy unfairly and that it is the steelworkers who have been adversely effected by this action (i.e. their pay offer was limited to 2%). The issue of the Government's unfair application of a pay policy, which was also raised in MR1:8, is given extended consideration in MR5. It is suggested that the logic of Sir Keith Joseph's view that more money cannot be offered without more productivity (MR5:3) is "...undoubtedly right. Higher wages without higher productivity means higher prices or higher taxation" (MR5:4). It is then suggested "But why single out steel? Was the miner's 20 per cent rise paid for out of higher productivity? Or the local government workers' 13 per cent? Will the offer of 14 per cent to the civil servants be paid for by cutting costs? (MR5:5-MR5:6). Clearly, these parts re-affirm the suggestion that the Government has applied a pay policy unfairly and that it is the steelworkers who have been adversely effected by this unfair policy. In MR5:8-MR5:10 the reference to the Government's policy is as follows: "The Government says it isn't intervening in the steel strike. But by cutting off the Corporation's money it prevented a settlement. That's intervening. It didn't do the same to the Coal Board or the local councils. It isn't doing the same for its own workers. Its policy can't always be right. Or even always wrong. But at least it ought to be

consistent." These parts invite criticism of the Government not so much because an unfairly applied policy has adversely effected the steelworkers but rather because an inconsistent application of policy constitutes, whatever the Government says, an intervention in the steel strike and has prevented a settlement of it. This invitation and the invitation in the earlier parts of the editorial re-affirm knowledge in the sense that they reiterate some of the arguments and knowledge found in MR1, MR2 and MR3. Though in the case of MR5 criticism of the Government and sympathy for the steelworkers because they have been unfairly treated seem to be separable themes rather than two sides of the same coin. It would seem that for the Mirror the Government can be criticised because it has applied a pay policy unfairly, because it's inconsistent application of policy constitutes intervention and prevented a settlement, and because it's application of policy is unfair to the steelworkers.

Similarly, in MR4 criticism of the British Steel Corporation is not invited simply because it's actions/policies are unfair on the steelworkers. Under the heading "Blunder bosses" (MR4:1) the author suggests that "THE steel strike will have to be settled eventually on terms not much different from those which are "unacceptable" today.. But whatever the concessions and whoever makes them, they won't compensate for the damage that a prolonged strike will do. The Corporation has so far blundered at every step" (MR4:2-MR4:5). The author proceeds by indicating the ways in which the Corporation has blundered: after announcing lost jobs it made a low pay offer (MR4:5) and it rejected a plan to monitor productivity deals (MR4:6-MR4:7). In conclusion the author suggests that discussions about the plan should continue (MR4:8-MR4:9) "Because the only alternative is a battle which will do more harm to Britain than a complacent Government imagines. Harm

much greater than the benefits to anyone" (MR4:10-MR4:11). Clearly, MR4 re-affirms the invitation to criticise the Corporation and, to a lesser extent, the Government.

However, as in all the Mirror editorials analysed so far, there is no re-production of knowledge. What emerges from MR1, MR2, MR3, MR4 and MR5 is a consistent body of knowledge not a re-affirmed stock of knowledge; that is, the author consistently invites a particular understanding of the economics of the steel strike. All these texts seem to be local, they consist of specific arguments about specific aspects of the steel strike. The nearest the Mirror comes to relating the steel strike to more general knowledge is when it criticises the Government's policy on pay. Clearly, to make suggestions like -the Government's pay policy has led to high offers/awards to some occupational groups but a low offer to the steelworkers- is to invite generalisation about the Government's pay policy (i.e. it has been applied unfairly). However, this is only a limited generalisation about one aspect of the Government's activities and it does not draw on or re-affirm a stock of knowledge about the Government's pay policy or pay policy in general.

In summary the main dimension of the Mirror's body of knowledge about the economics of the steel strike are as follows: the steelworkers have been unfairly treated and deserve sympathy, they have received a low offer, have lost jobs and their communities are threatened by further job losses/closures; the British Steel Corporation/Sir Charles Villiers is open to criticism because it/he made a low offer which started the dispute, because it's/his policies unfairly effect the steelworkers, and because it/he handled the pay claim/negotiations badly; the Government is open to criticism because it's inconsistent policy is unfair, unfairly

effects the steelworkers and prevented a settlement of the strike.¹¹

A revealing feature of the use of the notion of fairness in MR5 is that the author accepts the logic or internal validity of the argument that higher wages cannot be offered without increased productivity but proceeds by using the notion of fairness to challenge this argument (MR5:3-MR5:6). This kind of feature is also found in MR1. It is suggested that "... Sir Charles Villiers... says: "It is not possible to protect trade unionists from reality". Maybe not. But for the 50,000 men whose jobs are going that sounds like the skipper saying: "The ship's sinking. Throw some more men overboard"" (MR1:5-MR1:6). In each of these cases the author is not challenging the logic/internal validity of an argument which suggests that the use of the notion fairness is not the most appropriate way to understand the steelworker's situation. In the first case the argument not challenged is higher wages can only be paid if productivity is increased; in the second case the argument not challenged is reality is such that lost jobs are inevitable. Having not challenged the logic/internal validity of these arguments the author proceeds to use the notion of fairness to challenge their validity. In the first case he/she is suggesting: higher wages can only be paid if productivity is increased but why is this principle only applied to the steelworkers? Why is it applied unfairly? In the second case he/she is suggesting: maybe trade unionists cannot be protected from reality but it is unfair to simply throw men overboard.

The structure of MR5:3-MR5:6 and MR1:5-MR1:6 suggest that for the Mirror fairness to the steelworkers is the only criterion which should be used to assess their pay claim and situation. To accept the logic/internal validity of arguments which propose other criterion but to argue that fairness is a more appropriate criterion

is to suggest that fairness is the only criterion which should be used. In short for the Mirror the claim and situation are moral issues. Though, in conclusion, it should be emphasised that there is no evidence to suggest that the Mirror has invited readers to use the notion of fairness on previous occasions or that it considers fairness to be central to an understanding of pay claims, pay policies, occupational groups and Governments. In the Mirror it would seem that there is no re-production of knowledge only a consistent invitation to understand the economics of the steel strike in a particular way. As has been seen the Mirror only goes beyond local knowledge when it suggests that the Government's pay policy has been applied unfairly. But this is not a generalisation about pay policy in general or the Government in general, only a generalisation about one pay policy and one aspect of the Government's activities. Moreover, it is a generalisation which involves no reference to the past or to the similarities between the past and the present.

THE SUN SAYS

The Sun introduces the economics of the steel strike to readers by inviting them to consider the findings of a survey. It is suggested that "A NEW survey shows that seven out of ten British workers would think twice about making huge pay claims if they thought their companies would suffer badly" (S1:2).¹² The author proceeds by relating this reported survey finding to a general theory: "More and more people are learning that in many cases big wage demands mean fewer jobs" (S1:3). These parts suggest that there is quantitative evidence which suggests that the general theory in many cases big wage demands mean fewer jobs/poor company performance is recognised as valid by the majority of people (i.e. general theory in the sense that it applies to many cases). The author

proceeds by applying the general theory about wage demands to the threatened strike. It is suggested "So, why are the steel union leaders so hell-bent on calling out their 90,000 members? This (threatened strike)... is in support of a pay claim of 20 per cent. It would add £240 million more to the wages bill" (S1:4-S1:6). The "So, why..." which introduces these parts invites the reader to use the general theory to question the logic/legitimacy of a strike. The author seems to be saying: given the known relationship between big wage demands and lost jobs/poor company performance why are we faced with a strike which is in support of a 20 per cent pay claim and which would add £240 million to the wages bill; clearly, the only result will be lost jobs and poor company performance. It is then suggested that the British Steel Corporation is already in a poor financial state. "(It)... already expects losses of more than £300 million this year. And because of dwindling markets and the need to streamline the industry, there are plans to axe 50,000 jobs and close several plants" (S1:7-S1:8). The suggestion, or at least implication, here is that a 20% pay rise would not only lead to lost jobs and poor company performance it might also worsen an already poor situation (i.e. more lost jobs/even worse company performance).

Clearly, one of the intentions in S1:2-S1:8 seems to be to use a general theory about wage demands to understand the steelworkers pay claim. Knowledge is re-produced in the sense that the author is suggesting to the reader that the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which affirm the validity of the knowledge that in many cases big wage demands mean fewer jobs/poor company performance. Clearly, this knowledge is part of a stock of knowledge.

In the next section of S1 the author, after suggesting that the availability of productivity bonuses is one

of the reasons why the "... 2 per cent offer is not as bad as it seems" (S1:9-S1:10), proceeds by suggesting that "Higher productivity is vital, since Britain's steel men produce only about half as much per man as workers in the German steel industry" (S1:11). This reference to productivity can be read in two ways. The author could be suggesting that higher productivity is vital because the relatively low productivity of British steelworkers adversely affects the competitiveness of the British steel industry and/or that the relatively low productivity of British steelworkers means that a high wage claim and a threatened strike are illegitimate. The first reading is an implication of S1:11. The second is possible not just because it is implied in S1:11 but also because S1:11 is followed by the suggestion "Let the union chiefs get back to the negotiating table without delay" (S1:12). In the light of S1:11 this part suggests that because of the low productivity of British steelworkers the union chiefs should call off the strike and negotiate the pay claim. Put another way the author seems to be suggesting that given the low productivity of British steelworkers a strike in support of a high pay claim is illegitimate. True S1:12 could be read not as a argument following on from S1:11 but as a argument introducing S1:13 and S1:14. According to this reading the authorial suggestion would be that the union chiefs should go back to the negotiating table because "A prolonged strike would do massive harm to British industry generally. It would be fatal to the job prospects of the steel workers" (S1:13-S1:14). Both these readings seem equally plausible. Readers can see that low productivity and the adverse effects of a long strike are good reasons for a return to the negotiating table. There are no signs that the consideration of productivity and adverse effects involves the re-production of knowledge. Readers are offered local knowledge about the relatively low productivity of British steelworkers and the effects of a long strike.

In S2 the author begins by drawing attention to an instance of sympathy for the steelworkers and reasons why sympathy is legitimate (S2:2-S2:4).¹³ It is then suggested that "But the fact is that the steel industry cannot afford even one per cent. It is already £300 million in the red" (S2:5). He/she proceeds by offering an explanation of the current financial state of the steel industry. It is suggested that "This has happened partly because there is a world recession in steel. But also for the far more important reason that the performance of the steelworkers is appalling" (S2:6-S2:7). The next step in the author's argument is to provide evidence for the argument about the steelworkers performance and to offer an explanation of this performance: "Despite a massive programme of investment, each British steelworker produces only about half the output of a French or German worker. Japanese workers produce THREE TIMES as much steel... as our own. And the blame falls chiefly on the steel unions, with their restrictive practices and their stubborn insistence on 'over-manning'" (S2:8-S2:10). Taken together S2:5-S2:10 invite the reader to make the following logical/causal connections: there is clear evidence that despite high investment the productivity of British steelworkers is relatively low; the steel unions' restrictive practices and insistence on over-manning are responsible for the low productivity of British steelworkers; which is in turn responsible for the current financial state of the steel industry; the financial state of the industry undermines the legitimacy of the pay claim, they cannot afford to offer any pay rise. In the later parts of S2 readers are invited to see this chain of knowledge as a realistic assessment of the state of the steel industry. It is suggested that "Sooner or later, realism will have to dawn in our steel industry. It makes no sense at all for the railmen to help postpone the inevitable day of reckoning" (S2:11-S2:12). To suggest, in the context of the chain of knowledge, that

realism will have to dawn in the steel industry is to suggest that the industry will eventually have to recognise the validity of the chain of knowledge. To suggest, again in the context of the chain of knowledge, that the railmen's threat to support the steelworkers (introduced in S2:2) would merely help postpone "... the inevitable day of reckoning..." is to suggest that, if the fortunes of the steel industry are to improve, the realistic logic of the chain of knowledge will have to be applied. There are no clear indications in S2:11-S2:12 as to what elements of the chain of knowledge are seen as constituting the realism of the day of reckoning. However, readers could, given the chain of knowledge, make a number of assumptions. For example: that high wage claims, indeed wages claims of any kind, are unrealistic; that higher productivity and the curbing of restrictive practices/over-manning are necessary to improve the industry's fortunes.

Clearly, in the later parts of S1 and the whole of S2 there is no evidence for the re-production of knowledge. Taken together they offer the reader a local analysis of aspects of the economics of the steel strike, one which emphasises the fact, causes and effects of low productivity. The author does not invite the adoption of a historical perspective on pay claims, productivity, financial losses, strikes, restrictive practices, realism, etc.

In S4 the author offers a local analysis of a suggestion made by Mr. Bill Sirs. It is suggested that "STEEL UNION chief Mr. Bill Sirs is being even dafter than usual to suggest that his workers might call off the strike if they received their "productivity" money NOW" (S4:2). In S4:4 the author proceeds by suggesting that "If words are to mean anything at all, productivity bonuses have to be EARNED- by higher productivity" (S4:4). It is then suggested that there is "... precious little evidence..." (S4:6) to support Sir Keith Joseph's belief "... that the

British steelworkers are as good as any in the world" (S4:5). As in S2 the author supports arguments about the performance of British steelworkers by suggesting that despite high investment the relative productivity of British steelworkers is low (S4:7). In conclusion the author suggests that "Mr. Sirs should send his men back to work to EARN their bonuses. And to prove that Sir Keith's faith is justified" (S4:8). Clearly, S4 is a local text. The intention seems to be to simply challenge Mr. Sirs' suggestion and Sir Keith Joseph's belief rather than to relate them to a stock of knowledge. True there is some continuity of knowledge between S1, S2 and S4 (e.g. the author re-affirms arguments about the relatively low productivity of British steelworkers). However, there is no evidence for the re-production of knowledge.

There is such evidence in some of the other editorials. In S3 one of the main intentions seems to be to invite the reader to contrast two general economic theories/policies. The author begins by suggesting that "... before (the steel unions) plunge Britain into industrial chaos" (S3:2), they should "Stop this madness- and start talking" (S3:3). It is then suggested that "THE LAST thing we want is government intervention, as labour MPs demand... WE all know where THAT leads. To higher INFLATION, fewer JOBS, greater TAXATION" (S3:4 and S3:6-S3:7). These parts invite criticism of the interventionist economic policy preferred by Labour MPs. It is clear from S3:6 that the author is re-producing criticism. He/she would not really be in a position to say "...WE all know where THAT leads" unless he/she was confident that the effects of interventionist economic policy are part of the reader's stock of knowledge. To say we all know where that leads is not to tell readers something about the effects of interventionist policy it is to remind them that they know what these effects are. It is to say we know why interventionist economic policy is

inappropriate, if it is applied again the usual consequences will follow: higher inflation and taxation, fewer jobs. Clearly, in the first part of S3 the author is re-producing knowledge about the effects and appropriateness of interventionist economic policy.

He/she proceeds by suggesting an alternative to the Government intervention demanded by Labour MPs. It is suggested that "Instead the unions must start talking about how best to take the limited amount of cash the British Steel Corporation can offer. It isn't much. How could it be when the productivity of British steelworkers is so much worse than that of steelmen abroad? (S3:8-S3:10). One of the things which these parts suggest to readers is that the steel unions should negotiate within the financial limits set by the British Steel Corporation's current financial situation rather than want or expect Government intervention. This support for a non-interventionist policy (i.e. support- "Instead the unions must...") is at the same time support for Mrs. Thatcher's Government's policy. This becomes clear in the later parts of the editorial.¹⁴ In S3:16-S3:19 it is suggested that the country cannot afford "... to use taxpayer's' money to meet (the unions) unrealistic demands. This will be the first big challenge to Mrs. Thatcher's Government from powerful trade unions in a state industry. Ministers must mean it when they say that it is up to the employers and the workforce to solve their own problems. Let them show that the bad old days of buying off strikes with bags of unearned money have gone for ever." These parts invite support for the Government's economic policy: namely, non-intervention in strikes (S3:18) and a refusal to use taxpayers money to end strikes. Hence the later parts of S3 make it clear that the author's preference for a non-interventionist policy involves a preference for Mrs. Thatcher's Government's policy.

The reference to "... the bad old days of buying

off strikes with bags of unearned money..." is probably a reference to the policy of previous Labour Governments. A reference which re-affirms the knowledge re-produced earlier by reiterating the suggestion that interventionist policy is inappropriate and has adverse consequences (i.e. "... bad old days..."). The status of the knowledge about Mrs. Thatcher's Government's policy is not as obvious. Clearly, the author is supporting this policy and suggesting that it should be applied to the steel strike. However, just how old this knowledge is is uncertain. There are, for example, no arguments like: we know where interventionist policy leads, we know that Mrs. Thatcher's non-interventionist policy is superior. The main re-production of knowledge in S3 is the re-production of knowledge about the appropriateness and effects of Labour's interventionist policy. However, it would be strange if the Sun's stock of knowledge about interventionist policy did not include support for an alternative: criticism and support are two sides of the same coin (i.e. to suggest that Governments should not intervene by providing taxpayer's/unearned money is to suggest that all money paid out must be earned by the workforce and/or determined by the financial situation of the industry in question). Hence it seems reasonable to assume that criticism of an interventionist policy and support for Mrs. Thatcher's non-interventionist policy are two sides of the same stock of knowledge.

Criticism of Labour's interventionist policy is the central theme in S14. It is suggested that Jim Callaghan "... suggested that he could end the dispute in days. He did not say how. But we all guessed. He would have handed a bagful of gold to the strikers. Now he confirms those suspicions. What matter, he asks, if we DO add another £20 million or so to the national debt" (S14:4-S14:6). These parts suggest to readers that their stock of knowledge about the nature of interventionist policy has been confirmed (given S3 readers know that handing

out a bagful of gold is a description of interventionist policy). To suggest that "... we all guessed" how Jim Callaghan would end the dispute is to suggest that we (i.e. author and readers) have a stock of knowledge about the likely nature of Jim Callaghan's policy for ending the steel strike, to proceed by suggesting "Now he confirms those suspicions" is to suggest that the steel strike has re-affirmed what the Sun already knew. Clearly, the author is re-producing a stock of knowledge about the nature of interventionist policy: re-producing the knowledge that this policy involves handing out unearned money to strikers. He/she proceeds by suggesting that adding to the national debt can be seen as "... a mere drop in the ocean" (S14:6-S14:7). It is then suggested "And how did we get this ocean in the first place? It is made up of drops. Drops dribbled out by Diamond Jim and his cronies. It was Callaghan and Co. who dug a pit for Britain by granting enormous, inflationary pay awards to win favour with the unions- or to buy off blackmail... It was because he spent OUR money like a drunken sailor that Mr. Callaghan was turfed out of office... he has clearly learned nothing from his fall" (S14:8-S14:10). These parts develop the analysis of "the bad old days" provided in S3:16-S3:19. They re-affirm the suggestion that industrial relations issues were handled by spending unearned/taxpayer's money (i.e. "OUR money" = unearned/taxpayer's money) and develop this suggestion by pointing out that the last Labour Government's interventionist policy created a large national debt. They also remind readers that this kind of policy is current Labour policy (i.e. "... he has... learned nothing from his fall"). Clearly, in S14 the author is re-producing and re-affirming criticism of Labour's interventionist policy, formulating the steel strike as the latest in a series of events which demonstrate the validity of the Sun's stock of knowledge.

In S13 the author begins by suggesting "THE LATEST

idea for ending the steel dispute is to set up a court of inquiry" (S13:2). He/she proceeds by criticising this option because it is a form of intervention (S13:3-S13:4). It is then suggested that "The Government... are insisting on no intervention. Gone, they say, are the days when Whitehall was willing to play fairy godmother to the workers, forcing employers to grant settlements they could not afford" (S13:5-S13:6). These parts remind readers that the current Conservative Government has a non-interventionist policy and invite support for this policy (i.e. the criticism of a court of inquiry because it is a form of intervention (S13:3-S13:4) = support for non-intervention). In the light of S3 and S14 this is a re-production of knowledge in the sense that it re-affirms support for non-intervention. In conclusion, the author suggests that "A court of inquiry would be simply intervention by the back-door, with some Left-wing professor indulging his pet financial theories and sociological aims. On past performance, the strikers would be handed all they wanted. Maybe more. And the Government's whole industrial strategy would be in ruins" (S13:7-S13:9).

Readers will probably read these concluding parts as a specification of the reasons why the idea of intervention/a court of inquiry should be resisted, as the because elements of the following argument: intervention/a court of inquiry must be resisted because it would result in unearned/taxpayer's money being used to settle the steel strike and because it would ruin a good industrial strategy. True the author does not directly suggest that intervention/a court of inquiry should be resisted because... and because... . The text structure indicates that he/she is only suggesting that money being handed out and a ruined industrial strategy are the likely consequences of an academic inquiry. However, readers bringing the knowledge re-produced in S3 and S14 to bear on S13 will read S13:8-S13:9 as undesirable consequences, as reasons why the interventionist option discussed should be resisted. They know that providing unearned/taxpayer's money to settle

strikes is undesirable and that the Government's policy is good and therefore should not be ruined. Consequently, they know that the interventionist option discussed in S13 should be resisted because... . Even if this reading is not made S13 in itself criticises an interventionist option and supports the Government's non-interventionist policy. Hence it re-produces knowledge in that it re-affirms such criticism and support. This analysis might be objected to on the grounds that S13 does not associate intervention with the Labour Party and/or Labour MPs and therefore does not genuinely re-produce the knowledge re-produced in the other editorials. However, there is a contrast between a desirable non-interventionist policy and an undesirable interventionist policy. Hence it seems legitimate to suggest that S13 re-affirms a central feature of the knowledge re-produced in S3 and S14.

In S8 the author invites a consideration of the intervention/non-intervention issue by suggesting that Sir Keith Joseph's "... message on the steel strike has been clear and consistent. There are only two ways in which the steelmen can get more money. EITHER they fund the rises themselves, by increased productivity. OR the taxpayer coughs up yet more money" (S8:3-S8:6). While the author proceeds by distinguishing between Government money and taxpayer's money (S8:7), it seems reasonable to assume that readers will read "... taxpayer coughs up yet more money" as a reference to the possibility of the Government sanctioning the use of taxpayer's money. Put another way the author is in effect suggesting -or the taxpayer/Government coughs up yet more money. This seems reasonable because competent readers know that the Government makes decisions about the use of taxpayer's money, that taxpayer's money is to all intents and purposes the same as Government money. It also seems reasonable to assume that readers will read the presentation of Sir Keith Joseph's message as a presentation of a

desirable option and an undesirable option. Readers know that the Government has a desirable policy on non-intervention, a policy which recommends the non-use of taxpayer's money. Hence they will read the phrase "... the taxpayer coughs up yet more money" as a reference to undesirable interventionist policy and the phrase "... fund the rises themselves by increased productivity" as a reference to desirable non-interventionist policy.

The author proceeds by emphasising the extent to which taxpayer's money is already being used to subsidise/support the steel industry: "In the current financial year the steel industry will swallow £324,000,000 of OUR money. Or, to put it another way, the rest of us are already paying a subsidy of £1,800 a year, or £35 a week, to every man employed in the industry" (S8:8-S8:9). It is then suggested that the steelmen already earn more than the national average (S8:10), that the productivity deals now being offered would further increase their earnings (S8:10) and that despite a recent increase British steelmen's productivity is still lower than that of French and West German steelmen (S8:11). In the context of the earlier parts of the editorial S8:8-S8:11 suggest that financing any pay rise by providing more taxpayer's money would be wrong because large amounts of taxpayer's money are already being used to support the steel industry/steelmen, because the steelmen are already earning relatively high wages and because they can increase these wages through increased productivity. A significant feature of this suggestion is that it re-affirms a preferred policy (i.e. we and the Government favour non-intervention/the non-use of taxpayer's money, surely this is an appropriate preference given the already high subsidies, relatively high wages and the possibility of even higher wages) and demonstrates how this policy can be practically applied to the steel strike (i.e. pay rises can be funded via increased productivity).

In the second half of S8 (i.e. S8:12-S8:16) the

author re-affirms the contrast between a desirable non-interventionist policy and an undesirable interventionist policy. It is suggested that "Of course, everyone wants a speedy settlement to a strike which is inflicting great and growing damage on the nation. But not at any price. The widespread delusion- shared, apparently, by Jim Callaghan- that we can solve every problem by paying up is a dangerous nonsense. Fortunately, more and more people are beginning to recognise that it is necessary for us to EARN our living. That printing money is no solution" (S8:12-S8:15). Clearly, these parts re-produce criticism of interventionist policy, specifically Labour's (i.e. "... Jim Callaghan...") interventionist policy, and support for non-interventionist policy. In the context of the rest of the editorial these parts suggest that the overall intention in S8 is to use the steel strike as an occasion to re-produce criticism of Labour's interventionist policy and support for the Conservative's non-interventionist policy. The author's conclusion reflects and underlines the concern to use the steel strike in this way. It is suggested that "The steel strike, traumatic as it is, seems as good a place as any from which to begin the journey back to sanity" (S8:16). Given the suggestions which this part provides a conclusion for it seems likely that the author is suggesting that the new Conservative Government should use the steel strike as a vehicle for implementing a sane policy (i.e. non-intervention) and replacing an insane one (i.e. Labour's interventionist policy).

To date the analysis has identified a number of editorials which re-produce knowledge about interventionist and non-interventionist policy and a number which primarily seem to offer the local knowledge that the actions of the steelworkers/steel unions have made the steel industry an inefficient and loss-making industry. There is some evidence which suggests that there is a relationship between the two sets of knowledge. In some of the parts

of S5 the author re-makes the kind of logical/causal connections made in S2.¹⁵ It is suggested that "The industry is losing money at the rate of something like a million pounds A DAY" (S5:14), that "... devastating figures... (show) that productivity in two Japanese steel plants last year was up to SIX TIMES greater than in Britain" (S5:15) and that the British steel industry has received large amounts of state/taxpayer's cash (S5:17). It is then suggested that "... there are only two possible explanations for the current state of the industry: ONE: That far too many people are employed in it, and TWO: That there are too many restrictive practices" (S5:18-S5:20). These parts suggest the following logical/causal connections: despite high investment the productivity of British steelworkers is relatively low and the industry loses enormous amounts of money, over-manning and restrictive practices are responsible for the current state of the steel industry; that is, responsible for low productivity and large losses. The author proceeds by suggesting that "In the end, the unions will have to move out of Never-Never Land... TO ACCEPT that it is no longer sensible to live now and pay later. TO RECOGNISE that increased prosperity for the industry and the nation can only come through drastic pruning and drastic reforms" (S5:22-S5:24). These parts, as do S2:11-S2:12, suggest that the realities of the situation will have to be faced, that the Sun's analysis of the state of the steel industry is a realistic assessment (i.e. not one made from never-never land) of what has to be done. However, they also, if indirectly, relate the analysis of the state of the steel industry to the Government's non-interventionist policy. To suggest that the unions will have to accept that "... it is no longer sensible to live now and pay later" is to suggest that if the unions act and think in a non-interventionist manner the steel industry will recover (i.e. living now and paying later refers to the use of unearned money and the postponement of repayments of borrowed money; that is, in the industrial context, to a reliance on endless intervention).

The implication here is that the non-application of non-interventionist principles is a cause of the poor state of the steel industry. Hence the analysis of this state is a re-affirmation of the desirability of applying non-interventionist policy. Similarly, to suggest that the viability of the steel industry and the nation generally depends on changes within industry (e.g. reforms like reducing over-manning and restrictive practices and increasing productivity) is to suggest that the state of the steel industry is a good example of the adverse effects of the non-application of non-interventionist policy. Again, the analysis of the state of the industry is, if indirectly, a re-affirmation of the Sun's knowledge of interventionist and non-interventionist policy. A re-affirmation is also provided by the suggestion that the steelworkers could increase productivity and thereby increase earnings and save jobs (S3:13-S3:14). To suggest this is to suggest that desirable goals can be achieved by the application of non-interventionist policy (e.g. rises funded through increased productivity). Similarly, the suggestion in S8:15-S8:16 that the steel strike is a good opportunity to apply the principle that "... it is necessary for us to EARN our living" (S8:15) suggests that the state of the steel industry is a good example of the adverse effects of not applying non-interventionist policy. It might be argued that these re-affirmations are indirect. Nevertheless it seems reasonable to assume that readers can use the analysis of the state of the steel industry to re-affirm their knowledge of interventionist and non-interventionist policy.

However, not all the elements of the Sun's analysis of the state of the steel industry are reinforcements of its knowledge about interventionist and non-interventionist policy (e.g. the suggestion that the strike will/does have adverse effects (see also S5:26-S5:27)). The stock of knowledge about the interventionist policy referred by the Labour party suggests that it is a bad policy because it leads to higher inflation, higher taxation and lost

jobs and because it involves spending unearned/taxpayer's money. The stock of knowledge about the non-interventionist policy preferred by Mrs. Thatcher's Government suggests that it is a good policy because it makes particular industries and industry in general viable and because it avoids the adverse effects of interventionist policy. As the analysis of S1 demonstrated an additional element of the Sun's stock of knowledge is the knowledge that in many cases big wage demands lead to lost jobs and poor company performance. There are no indications that the author is suggesting that any events constitute exceptions to the stock of knowledge. It seems reasonable to assume that the author is inviting criticism of the Labour Party and support for Mrs. Thatcher's Conservative Government. True the editorials only deal with a particular policy. However, competent readers know that an industrial and economic policy is an important policy and a distinguishing feature of mainstream political parties. Hence readers will equate support for or criticism of such a policy with support for or criticism of a party.

FOOTNOTES

1. The Star does not offer a detailed consideration of the economics of the steel strike but it could be argued that some of the Star editorials consider the economic dimensions of the strike. However, the Star is a special case because compared to the other newspapers it did not produce very many editorials about the steel strike (only six) and did not consider issues in the same depth as the other newspapers. Given this it seemed reasonable to analyse all the Star editorials in one chapter and to exclude the Star from the analyses provided in the other chapters. The analysis of the Star is provided in chapter six.
2. Chapters three, four, five and six all analyse some of the editorials produced by the Express, the Mail, the Mirror and the Sun. General categories or themes (e.g. the economics of the steel strike) are used to provide a group of editorials for analysis. These categories or themes are only organising devices and therefore have no substantive implications: arguments and knowledge are derived from the editorials not imposed on them. However, there are relationships between the editorials analysed in different chapters and some editorials fall into more than one category. These relationships will be analysed as and when they become apparent and some of the editorials will be analysed in more than one chapter. Hence there is a sense in which chapters three, four and five provide incomplete analyses.
3. A feature of all the analyses is that when a reference to a part is in brackets after the part has been quoted the full stop appears after the brackets have been closed- e.g. steelworkers' fire" (E1:2). Omissions are indicated by features like "...", "...", "...," . When none of these features/appear complete sentences and/or parts have been quoted.
4. Throughout the analyses the phrase local knowledge will be used to refer to non-re-produced knowledge involving specific arguments about specific events.
5. E3 is analysed very selectively. This seems reasonable because it deals with a variety of issues which are unrelated to the steel strike. Consequently, the reference to the steel strike can be legitimately extracted from the editorial.
6. The Mail's invitation to have sympathy for the steelworkers is itself an interesting feature of MA1. An

analysis of this invitation is provided in chapter five.

7. MA3 is analysed selectively. This seems reasonable because the reference to the steel strike is part of a more general consideration of the prospects for the New Year, consequently, the reference to the strike can be extracted from the rest of the editorial.
8. The "non-economic" editorials and the possibility of links between these editorials and the editorials analysed in this chapter will be examined in chapter six. As that chapter demonstrates the Mail makes a clear distinction between trade union leaders and ordinary trade unionists. The use of the phrase trade unionists to describe the knowledge re-produced in MA3 and MA4 is a general description of the agents referred to in these editorials.
9. The suggestion that "The banners behind which our unions march still proclaim the brotherhood of man..." (MA11:9) will probably be read as a historical reference to the values of the trade union movement. The Mail's consideration of this kind of issue is dealt with in chapter six:
10. It might be argued that in the Mail and the Express the local modification of the stock of knowledge which suggests that the current Government will not necessarily be effected by trade unionists constitutes an exception to the stock of knowledge. However, in both cases the steel strike is defined as a threat. Chapter seven, which presents the conclusions, will consider the status and significance of local modifications.
11. In MR1:9 the author invites criticism of the Government's general economic and industrial policy. However, this invitation is not a major focus in MR1 or MR2, MR3, MR4 and MR5. The issue of the Mirror's criticism of the Government is taken up again in chapter six.
12. The first and last parts of all the Sun editorials are underlined. In some cases other parts are also underlined. This feature has been omitted for practical reasons. This omission is not serious. The analyses naturally identify the arguments and knowledge which the author wants to emphasise.
13. This feature of the editorials is analysed in chapter five.

14. The parts not included in the analysis are not, at least at the moment, important. However, some of them will be referred to at a later stage.

15. The first thirteen parts of S5 consider, in general terms, the argument that it is possible to have sympathy for both the steelworkers and the British Steel Corporation. This argument is not relevant to the issue under analysis. However, it is, in another context, a significant argument. This context is the focus of chapter five.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY: PICKETS AND PICKETING

INTRODUCTORY COMMENT

This chapter examines a group of editorials (see appendix three) which deal with phenomena like pickets, secondary pickets, picketing and secondary picketing.¹ In general terms the provision of arguments and knowledge about these phenomena is a central concern in the Express, the Mail and the Sun. In the Mirror it does not seem to be a central concern. As in chapter three each newspaper will be analysed in turn.

DAILY EXPRESS OPINION

In E12 the author begins by inviting the reader to consider the argument that "THIS WAS the scene at Hadfield yesterday where 1,200 pickets, many led by Yorkshire miner's leader Arthur Scargill, frightened the workforce of Britain's largest steelworks back on strike" (E12:1).² The author proceeds by inviting the reader to consider two quotes. The chairman of the steelworks is quoted as saying that "Intimidation and anarchy have won a total victory" (E12:2) and a Hadfield's convener as saying that "Loss of life has nothing to do with the trade union movement. But after all we have been through today it became obvious lives may be lost. We were determined to continue working. But we were told that if we did there would be 2,000 pickets tomorrow. I would challenge anyone to go through that picket line and face what we went through today" (E12:3-E12:4).

The intention in E12:1-E12:4 seems to be to produce

knowledge about secondary picketing at a Sheffield steelworks. True the author refers to 1,200 pickets and quotes a reference to 2,000 pickets. However, it seems likely that readers will read E12 as an editorial about secondary pickets/secondary picketing. This is likely because the author suggests that a firm, whose workforce is not on strike, has been visited by pickets who do not work for this firm and who were led, or at least many of them were led, by a well known non-steel trade union leader. The use of the phrase "... flying pickets..." (E12:5) also suggests that the author is considering secondary pickets and/or secondary picketing (i.e. flying to visit a firm, flying from firm to firm).³ Hence it would seem likely that the author is producing knowledge about secondary pickets and/or secondary picketing; specifically, he/she is using quotes to support his/her arguments about the events at the steelworks, the chairman and the convener are presented as eyewitnesses to the frightening of the workforce.

However, the production of knowledge about a specific instance of secondary picketing is not the overall intention in E12, it is only part of it. In the first of the final two parts the author relates this specific instance to previous instances. It is suggested that the convener's "... experience, Mr. Pussyfoot Prior, is why the people of this country voted you and your party into office. They want protection. They want a law to defend them against intimidation... from flying pickets like these" (E12:5). This part suggests to the reader that events like the recent events at Sheffield have occurred in the past. Clearly, to suggest that instances of intimidation by flying pickets LIKE THESE led people to vote for the present Government is to suggest that intimidatory events similar to the recent ones at Sheffield have occurred in the past. The suggestion is that the intimidatory actions at Sheffield are the latest in a series of intimidatory actions. Hence the author is re-producing the knowledge that secondary picketing in general is

intimidatory. True there is no evidence to suggest that the author is inviting the reader to see all past and present instances of secondary picketing as intimidatory. However, it is clear that he/she is re-producing knowledge about secondary picketing as opposed to merely producing knowledge about the secondary picketing at Sheffield; a specific, recent instance of secondary picketing is understood as being similar to previous instances of secondary picketing. The issue of the extent to which secondary picketing is held to be intimidatory will be returned to in due course. For the moment it is sufficient to note that the author is clearly suggesting that the events at Sheffield are the latest in a series of events which suggest that intimidatory secondary picketing is not atypical.

In E12:5 the author also suggests that people disapprove of and want something done about intimidatory secondary picketing. To suggest that people elected a Government to defend them against the kind of secondary picketing seen at Sheffield is to suggest that people disapprove of and want something done about this kind of secondary picketing. The author reinforces this suggestion in the final part, addressing Mr. Prior he/she suggests that "You have a mandate to act. Unless you listen to the people who put you in office, your whole government may become obsolete" (E12:6). Clearly, the reference to a mandate is a reference to the mandate to do something about intimidatory secondary picketing.⁴

Given the nature of E12 evidence for the re-production of knowledge about secondary picketing in the other editorials would be the existence of an attempt to demonstrate that secondary picketing during the steel strike, like previous instances of secondary picketing, is intimidatory and that people disapprove of and want something done about intimidatory secondary picketing. In E13 the author, developing the suggestion that two

officials of the miner's union are involved in the steel strike (E13:2), suggests that "The flying pickets which were successful at Hadfield's last Thursday, this week threaten to descend on the Sheerness Steel Company in Kent, Manchester Steel and the Bidston plant in Birkenhead. And the name of the game is bullying and intimidation" (E13:3-E13:4). These parts understand the intention to picket steel companies via a reference to the recent secondary picketing at Hadfield's. To suggest that the secondary pickets (i.e. flying=secondary; visiting different companies=secondary) who intimidated people at Hadfield's are going to other companies and that the "... name of the game is bullying and intimidation" is to invite readers to use the knowledge of the recent secondary picketing at Hadfield's established in E12 as a guide to the character of the intended secondary picketing. This invitation suggests to the reader that secondary picketing during the steel strike, not just the particular instance at Hadfield's is intimidatory. True the author does not directly say that all secondary picketing during the steel strike is intimidatory. However, to make a list of companies about to be effected by the kind of secondary picketing seen at Hadfield's is to suggest, or at least imply, that during the steel strike intimidatory picketing is commonplace. This is a re-production of knowledge in the sense that it re-affirms some of the knowledge re-produced in E12. Readers are reminded that instances of secondary picketing during the steel strike demonstrate that secondary picketing involving intimidation and/or bullying is a feature of industrial disputes. True there is no direct reference to past events in E13:2-E13:4 but readers bringing the knowledge re-produced in E12 to E13 will be able to use the analysis of the intended secondary picketing to re-affirm the knowledge that instances of secondary picketing during the steel strike are the latest in a series of instances of intimidatory secondary picketing.

The author develops the analysis of intimidatory secondary picketing during the steel strike by suggesting that it is illegal. It is suggested, for example, that one of the functions of the police "... is to enable law-abiding citizens to go about their business in peace" (E13:4) and that it is no "... use Mr. Prior talking about laws against secondary picketing which will be on the Statute Book by the summer. Massive intimidatory picketing blatantly violates the law as it already stands. The only legal right pickets have is to inform and persuade peacefully. Nobody pretends that this is what is going on now" (E13:7-E13:10). The author proceeds by suggesting that illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing has occurred in the past. It is suggested that "If necessary, chief constables should be told that they are expected to carry out this basic police duty, as did the Metropolitan Police in the case of Grunwick" (E13:11). This part invites readers to see illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing during the steel strike as another instance of illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing. To suggest that it is possible for chief constables to fulfill the function of enabling "... law-abiding citizens to go about their business in peace" (i.e. E13:4=E13:11 "... this basic police duty") by doing what the police did at Grunwick is to suggest that the steel strike and Grunwick are similar. The same police response is possible/applicable in both cases. Hence readers know that one of the issues in the steel strike, as in the Grunwick dispute, is the possibility and desirability of a police response to the threat posed by illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing. Further generalisation about this kind of issue is invited in E13:12. It is suggested that "If necessary, the Public Order Act can be toughened up, or... the law which forbids people to hold demonstrations outside polling stations at General Elections can be applied to industrial disputes." In the context of the reference to Grunwick

and the consideration of possible responses to illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing the reference to "... industrial disputes" suggests to the reader that the issue of responding to such secondary picketing arises in several rather than just one or two specific industrial disputes.

Clearly, the analysis of the illegality of intimidatory secondary picketing during the steel strike involves the re-production of knowledge. It relates this instance of illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing to other instances. Readers are invited to re-affirm the knowledge that the threat posed by illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing should be resisted. Taking E12 and E13 together it would seem that the Express' stock of knowledge about secondary picketing includes the following pieces of knowledge; that intimidatory secondary picketing is not atypical; that people disapprove of intimidatory secondary picketing and want something done about it; that intimidatory secondary picketing is illegal; that the threat posed by illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing should be resisted by the authorities. Clearly, all of these pieces of knowledge are re-affirmed and/or re-produced in E12 and/or E13.

In E14 the author begins by suggesting that "LORD HAILSHAM has made it clear that mobs who stand outside factory gates calling themselves pickets but behaving like gangsters are in violation of the existing law" (E14:1). The author proceeds by developing and supporting Lord Hailsham's argument. It is suggested that "None of the laws which bestow such wide-ranging immunities upon trade unions give a licence for thuggery. So if the criminal law is being blatantly violated in the context of an industrial dispute, the duty of the police is to enforce the law..." (E14:2-E14:3). These parts invite the reader to understand two things. Firstly, that secondary picketing during the steel strike is intimidatory, in the

terms of E14:1-E14:2 gangster like thuggery. Secondly, that this secondary picketing is illegal and can/should be dealt with by the authorities. True there is no direct reference to the steel strike. However, given E12 and E13 readers will read the reference to mobs breaking the law as a reference to illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing during the steel strike. The invitation in E14:1-E14:3 is a re-production of knowledge in the sense that the author is re-affirming the knowledge that the steel strike is another instance of intimidatory and illegal secondary picketing. True there is no reference to previous instances in E14:1-E14:3 but in the light of E12 and E13 these parts are clearly a re-affirmation of the validity of the knowledge that illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing is not atypical.

The next part of E14 seems to introduce a distinction between intimidatory activities and secondary picketing. It is suggested that "Violence or intimidation aside, where at least the law is clear, the question remains about the usefulness of Mr. Prior's Employment Bill when it comes to secondary picketing" (E14:4). One interpretation of this suggestion is that the author is suggesting that illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing and secondary picketing are both problems which should be dealt with. (NB. another interpretation of this kind of suggestion is given during the analysis of E8.) Competent readers know that the reference to people who call themselves pickets but behave in a violent and intimidating way is a description of the intimidatory and illegal nature of instances of secondary picketing during the steel strike. It follows that the author is inviting a distinction between legitimate secondary picketing and illegitimate (i.e. illegal and intimidatory) secondary picketing; that is, legitimate in the sense of being legal under existing legislation. Clearly, he/she does not consider non-intimidatory secondary picketing to

be legitimate in the normative sense. To suggest that the existing law can be used to deal with illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing (E14:1-E14:4) and to proceed by raising the question of the "... usefulness of Mr. Prior's Employment Bill when it comes to secondary picketing..." (E14:4) is to suggest that while the law can be used to deal with the problem of illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing, Mr. Prior's proposed legislation may not be a useful response to the problem of non-intimidatory but legal secondary picketing.

In E14:5-E14:11 the author invites a detailed consideration of the usefulness of Mr. Prior's Bill/proposed legislation. It is suggested that he has wrongly rejected criminal sanctions (E14:5); that "... his policy will fail unless it is drastically strengthened..." (E14:5); that the idea of suing or seeking injunctions against actual pickets is impractical (E14:6-E14:9); and that there are also practical problems involved in trying to sue union organisers (E14:9-E14:11). Clearly, these parts suggest that non-intimidatory secondary picketing is a problem which should be dealt with. To criticise a policy on legal secondary picketing because it is not strong enough, does not propose criminal sanctions and proposes impractical measures is to suggest that legal secondary picketing is a problem which should be dealt with. Readers know that recommendations like strengthen your policy on secondary picketing and consider introducing criminal sanctions are only made if secondary picketing is considered to be a problem which should be dealt with.

Clearly, in E14 the consideration of illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing and legal secondary picketing are distinct in that the author considers the former and then moves on to (i.e. "Violence or intimidation aside...") a consideration of the latter. The general significance of this is that it suggests that

the author does not invite the knowledge that all secondary picketing is illegal and/or intimidatory. To make a distinction between illegal/intimidatory secondary picketing and secondary picketing and to consider proposals to deal with the secondary picketing problem is to rule out the knowledge that all secondary picketing is illegal and/or intimidatory. What emerges from E12, E13 and E14 is that illegal and/or intimidatory secondary picketing is not atypical either in the past or during the steel strike. As the author does not suggest that all secondary picketing is illegal and/or intimidatory and does not suggest that only a few, isolated instances of secondary picketing have been illegal and/or intimidatory it seems reasonable to assume that the suggestion is that illegal and/or intimidatory secondary picketing both in the past and during the steel strike is common.

In E10 the author re-produces knowledge about the legal secondary picketing problem. Under the heading "Stop pussyfooting Mr. Prior, time is running out" (E10:1) the author asks "HOW CAN the Tory Government hope to make Britain great if it cannot make it work?" (E10:2). It is then suggested that "It's about time that they realised that they have a mandate for tough, direct action to solve the jungle of industrial relations- and to stop pussyfooting around with meek and mild policies" (E10:3). The author proceeds by criticising Sir Keith Joseph and Jim Prior's policy on secondary picketing. In respect of the latter and the Government in general it is suggested that "Jim Prior, afraid to take the firm steps that would strengthen the hand of the law, refuses to outlaw secondary picketing. This was a battle fought by this newspaper last year. And, as we said in 1977, the Government must give the management the right to manage and the workers the right to work. The Government came to power... with radical ideas for changing our fortunes.. The mistake... (they) made was to embark on a monetary

policy before tackling industrial relations" (E10:8-E10:11). These parts, amongst other things, provide evidence that knowledge about the problem of secondary picketing is part of the Express' stock of knowledge. The explicit reference to a tradition of campaigning to outlaw secondary picketing suggests that invitations to consider secondary picketing in steel strike editorials are re-productions of the knowledge that secondary picketing is a problem which should be dealt with. True in E10:1-E10:11 the author does not refer to secondary picketing during the steel strike. Moreover, in E10 the one brief reference to the steel strike (E10:6) is only a part of the author's criticism of Sir Keith Joseph. Hence it might be argued that E10 is not an editorial about the steel strike. However, the steel strike is mentioned in E10 and readers can relate the consideration of secondary picketing and industrial relations to the steel strike. Hence E10:1-E10:11 reproduce the knowledge that secondary picketing is a problem which should be dealt with.

In E8 the author considers a legal judgment about secondary industrial action during the steel strike. It is suggested that "THE LAW of England is what the House of Lords says it is... But if it is lawful for the steel union to create a strike in the private sector, where there is no real dispute, and if it is right for the unions acting in collaboration with the steel union to stop the movement of steel through the ports and across the country, then all we can say is that the law is wrong" (E8:2-E8:3). This part invites the reader to see the law, or at least the law as interpreted by the House of Lords, which permits secondary industrial action during the steel strike (i.e. extending the steel strike and stopping the movement of steel) as wrong. The author proceeds by suggesting that the Express, faced with a law which goes against its beliefs, recommends constitutional change rather than disobedience (E8:4-E8:5). It is then

suggested that "The trouble is that the Government Bill which is before the House makes scarcely a dent in the vast immunities which trades unions enjoy. Nothing in the Bill will make a criminal offence the kind of obstruction which the House of Lords judges to be perfectly legal" (E8:6). This part suggests to the reader that the fact that the secondary industrial action carried out during the steel strike would be legal under the Government's proposed legislation indicates the general inappropriateness of this legislation. In effect the author seems to be saying: the proposed legislation will not affect the immunities enjoyed by trades unions involved in secondary industrial action, for example, the stopping of the movement of steel during the steel strike and the extension of the steel strike would remain legal. To illustrate the suggestion that proposed legislation would not affect the immunities enjoyed by trades unions by suggesting that it would not make secondary industrial action during the steel strike illegal is to suggest that this instance of secondary industrial action illustrates that the proposed legislation does not solve the secondary industrial action problem.

In the last four parts of E8 it is suggested that "As things stand, the unions could, perfectly lawfully, mount a blockade against the country's economic life far more severe than anything imagined, let alone carried out, by Hitler's U-boats... The brutal truth is this. To stop intimidatory picketing, secondary picketing or blacking, requires being willing to bring trade unionists before the courts if they do not obey the law. Which in turn means being willing to face a general strike. All talk about "trades union reform" comes down to this. It is, in fact, the big question in our national life" (E8:7-E8:10). It is not clear whether the phrase "As things stand..." introduces arguments about what the unions could do under existing legislation or what they could do under proposed legislation. The latter reading

is more likely because the phrase is preceded by a consideration of the proposed legislation. However, it does not really matter which reading is intended. This is so because it is clear that the author is unhappy about both existing and proposed legislation (E8:2-E8:3 and E8:6). Hence in E8:7 he/she is in effect suggesting that the problem not solved by existing or proposed legislation is that the unions can, via industrial action, mount a blockade of the country's economic life. Readers are invited to see that a variety of forms of industrial action are part of the industrial action problem; namely, secondary industrial action (e.g. extending strikes, stopping or blacking the movement of goods), intimidatory picketing, intimidatory secondary picketing and legal, non-intimidatory secondary picketing. The reference to intimidatory picketing is almost certainly a reference to any kind of picketing involving intimidation. True the previous analyses have suggested that the author invites a consideration of intimidatory secondary picketing. Hence it might be argued that he/she is introducing a new previously unconsidered category (i.e. intimidatory picketing). However, for the Express intimidatory secondary picketing is a problem not so much because it is secondary picketing or because it is illegal but because it is intimidatory. Readers despite the fact that they have been invited to read accounts of intimidation as accounts of intimidatory secondary picketing will put intimidatory picketing in the same category as intimidatory secondary picketing. They will distinguish picketing and secondary picketing and will recognise the difference between intimidatory picketing and intimidatory secondary picketing but this latter difference will be considered unimportant because both activities involve the horror of intimidation.

It follows that E8 re-affirms the knowledge that intimidatory picketing/secondary picketing and legal, non-intimidatory secondary picketing should be dealt

with/outlawed. The author is also re-producing the knowledge that secondary industrial action is a problem which should be dealt with (i.e. outlawed). To suggest that, for those who believe that secondary industrial action is wrong, the appropriate response to a judgment legalising secondary industrial action during the steel strike is to critically re-affirm their belief (E8:4) is to suggest that this belief is part of our stock of knowledge.⁵

In E9 the author begins by suggesting that "AS THE steel strike drags on and involves more and more people, it is starkly obvious that the Government's present plans are pathetically inadequate to deal with the situation. The Bill going through the Commons would make no difference to the ability of the steel unions to extend the dispute to the private sector, it would not stop other unions from stopping the movement of foreign steel into and across the country" (E9:2-E9:3). These parts suggest to the reader that the lesson to be drawn from secondary industrial action during the steel strike is that the Government's proposals would not solve the secondary industrial action problem. To suggest that a Bill is inadequate because it would not prevent the extension of the steel strike and action to prevent the movement of steel is to suggest that the steel strike indicates that the proposed legislation does not solve the problem, it does not prevent that which should be prevented. Hence the author is re-affirming the knowledge that secondary industrial action is a problem which should be dealt with. In E9:2-E9:3, as in some of the other editorials, the emphasis on the inadequacy of the Government's proposals is a local modification of the Express's stock of knowledge about industrial action. The author seems to be saying: Sometime ago we began a battle against various forms of industrial action. The Government is right to tackle the problem which has

re-emerged in the steel strike. However, while the steel strike clearly indicates the nature of the problem it also, equally clearly, indicates the inadequacy of the Government's response to the problem.

In the rest of E9 it is suggested that hopefully Government amendments to the Bill will cover the points raised by the steel strike (E9:4-E9:5); that "... if the Government fails... to curb the abuse of trade union power..." it will have failed to carry out a mandate (E9:6); that given this mandate "... there can be no excuses. The work has got to be done on the immunities that trade unions enjoy" (E9:7); that "As things stand they can do virtually anything they like..." (E9:8); that the Government's proposals on secondary picketing and other facets of trade union practice are "...peanuts" (E9:10-E9:11); and, finally, that "It is not too late to think again. . It will be soon" (E9:12). Clearly, all of these suggestions re-affirm knowledge. To hope that amendments to the Bill will do something about the extension of strikes and the stopping of the movement of goods is to suggest that secondary industrial action should be stopped. To suggest that a failure to curb the abuse of trade union power and the immunities enjoyed by trades unions is a failure to act on a mandate is to suggest that the Government have a mandate to deal effectively with the industrial action problem (see also E10:3). To suggest that trades unions can do virtually anything is to suggest that without an effective Bill the problem will remain. To suggest that the Government's proposals are peanuts is to suggest that stronger proposals are necessary to deal with the problem posed by the various forms of industrial action. To suggest that it will soon be too late to think again is to suggest that the Government may lose the chance to solve the problem.

A question which now arises is what is the nature

of the industrial action problem, why do the various forms disliked by the Express need dealing with/outlawing? In E8 and E10 it is suggested that the industrial action problem is a fundamental problem. Some of the relevant parts of these editorials have already been referred to. To suggest, in the context of a recommendation to outlaw secondary picketing, that for sometime it has been necessary to give management the right to manage and workers the right to work (E10:9) is to suggest that until secondary picketing is outlawed industry will be unable to function properly and thereby will be unviable. To suggest, in the context of a reference to the Government's radical ideas for changing our fortunes, that to introduce an economic policy without tackling industrial relations is a mistake (E10:10) is to suggest that until the industrial action problem is solved economic prosperity for the nation is impossible. In the terms of the last part of E10:10 "A tight-money, free enterprise policy is the right one but it won't work unless the industrial relations problem has been dealt with". It would seem that for the Express various forms of industrial action are a fundamental problem, not just undesirable practices which should be curbed and/or outlawed but cancers which must be removed if industry and the nation generally are to prosper.

It might be argued that E10 only invites readers to see secondary picketing as the industrial action/industrial relations problem. However, industrial relations is a general term which covers more than just one category of industrial action and E8:7-E8:10 make it clear that all the various forms of industrial action disliked by the Express can contribute to a blockade of economic life.⁶ Moreover, as chapter three demonstrated E4 suggests that pickets involved in secondary industrial action "... could cripple British industry..." (E4:3) and E5 suggests that picketing in support of the steelworkers will worsen the already poor financial state of the steel

industry. E5 is also instructive because it specifies a form of industrial action which the author considers if not alright at least acceptable. It is suggested that after the enactment of the Government's Bill "... picketing can be subject to reasonable restriction- namely to the striker's own place of work" (E5:5). As E8, E4 and E5 suggest intimidatory picketing/secondary picketing is included in the forms of industrial action which are a problem because they can be used to mount a blockade of economic life. However, as some of the previous analyses suggest intimidatory picketing/secondary picketing is also seen as a problem because of the fact that it involves unlawful intimidation. Hence the Express' stock of knowledge has a moral as well as an economic dimension.⁷

The Express' stock of knowledge suggests that past and present are similar because: illegal, intimidatory picketing and illegal, intimidatory secondary picketing are problems and should be outlawed; legal, non-intimidatory secondary picketing and secondary industrial action are problems and should be outlawed; the majority of people want a solution to the industrial action/industrial relations problem; and because the problem is a fundamental problem, one which threatens orderly like (i.e. unlawful intimidation) and prevents prosperity for industry and the nation generally. This statement can be qualified in two ways. Firstly, picketing of the striker's own place of work is considered reasonable. Secondly, the author provides a local modification of the stock of knowledge by suggesting that the Government's response to the problem is inadequate. Presumably if in the future the Government does not satisfy the Express' requirements criticism of it's response will become part of the stock of knowledge. However, such criticism is not part of the existing stock of knowledge.

Clearly, while the author does not, for example,

suggest that all secondary picketing is illegal and intimidatory he/she only identifies one class of event which is not covered by the stock of knowledge about the industrial action/industrial relations problem; namely, picketing of the strikers own place of work. Finally, one of the conclusions in chapter three was that industrial action is one of the things which bring about the adverse effects associated with industrial disputes. Obviously this conclusion can now be qualified: industrial action is not simply a means or strategy.

DAILY MAIL COMMENT

The first Mail editorial about pickets and picketing considers Lord Denning's Appeal Court judgment banning secondary picketing during the steel strike. It is suggested that "With his views, as such, we have no quarrel. They are a splendid embodiment of the popular will. Secondary picketing is a thoroughly nasty practice. The overwhelming majority of men and women, in and out of trade unions, do detest it and do want to see it outlawed" (MA6:3). This part is clearly about secondary picketing in general (i.e. "Secondary picketing is..." as opposed to the more specific Secondary picketing during the steel strike is...). The author proceeds by inviting readers to consider secondary picketing during the steel strike. It is suggested that "The extension of the steel strike to workers in the private steel firms is an excessive and authoritarian abuse of union power. These men have no quarrel with their own employers. They are not party to any dispute with the British Steel Corporation. Most of them do not want to strike. And there has been no union attempt to ballot their opinions" (MA6:4). In the context of MA6:3 this part invites the reader to consider fresh evidence for the validity of the knowledge that secondary picketing in general is a nasty practice. To make an argument about the nastiness of

secondary picketing in general and to proceed by pointing to the nasty or undesirable features of secondary picketing during the steel strike is to suggest that this particular instance of secondary picketing re-affirms the knowledge that secondary picketing is nasty. It might be argued that there is no evidence for the claim that the knowledge that secondary picketing is a nasty practice is existing knowledge. However, at least in MA6, the implication of the statement "Secondary picketing is..." is that past events have demonstrated that secondary picketing is an undesirable practice. If the author merely intended to produce a generalisation from a consideration of secondary picketing during the steel strike it seems reasonable to assume that the description of the nastiness of this particular instance of secondary picketing would probably have preceded the more general claim (i.e. he/she would have derived the generalisation from the consideration of the particular instance). As it in fact follows rather than precedes the general claim it is probable that the author is re-producing the knowledge that secondary picketing is an undesirable practice not merely producing a generalisation.

An issue which now arises is whether the knowledge re-produced in MA6:2-MA6:4 is that secondary picketing is an undesirable practice or that secondary picketing is an undesirable practice which the majority dislike and want made illegal. Clearly, there is a sense in which the author invites a consideration of the latter knowledge. True the reference to the "...overwhelming majority..." and "...the popular will..." could be legitimations of knowledge not actual knowledge; that is, the author could be legitimating the Mail's views by invoking the support and approval of the majority. However, a knowledge reading is perfectly plausible.

In MA6:5-MA6:9 the author suggests that while Lord Denning's judgment is controversial because it

pre-supposes planned legislation and contradicts legal precedent it must be obeyed because it is the declared law. He/she proceeds by suggesting that "For the future, this Tory Government must both strengthen and more speedily implement plans for responsible union reform... the existing laws, on which... (Lord Denning) seeks to ground limits to overweening trade union power, have the solidity of quicksand and the clarity of activated sludge" (MA6:10-MA6:11). These final parts invite the reader to see secondary picketing during the steel strike as an event which demonstrates that secondary picketing is an undesirable practice and that plans to deal with it are desirable. The phrase "... this Tory Government must both strengthen and more speedily implement plans for responsible union reform" refers to plans about secondary picketing which existed prior to the steel strike (i.e. something which did not already exist could not be strengthened and more speedily implemented). True the final parts refer to "... plans for responsible union reform" and an attempt "... to ground limits to overwhelming trade union power..." rather than plans to reform or an attempt to ground limits to secondary picketing. However, readers will either read these phrases as meaning plans to reform or an attempt to ground limits to secondary picketing or read them as suggesting that secondary picketing is one of the aspects of unionism that needs reforming and one of the dimensions of union power which needs limiting. Clearly, the plans and attempt referred to in MA6:10-MA6:11 are references to the plans referred to in MA6:6 and the legal judgment referred to in MA6:2-MA6:5 (i.e. references to secondary picketing). Equally clearly the reference to the Government's plans invites the reader to approve of the pre-existing plans. To suggest that in the future plans must be strengthened and more speedily implemented is to suggest that the pre-existing plans are desirable. Competent readers know

that people do not recommend the strengthening and more speedy implementation of something which is undesirable. It follows that the author is offering the knowledge that past events have demonstrated the desirability of the plans. To suggest, in the context of a judgment about secondary picketing during the steel strike, that plans must be strengthened and more speedily implemented is to suggest that the knowledge that plans to deal with secondary picketing are desirable is valid but needs modifying. The suggestion is that the lesson of the steel strike is that these plans need strengthening and implementing faster. Obviously the invitation to modify knowledge in this way re-produces the knowledge that plans to deal with secondary picketing are desirable. In the light of the earlier parts of the editorial it re-produces the knowledge that such plans are desirable because secondary picketing is a nasty practice detested by the majority. The author is suggesting that the fact that the judgment banning secondary picketing during the steel strike is a controversial condemnation of secondary picketing does not alter the steel strike's status as the latest in a series of demonstrations of the need to combat the nasty practice of secondary picketing. The overall intention seems to be to say something like: previous industrial disputes demonstrated that plans to combat the widely detested nasty practice of secondary picketing are desirable. The steel strike confirms this knowledge and suggests a modification of it; namely, that the plans should be strengthened and more speedily implemented. This re-production of knowledge means that subsequent coverage of industrial disputes could make the following kind of statement: the steel strike, like other industrial disputes, demonstrated that... .

Given the nature of MA6 evidence for the re-production of knowledge in the rest of the editorials would be the existence of an attempt to re-produce and/or

re-affirm the knowledge that secondary picketing is an undesirable practice which the Government should deal with/outlaw, a practice which the majority of people dislike and want dealt with/outlawed. In MA7 the author begins by inviting the reader to recognise the intimidatory character of an instance of picketing. It is suggested that "INTIMIDATION has triumphed, however temporarily, at Hadfields. You can no more convince most men and women in this country that Arthur Scargill and his irregulars were peaceful pickets than you could persuade them that Hitler's stormtroopers were a butch contingent of the Salvation Army" (MA7:2). The immediate intention in this part seems to be to invite the use of a contrast between legitimate picketing (i.e. "... peaceful pickets...") and illegitimate picketing (i.e. intimidation organised in a military fashion) to produce the knowledge that the picketing at Hadfields was intimidatory. The author is suggesting that the intimidatory character of the picketing is an incontrovertible fact. Readers are invited to consider the following argument: the picketing was intimidatory, it would be virtually impossible to convince most people that this was not the case.

It could be argued that this characterisation of the picketing re-affirms the validity of the knowledge that secondary picketing is an undesirable practice. Competent readers know that acts of intimidation are examples of the nastiness referred to in MA6. True there is a sense in which intimidation is not the same kind of evidence for nastiness. Competent readers know that there is a difference between activities like intimidation and extending the strike to workers who do not want to be involved in it. However, they also know that these activities are similar in that they are both nasty. A problem here is that MA7 does not explicitly refer to secondary picketing. Hence unless there is evidence that it will be read as an editorial about secondary picketing it may be difficult to argue that knowledge is being

re-affirmed in the way suggested. This issue will be returned to shortly.

In MA7:3-MA7:5 the author proceeds by suggesting that "Public opinion is outraged by such scenes. Prior's law must be strong enough to defend the liberties of both workers and management at beleaguered firms like Hadfields. If the Tories now place anything less on the statute book in 1980 they will be abdicating their responsibilities". The reference to Prior's proposed law does not refer to a proposed law designed to deal with intimidatory picketing at Hadfields but to a proposed law which was formulated before the scenes at Hadfields. Readers know that Tory plans for legislation have been in existence for some time. If, as the author suggests, the proposed law is applicable to the scenes at firms like Hadfields, there must be some similarity between these scenes and the scenes or events which led to the formulation of the proposed law. In drawing the reader's attention to this similarity the author is using historically grounded knowledge to understand the picketing at Hadfields. The suggestion that "Prior's law must be strong enough..." invites the view that the lesson to be drawn from the picketing at Hadfields is that the Government must ensure that its existing plans are strong enough to deal with scenes of the kind which have occurred in the past (i.e. those which led to the formulation of the proposed law) and, most recently, during the steel strike. Hence the author is suggesting that some picketing past and present has been intimidatory and that this kind of picketing should be dealt with via legislation because it is an intimidatory threat to people's liberties, a threat which the majority dislike (i.e. "Public opinion is outraged by such scenes" (MA7:3)). It is possible to argue that MA7 will be read as an editorial about secondary picketing. Readers will probably read the reference to "Arthur Scargill and his irregulars..." (MA7:2) as a reference to secondary

pickets (i.e. they are not steelworkers and therefore cannot be primary pickets). Moreover, part of the Mail's definition of secondary picketing is extending the strike "... to workers in the private steel firms..." (MA6:4) and readers know that Hadfields is a private steel firm (see MA8:2-MA8:6 and MA11:2-MA11:3). Hence it is not unreasonable to suggest that the Mail's knowledge states that secondary picketing is undesirable simply because the mere fact of extended strikes is undesirable and because such extensions sometimes involve intimidatory threats to people's liberties.

Under the heading "Mobsters at the factory gates" (MA8:1) the author begins MA8 by suggesting that "MORE trade union thuggery is planned for this week. Mass assaults are threatened against those private steel companies and their independent-minded employees, who are still refusing to come to heel. This is not picketing. It is gangsterism. It is a deliberate attempt to terrorise, men who want to work, into joining the strike" (MA8:2-MA8:5). This formulation of the intended trade union action seems to be based on knowledge of the previous weeks' events at Hadfields. In MA8:6-MA8:8 the author suggests that "Hadfields of Sheffield was not closed down last week by peaceful persuasion, nor by an appeal for union solidarity. It was battered into surrender by blatant intimidation. The scenes... were sinister, ugly and criminal". Given this juxtaposition of the descriptions of the intended action and the events at Hadfields the author is grounding arguments about the former via a reference to the latter. This strategy suggests to the reader that secondary picketing (i.e. picketing private steel firms) during the steel strike, not just one instance at Hadfields, involves the gangster like intimidation of people who want to work rather than join the strike. Readers are invited to consider the fact that during the steel strike intimidation rather than peaceful secondary picketing is the norm. In the

terms of MA7:2 the triumph of intimidation is not just temporary. Clearly, this strategy re-affirms the knowledge that some secondary picketing is an intimidatory threat to liberties and the knowledge that extended strikes impose strikes on people who do not want to strike (i.e. independent employees who do not want to come to heel).

The author proceeds by suggesting that "In... (a) ...clear... invitation to arrest and prosecute... Lord Hailsham... uttered these... words:- "Let no one suppose that intimidation is legal. Let no one suppose that what we have seen on television again and again is legal under the existing law. These are breaches of the criminal law. Intimidation is unlawful and violence can amount to an affray'" (MA8:10). The use of this quote about the legality of the secondary picketing re-affirms the knowledge that it is intimidatory. The author proceeds by suggesting that "... intimidation... enjoys no immunity under existing English law" (MA8:11). This re-statement of Lord Hailsham's argument and the author's own characterisation of the secondary picketing invite the reader to take the view that there can be no reasonable doubt about the character of the secondary picketing and its legal status. The intention seems to be to make it unequivocally clear that secondary picketing during the steel strike involves intimidatory and criminal acts rather than legal and peaceful picketing.

The consideration of the illegality of the secondary picketing reinforces the knowledge that it is undesirable, denies it any legitimacy and suggests that the existing law can and should be used to deal with the problem of intimidatory threats to liberty. The author proceeds by suggesting "It is not as if we are dealing here with riots fuelled by spontaneous fury. Stormtrooper miners from Yorkshire, for example (and what an example), are scarcely men crazed by hardship or driven to extremes by empty bellies. They are well-heeled and well-fed. While

they take time off work down the pits to do a little intimidating, they draw meal allowance and money in lieu of wages... Flying pickets of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation are also given pocket money from union funds. Yet the ISTC is not providing strike pay... it is the taxpayers who are having to find millions... to support the families of striking steel workers... Unions... should be forced to meet at least a proportion of the cost (of official strikes). Let the executive of the ISTC decide whether to give beer money to bully boys or milk allowance to the babies of strikers. Let them choose and bear the odium" (MA8:12-MA8:17 and MA19).

This consideration of the financing of strikes and support for families seems to offer the reader local knowledge. There are no indications that knowledge is being re-produced. The author seems to be making specific complaints about some of the financial dimensions of strikes and proposing fairer arrangements. The consideration of the storm troopers and bully boys is continued in the rest of the editorial. It is suggested "Why should Britain's Welfare State be softer on strikers than that of almost any other industrialised nation in the free world. Why should the police turn a blind eye to Marxist publicity-seekers who stand dictator-like at the head of their union heavies and deny to law-abiding men and women that most cherished of rights, the right to work? The mobsters are at the factory gates. They trample on the rule of law and rob innocent citizens of their liberty. The Lord Chancellor has sounded the alarm and not before time" (MA8:20-MA8:23). As well as reinforcing suggestions about welfare policy and the use of existing legislation these parts suggest that the secondary picketing which has no possible justification (i.e. the pickets are well financed and well fed) is a well organised and politically motivated attempt to deny liberties via intimidation. In so doing they, amongst other things, underline and emphasise the nature and undesirability of secondary

picketing.⁸ There is no clear evidence which suggests that the author is re-producing the knowledge that intimidatory secondary picketing is illegal. However, competent readers know that intimidation implies illegal acts. Consequently, the suggestion that secondary picketing is illegal can be seen as a strong implication of the stock of knowledge.

Under the heading "VICTIMS CRYING OUT FOR JUSTICE" (MA11:1) the author begins MA11 by suggesting that "ONE private steel firm has been driven to breaking point. Shut down by secondary strike action, Hadfields... is losing £½ million a week" (MA11:2-MA11:3). The author then points out that the chairman of Hadfields says that during "... this crippling dispute..." (MA11:3) he will not pay "... taxes and insurance to the Government worth £2 million a month" (MA11:3). These parts suggest to the reader that the secondary picketing at Hadfields is to be understood as something which causes financial damage (i.e. losses arising from the shut down) and that Mr. Norton's refusal to pay taxes and insurance is a response to the crippling financial effects of secondary picketing/secondary strike action.⁹ In a way this knowledge of the secondary picketing at Hadfields is different from the knowledge of secondary picketing found in MA6, MA7 and MA8. The emphasis is on financial damage to a firm rather than on the intimidation of people who are not involved in the strike and/or who want to continue working rather than go on strike. However, there is also a sense in which these two kinds of knowledge are similar. Competent readers know that financial damage and intimidating people who are not involved in the strike and/or want to continue working rather than strike are similar activities. They can be understood as indications of the nastiness of secondary picketing and they adversely affect desirable things (i.e. economic viability and people's freedom/liberty). Hence there is clearly a sense in which the first part of MA11 re-affirms

the knowledge found in MA6, MA7 and MA8. This is not to say that things like financial damage and intimidating people can be equated but simply that they can both be taken as indicators of the way a nasty practice adversely affects desirable or valued things. In the terms of MA11:5 the firm shut down by secondary strike action is in the same category as "... the innocent passer-by who is mugged...". The suggestion is that the category is victim of a nasty practice.

The author proceeds by inviting readers to see trade union action in general, not just the specific action at Hadfields, as a threat to economic well being. This invitation begins in MA11:6-MA11:7, it is suggested that Mr. Norton and his firm are "Not only... victims but they are also the breadwinners for the nation. It is they and their like who support the State, subsidise its welfare needs and foot the bill for its follies". It is then suggested that "Yes, it is the money squeezed out of what wealth can still be created by such private enterprise which pays for schools, hospitals, debt-ridden nationalised industries and even handouts to the families of strikers" (MA11:8). This account of how finance for public spending is raised invites the reader to make generalisations. It is not just Hadfields who are the breadwinners but "... they and their like..." or put another way "... such private enterprise...". Further generalisation is invited in MA11:9. The reference to "... our unions..." is a reference to unions in general (i.e. unions) not just those associated with the steel strike or the secondary picketing at Hadfields. These generalisations are brought together in the suggestion that "Some brotherhood when the only solidarity they can show is to bite the hand that feeds them" (MA11:10). This part suggests that trade unions, through secondary picketing, adversely affect the economic viability of private enterprise and the State. Readers are invited to make a sharp contrast between trade unions and private

enterprise. The latter is seen as playing a central role in the creation and maintenance of the country's economic and social well being; in contrast, the former are understood as the causers, despite the rhetoric of brotherhood, of crippling damage to private enterprise and thereby to everyone, including themselves.

Taken in isolation the generalisations in MA11 invite the reader to use claims about the economic effects of secondary picketing at Hadfields as an occasion to produce general knowledge about trade unions/secondary picketing. However, set in the context of some of the editorials analysed in the previous chapter MA11 re-affirms knowledge about the effects of the actions of trade unionists. It suggests that these actions, specifically secondary picketing, damage particular industries, industry in general and social expenditure. Given this relationship between the two sets of editorials it is not unreasonable to suggest that MA11 is in effect a re-production of knowledge about the economic and social effects of secondary picketing/secondary strike action.

The Mail's stock of knowledge suggests that past and present are similar for three reasons. Firstly, secondary picketing is an undesirable practice because: extending strikes imposes strikes on people who are not and do not want to be involved in them; it sometimes/often involves an intimidatory/illegal threat to people's liberties; it damages particular industries, industry in general and social expenditure. Secondly, secondary picketing should be dealt with/outlawed. Thirdly, the majority of people disapprove of it and want it dealt with/outlawed. Clearly, the Mail considers all secondary picketing to be undesirable. To suggest that it is a "... thoroughly nasty practice..." (MA6:3) and to proceed in the rest of MA6, MA7, MA8 and MA11 by indicating the ways in which it is undesirable is to suggest that various aspects of the steel strike are re-affirmations of the knowledge that

secondary picketing in general is undesirable because... .. It is also probable that the Mail considers any kind of picketing which has the effects described to be undesirable; if the effects were the same the difference in the form of picketing would be insignificant. Finally, as suggested above, there is a close relationship between the Mail's knowledge of the economics of the steel strike and it's knowledge of pickets and picketing. Pickets and picketing are partly defined in economic terms and the author extends the list of adverse effects associated with the actions of trade unionists during strikes (i.e. trade unionists impose their will/views on people and threaten their liberties via intimidation).

MIRROR COMMENT

As has already been suggested the provision of arguments and knowledge about pickets and picketing is not a central concern in the Mirror. In MR12 picketing is understood in the context of the knowledge that the Government could resolve a strike which could have been prevented. Under the heading "THE COST OF SAVING FACE" (MR12:1) the author begins by suggesting that "THE strike which should never have started was looking as if it would never end. That's why the steel unions decided to make it much rougher. Their picketing of every customer of British Steel will be legal and devastating- if it is successful" (MR12:2-MR12:3). These parts suggest that steel strike secondary picketing, in the author's terms the picketing of customers, is best understood as a response to a deadlocked strike (i.e. ... "That's why" ...). In so doing they draw the reader's attention not so much to the secondary picketing but to the fact that the strike is deadlocked. Put another way the emphasis is on the status of the secondary picketing as an indication of deadlock rather than on the actual character of the secondary picketing. True there is a sense in which the

author provides an understanding of the actual character of the secondary picketing. Readers are invited to understand it as a means or strategy used by the steel unions. To suggest that secondary picketing is a potentially effective response to the fact that the strike has not ended is to suggest that it is a means or strategy, a tactic which might end the strike. This argument is reiterated in MR12:4 and MR12:5. It is suggested that "Industry has got by for nine weeks without the Steel Corporation. Stocks are high and so are imports. Manufacturers and Government have almost become complacent. But if they have half forgotten the strike, the steelmen haven't. Each has lost close on £1,000 in wages. Their desperation has made their leaders get tough". In the light of the earlier parts these parts suggest that so far the tactics of the steel union have not been successful and that the adverse effects of this lack of success led to the decision to picket customers of British Steel. The implication of this suggestion is that the secondary picketing is a legitimate trade union tactic. This implication is present not so much because the author positively invites the reader to approve of the secondary picketing but because the suggestion is that it is simply a tactic, means or strategy; something which is to be neither applauded nor denounced. In the rest of MR12 the author develops the issue of a preventable and deadlocked strike by suggesting that the negotiations have produced a basis for a reasonable settlement (MR12:6-MR12:8) and that a settlement is being delayed primarily because the Government will not break the deadlock because it is interested in saving face (MR12:9-MR12:10).

Like MR12, MR6 invites a view of pickets and picketing but highlights other issues. The author responds to legal judgments banning the extension of the strike and secondary picketing during the strike by suggesting that Lord Denning's "... decisions- about

spreading the strike and on secondary picketing- mean that the law is different from what many lawyers thought it was. And from what the House of Lords said it was only a few weeks ago" (MR6:6). The author proceeds by suggesting that these "... extraordinary judgments..." (MR6:5) must despite what some people say be obeyed (MR6:7). Having criticised the judgments (i.e. they are extraordinary because they contradict dominant legal opinion and a legal precedent) but recommended that they should be obeyed the author switches to the issue of a preventable and deadlocked strike (MR6:9-MR6:11). In this case criticism of the Government's stance towards the deadlock takes the form of the suggestion that the Government should intervene because the dispute "... affects us all" (MR6:11).

The suggestion that secondary picketing and strike action during the steel strike should not have been outlawed does not necessarily invite approval for the secondary picketing. However, the criticism of the judgment (see also MR7:7) implies that the secondary picketing is a legitimate trade union tactic in the sense that it is perfectly legal.¹⁰ As in MR12 there is no indication that the view that secondary picketing- and by implication other kinds of picketing- is a legitimate trade union tactic involves an invitation to positively support secondary picketing during the steel strike, secondary picketing in general or the trade union movement in general. Moreover, neither of these editorials is about secondary picketing in the sense that this topic is not a major topic and is subordinate to other topics. Clearly, the Mirror not only does not generalise or re-produce knowledge about pickets and picketing but also does not consider it a particularly important topic. All the author invites is approval for the view that secondary picketing during the steel strike can be supported in the sense that it is a legitimate trade union tactic. The editorials which refer to

pickets and picketing, like those analysed in chapter three, are local texts.

THE SUN SAYS

The Sun's consideration of pickets and picketing begins with the suggestion that "AN OLD menace returns to the industrial scene: bullying, threatening and sometimes violent secondary pickets" (S6:2). This introduction is followed by two parts which invite the reader to consider two specific, recent events: "At Sheffield, lorries trying to get into a private steel-works find their way blocked by 100 angry men. At Corby, a woman office worker is punched in the mouth as she tries to cross a picket line" (S6:3-S6:4). The reference to the recent events at Sheffield and Corby provide support for the author's argument that an old menace has returned. He/she is suggesting that the behaviour of secondary pickets at Sheffield and Corby are examples of bullying, threatening and sometimes violent behaviour. This invitation to see similarities between past and recent events is continued in the next two parts. In the first it is suggested that "Such ugly, shameful scenes are all too familiar. They recall the "flying pickets" of the two coal strikes" (S6:5). In the second it is suggested that it is significant that Arthur Scargill, the supposed inventor of secondary picketing, "... is said to be "advising" the strikers" (S6:6). Clearly, these parts relate the present to the past.

The overall intention in S6:2-S6:6 seems to be to offer an understanding of some secondary picketing during the steel strike by suggesting that the activities of steel strike secondary pickets are similar to those of secondary pickets in previous industrial disputes. The author does not argue that the secondary pickets at Sheffield and Corby were bullying, threatening and sometimes violent but rather that these secondary pickets, like

previous secondary pickets, were bullying, threatening and sometimes violent. He/she is re-producing knowledge rather than producing knowledge; drawing the reader's attention to the similarities between secondary pickets past and present. It seems reasonable to assume that this handling of the steel strike secondary pickets means that in editorials which deal with subsequent industrial disputes the author is in a position to re-produce knowledge by beginning with arguments like: An old menace returns to the industrial scene... . At X... , at Y... . These ugly and shameful scenes are familiar. They recall the flying pickets of the coal strikes and the steel strike secondary pickets. Whether or not this option was used in subsequent coverage of industrial disputes is of course an empirical issue. However, what is clear is that in the first half of S6 (i.e. S6:2-S6:6) the author is re-producing a stock of knowledge.¹¹

In the next section of the editorial the author develops his/her analysis via an invitation to understand the secondary pickets as a problem. It is suggested that the strikers "... nominal leader, the pathetic Bill Sirs, wrings his hands and says he is "very worried"" (S6:7) and that "Tory speakers declare that events are demonstrating the need for tougher laws against picketing, which they promised at the last Election" (S6:8). These suggestions invite the reader to argue that people who might normally be expected to have different views about the secondary pickets (i.e. a union leader and tory speakers supportive of anti-picketing legislation) in fact have similar views. The reference to Bill Sirs suggests that the official leader of the secondary pickets defines their activities as a problem. The reference to tory speakers suggests that they, like Mr. Sirs, consider these activities to be a problem. Competent readers know that people only worry and call for tougher laws when they think that some kind of problem exists. The next step in the author's argument is the suggestion that the views of

Mr. Sirs and the tory speakers are not a completely accurate analysis of the problem. He/she suggests "Of course, these (i.e. tougher laws) are needed. And soon. But we do not have to wait for new Acts of Parliament to appear like the Seventh Cavalry to save us. There are already laws against intimidation. Against violence. It is every bit as illegal to use force in an industrial dispute as it is in a robbery" (S6:9-S6:12). In the light of the earlier parts these parts suggest to the reader that while the activities of the secondary pickets are a problem worrying and calling for tougher laws are not, at least in the short-term, the most appropriate response to this problem. Clearly, to suggest that tougher laws are needed but are not necessary because existing legislation can be used against bullying, threatening and sometimes violent secondary pickets is to suggest that for the moment the best way to respond to the problem is to invoke existing laws. The underlying assumption is that the activities of the secondary pickets are a problem which should be responded to.

This production of a problem perspective on the secondary pickets is not the production of a new perspective, one which the author is offering as a specific response to a specific group of secondary pickets. The suggestion that promised tougher laws against secondary pickets/secondary picketing are needed soon suggests to the reader that the activities of secondary pickets have been a problem in the past.¹² To invite approval for a previous promise (i.e. "... at the last Election" (S6:8)) is to invoke a historical perspective. Readers know that a problem which was the subject of a previous promise to introduce tougher laws has been a problem for some time (i.e. at least since the date of the previous promise). Moreover, the initial suggestion that "AN OLD menace returns..." (S6:2) suggests that a problem has returned. Competent readers know that authors do not use words like menace to describe bullying, threatening and sometimes violent behaviour unless they feel that this behaviour should be defined as a problem.

Clearly, the knowledge re-produced in S6:2-S6:12 is that bullying, threatening and sometimes violent secondary pickets are a problem which should be responded to (i.e. tackled, solved, dealt with, etc.). For the author this knowledge adequately describes secondary pickets, or at least some secondary pickets, past and present. The final two parts of S6 re-affirm this knowledge. It is suggested that "No one has the right to stop workers who want to work. There is nothing sacred about a picket line. The police should not hesitate to use their full powers. And the Government should back them with its full authority" (S6:13-S6:14). In the light of the rest of the editorial these parts do two things. Firstly, they re-affirm the knowledge that the behaviour of secondary pickets is a problem which should be tackled. The references to the Government and the police only make sense if it is assumed that there is a problem which should be tackled. Secondly, they re-affirm the reader's knowledge of the nature of the problem. The earlier references to the events at Sheffield and Corby suggest that secondary pickets are not just a problem because they behave in a bullying, threatening and sometimes violent manner but because this kind of behaviour adversely affects some of the material and human dimensions of normal working (i.e. lorries cannot enter steelworks, an office worker has difficulty getting to work). True it might be argued that the author only offers these effects as examples of bullying, threatening and sometimes violent behaviour and is thereby suggesting that the problem is the behaviour not the behaviour and certain kinds of effects. However, to suggest that certain actions (i.e. angry men blocking lorries, somebody punching someone else) and the effects of these actions (i.e. blocked lorries and punched people cease to function in a normal manner) are examples of bullying, threatening and sometimes violent behaviour is to suggest that these actions and effects are part of the problem. It follows that the suggestion "No one has a right to stop workers

who want to work" (S6:13) reminds the reader that an aspect of the problem which should be tackled is the way the bullying, threatening and sometimes violent behaviour of some secondary pickets adversely affects a feature of normal working (i.e. people who want to work cannot do so).

Given the nature of S6 evidence for the re-production of knowledge in the rest of the Sun editorials would be the existence of an invitation to re-affirm the knowledge that the behaviour of some secondary pickets is a problem-one which should be solved- because bullying, threatening and sometimes violent actions adversely affect some of the material and human dimensions of normal working. In S7 the author begins by drawing the reader's attention to a particular response to steel strike pickets. It is suggested that "THANK HEAVEN that Home Secretary Willie Whitelaw has had the guts to demand that the law should be enforced against steel strike pickets who go too far. He promised that the police would ensure that all who wanted to work would be allowed to do so. They will crack down hard against violence and threats on the picket lines" (S7:2-S7:4). The first point to make about these parts is that they clearly invite a consideration of steel strike pickets not steel strike secondary pickets. However, equally clearly the author is referring to the behaviour of bullying, threatening and sometimes violent secondary pickets. This is so because in both S7:2-S7:4 and S6 there is a reference to violence and threats directed at people who want to work. Readers will read the two references as references to bullying, threatening and sometimes violent behaviour. It follows that the author is not distinguishing between pickets and secondary pickets or picketing and secondary picketing. Either he/she is suggesting that both pickets and secondary pickets behave in the way described or he/she is using pickets as shorthand for secondary pickets. In both cases there does not seem to be an intention to distinguish different kinds of pickets and picketing. Hence it seems

reasonable to assume that the author considers his/her descriptions to be applicable to all kinds of pickets and picketing. It follows that the author's formulation of Mr. Whitelaw's response to the activities of steel strike pickets suggests to the reader that picketing, or at least some picketing, during the steel strike involves violence and threats directed at people who want to work normally. To thank heaven for a demand that the law is enforced to allow people to work and to curb violence and threats is to suggest that violence and threats which prevent people working have occurred. This is a re-production of knowledge in the sense that it re-affirms most of the knowledge re-produced in S6. Readers are invited to focus on the merit of Mr. Whitelaw's response to bullying/threatening/violent/intimidatory behaviour directed at people who want to work normally. The suggestion is that he has taken a worthy and brave stance towards the problematic behaviour of steel strike pickets.

The author proceeds by inviting the reader to "... contrast Willie's firm stand for law and order with the wishy-washy excuses offered a year ago by Labour Prime Minister Jim Callaghan when lorry drivers mounted an unchecked blockade of British business" (S7:5). This part suggests that Mr. Whitelaw's response to the activities of pickets is better than Mr. Callaghan's. In the terms of S7:6-S7:7 he does not propose "... a weak-kneed reliance on a voluntary code..." but rather "... tough support of the law". The invited assumption in these parts is that some steel strike pickets, like some pickets in general, are a problem and that it is possible to assess the relative merits of politicians' responses to the problem of pickets. Readers know that tough support for the law and weak reliance on a voluntary code are two possible responses to the problem. Clearly, these parts are not inviting the reader to consider new knowledge about steel strike pickets in particular or pickets in general. Knowledge is being

re-produced. The author is suggesting that in the steel strike, as in the lorry drivers dispute, the behaviour of pickets is best understood as a problem which requires a solution. While the contrast between tough support for the law and weak reliance on a voluntary code invites support for a specific response to a specific group of pickets, it also re-produces a stock of knowledge. Underlying the praise for Mr. Whitelaw and the criticism of Mr. Callaghan is the re-produced knowledge that the behaviour of pickets, past and present, is best understood as a problem. Competent readers know that violence and threats which prevent people working (S7:3-S7:4) and an unchecked blockade of British business (S7:5) are similar in that they are both problems because they threaten normal working.¹³

In the last part of S7 it is suggested that Mr. Whitelaw "... knows it is vital for Britain's interests that people who want to live and work in peace should be protected from the bully boys" (S7:8). This part invites the reader to widen the category of things threatened by bully boys or bullying pickets. Phrases like "... Britain's interests..." and "... live and work in peace..." suggest, or at least imply, that the threat is a threat to cherished values (i.e. the country's interests, the right to live and work in peace) rather than just to the routine features of normal working. (See also S6:13- "No one has the right to stop workers who want to work".)

As noted as well as re-affirming and re-producing the knowledge re-produced in S6, S7 indicates that the Sun does not distinguish different kinds of pickets and picketing and implies that the problem is the threat posed to cherished values. Whereas S7 deals with the merits of general political responses to the problem of pickets, in S9 the author invites a consideration of the possibility of a more practical response to the problem. He/she begins by suggesting that "ENGINEER'S union chiefs

have appealed to steel pickets to stop blockading factories... They are worried about possible lay-offs" (S9:2-S9:3). These parts invite the reader to begin from the assumption that the steel pickets activities can be adequately characterised as blockading factories. To announce that that someone has appealed to somebody else to stop doing something is to invite the assumption that this something is happening and that the activities of the somebody else can be characterised as the doing of the something. These initial parts also invite readers to re-affirm the knowledge that the activities of steel pickets are a problem. The suggestion is that appeals to steel pickets grounded in a worry about lay-offs are made by people who are faced with a pickets problem. In more general terms the author is suggesting that another incident (i.e. the union chief's appeal) has re-affirmed the knowledge that the behaviour of some pickets is a problem. True the account of the steel pickets activities does not use categories like bully boys; violence, threats, intimidation. Hence it might be argued that there is a significant element of discontinuity between S6 and S7 on the one hand and S9 on the other. On the surface this is true. However, there are very strong continuities. Not only is the knowledge that steel pickets are a problem because they adversely effect normal working re-affirmed, the kind of behaviour referred to in S9 is essentially similar to that referred to in S6 and S7. Blockading factories and thereby causing possible lay-offs is not dissimilar to the prevention of lorries entering factories, threats to the freedom to work and blockading British business. Clearly, the author is inviting the reader to re-identify the problem; that is, the threats associated with bullying, threatening and sometimes violent pickets.

In S9 the author proceeds by suggesting that

while the Sun has sympathy with the Engineer's union chiefs, "... we do not understand their difficulty. Why not simply order their members to cross the picket lines? And to call the police if they are impeded" (S9:4-S9:5). These parts suggest to the reader that there is a simple solution to the problem posed by pickets who blockade factories (i.e. What is the difficulty? Cross the picket lines). In so doing it re-affirms the knowledge that the activities of steel pickets can be best understood as a threat or problem. To ask what can the engineers do about steel pickets who blockade factories and thereby cause possible lay-offs? is to ask what can be done about the problem of steel pickets who pose a threat to people's livelihoods? In the terms of S9:6-S9:7 the engineers right to work is threatened. The suggestion that it is possible to call the police if people are prevented from crossing picket lines also re-affirms the knowledge that the steel pickets are a problem or threat. It suggests that blockading factories is illegal and thereby problematic. In S9:8-S9:10 the issue of responding to the problem of steel pickets is developed via a focus on the relationship between the pickets and the steel union leader. It is suggested that Mr. Sirs "... who pretends to be worried about his pickets getting out of control, has the remedy in his own hands" (S9:8). This part suggests that the pickets' activities can be described as getting out of control and implies that if Mr. Sirs really agrees that this is a problem he should make the response to the problem available to him (i.e. the remedy is in his hands, if he is genuinely worried he should apply the remedy). The author proceeds by drawing the reader's attention to the remedy available to Mr. Sirs. It is suggested that men who refused to join the strike would be expelled from the union (S9:9) and that "If pickets disobey instructions, Mr. Sirs should withdraw their union cards too. But he won't" (S9:10). These parts re-affirm knowledge about the pickets problem by

suggesting that union discipline can and should be used against pickets who are out of control, who blockade factories and deny people their rights.

In S16 the author devotes a whole editorial to the question of union discipline. It is suggested that Bill Sirs has said that a number of steelworkers are to be expelled from the steel union because they "... defied union discipline by refusing to join the strike" (S16:2-S16:3). The author proceeds by drawing the reader's attention to another instance of people defying union discipline. It is suggested that "The union ordered that the dispute should be peaceful at all times. But the pickets intimidated other workers. They threatened to storm Hadfields. They committed acts of violence" (S16:5-S16:6). This contrast between orders that the dispute should be peaceful and the reality of unpeaceful acts/threats allows the author to ask why those pickets responsible for the unpeaceful acts/threats have not been expelled "Or punished in any way?" (S16:7). The knowledge which makes the posing of this question possible is that pickets have been involved in violent/intimidatory/threatening acts. Clearly, the author's raising of the issue of union discipline re-affirms the Sun's knowledge about pickets. Hence while the overall intention in S16 may be to raise the issue of union discipline, the raising of this issue is also a re-affirmation of knowledge.

The relationship between S10 and the Sun's knowledge of pickets/picketing is not very clear. It is suggested that "A GROUP of German steel workers have come to Britain to help Yorkshire pickets in the steel strike" (S10:2). It is then suggested that the cynical interpretation of this visit would be that it is in the "...Fatherland's interests to inflict... damage... on our industry. But even if the Germans have come in the cause of international brotherhood, it is still an

outrageous intervention in an argument which is none of their business" (S10:3-S10:4). This part implies that even if the support for the Yorkshire pickets is based on a notion of brotherhood it is illegitimate because only the steelworkers have a legitimate right to be involved in the steel strike. This kind of interpretation is also found in S10:7 where it is suggested that maybe the Germans persuaded the authorities that they wanted "...to kneel at the throne of "King" Arthur Scargill, who now seems to be running the strike". This implies that it is possible that the interfering Germans may have come to assist the king interferer. Moreover, readers know that Mr. Scargill's role in previous strikes involved some kind of responsibility for the ugly and shameful scenes associated with bullying, threatening and sometimes violent secondary pickets (see S6:5-S6:6). Hence it seems reasonable to assume that readers can define the visit of the Germans as interferers supporting a known organiser of ugly/shameful scenes and/or those directly responsible for such scenes (i.e. Yorkshire pickets/steel strike pickets). In a sense this chain of implications and associations re-affirms some elements of the Sun's stock of knowledge about pickets/picketing. It suggests, or at least implies, that picketing during the steel strike involves ugly and shameful scenes. There is also some indication that S10 re-affirms the problem of pickets perspective. The argument that the Germans, given their purpose to help Yorkshire pickets, should be deported (S10:8) suggests that the activities of Yorkshire pickets during the steel strike is a problem. Readers know that the suggestion that someone should be deported for helping someone else suggests that the activity of helping and thereby the activity of the someone who is being helped is problematic. However, while S10 does seem to re-affirm some elements of the Sun's stock of knowledge, it is not, in the way the other editorials are, a clear invitation to consider the problem of bullying, threatening and sometimes violent secondary pickets.

There is, for example, no clear reference to this kind of activity and no clear posing of the question what can be done about it? Hence S10, compared to the other editorials, is probably best regarded as somewhat eccentric.

In S12 the author considers the overturning of Lord Denning's decision to stop the steel unions extending the strike to the private sector. It is suggested that Lord Denning's decision seemed to involve "... creating law instead of interpreting it" (S12:3). This part invites the reader to acknowledge the legitimacy of the decision to overturn Lord Denning's decision to ban the extension of the strike (i.e. he interpreted the law incorrectly). However, the author proceeds by suggesting that the "... law as it stands is BAD law" (S12:4). This part invites the reader to challenge the legitimacy of the decision to overturn Lord Denning's decision (i.e. the decision to overturn is based on a correct interpretation of a bad law). In S12:5-S12:7 the author invites the reader to consider the reasons why the existing law is bad law. It is suggested that "Workers in the private steel industry have no quarrel with their employers, no part in the dispute. The unions have sought to involve them as a piece of blackmail. They want to inflict so much wilful damage to the economy that the Government will grant them increases they have not earned and which the country cannot afford". This account of why the law governing the extension of the strike is bad law invites a focus on the relationship between the unions, private steelworkers, the pay claim, the economy and the Government. The author proceeds by reiterating the suggestion that the existing law is bad and by posing two questions. "When is this absurd law to be changed? When is the scandal to be ended?" (S12:9). To inquire when an absurd law is to be changed to end the scandal is to suggest that extending strikes is a problem which should be solved. In S12:10 the author draws the reader's attention to the history and proposed future of

the problem. It is suggested that "The nation is still waiting to hear from Employment Minister James Prior". This part reminds the reader that the present Government has plans to provide a solution to the problem. The Government, the author suggests, has promised to end the scandal. In so doing he/she re-produces knowledge via the suggestion that the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which affirm the validity of the knowledge that the law about the extension of strikes is bad law. It follows that the author is probably suggesting that blackmail and damage, or similar actions, intended to make Governments meet pay claims have occurred before.

Hence, it would seem that the Sun has a stock of knowledge about secondary industrial action/the extension of strikes and a stock of knowledge about pickets and picketing. In the second case the knowledge suggests that bullying, threatening and sometimes violent pickets are a problem because this kind of behaviour adversely affects the material and human dimensions of normal working; a problem which should be tackled. This statement can be qualified in one way. It is probable that the author is also re-producing the knowledge that this kind of behaviour is a threat to cherished values (e.g. the country's interests, the right to live and work in peace). In the first case the knowledge suggests that secondary industrial action/the extension of strikes is a problem which should be tackled because it involves blackmail and damage intended to make Governments meet pay claims. In both cases no exceptions to the stock of knowledge are indicated. Hence it is reasonable to assume that the knowledge is considered to be an adequate and comprehensive description of pickets/picketing and the extension of strikes. The two stocks of knowledge, or the two dimensions of the stock of knowledge, at least in general terms, reinforce one another. In both cases the author is suggesting that strikers cause damage and

act in undesirable and inappropriate ways. At an even more general level this negative image is reinforced by the local knowledge identified in chapter three (e.g. the steelworkers/steel unions are responsible for the poor state of the steel industry, a long strike would further damage the steel industry and damage industry generally).

FOOTNOTES

1. It is not being suggested that pickets, secondary pickets, picketing and secondary picketing are necessarily identical or even similar phenomena. The title and introductory sentences of this chapter simply introduce the general subject matter of the editorials. The actual analyses will carefully consider the ways in which the editorials refer to phenomena which can be generically described by using phrases like "pickets and picketing".
2. E12 was printed alongside a photograph of the pickets/picketing referred to in E12:1. Hence when the author says "THIS WAS the scene... yesterday..." (E12:1), he/she is referring to a photograph. Given the scope and aims of this research no analysis of this strategy has been provided. This omission is not serious: the photograph reinforces rather than alters the meaning of the editorial.
3. The use of the word pickets could be authorial shorthand or it could indicate that the author does not distinguish between pickets and secondary pickets or picketing and secondary picketing. Some of the other editorials may throw some light on this issue. It should be pointed out that throughout this chapter, unless any of the editorials suggest otherwise, it will be assumed that competent readers define secondary picketing as picketing carried out by people who do not work for the firm being picketed (i.e. secondary pickets) and/or who picket firms where the workforce is not directly involved in the dispute.
4. It might be argued that the claim that people elected a Government because they wanted something done about secondary picketing is a legitimation of knowledge rather than actual knowledge. That is, the author is supporting his/her arguments by invoking the disapproval of the majority. However, the claim can also be read as knowledge. *(see chapter seven for a review of different knowledge processes)*
5. The Express' consideration of the legal judgment mentioned in E8 will be analysed in detail in chapter five. To avoid undue repetition of analyses chapter five will focus on E7 and E7 will not be analysed in this chapter. It can, however, be noted that while E7 focuses on Mr. Arthur Scargill's response to a controversial judgment outlawing secondary industrial action the author also clearly states that the controversial version of the law is the desirable version (E7:10-E7:11) and thereby re-affirms the knowledge that secondary industrial action should be outlawed.

6. It should be noted that the term industrial relations covers more than forms of industrial action (e.g. E9:10 refers to secret ballots and closed shops). Analyses of the Express' consideration of other aspects of trade union practice are provided in chapter six.
7. E15 has not been analysed in this chapter and is not analysed in any of the other chapters. It is clearly about pickets and picketing but does not reveal anything new about the stock of knowledge. The nature of this knowledge has been firmly established via analyses of numerous editorials. Hence an exception to methodological rules seems reasonable. E15 is, of course, available for inspection in the appendix to this chapter.
8. In MA10 the author provides a detailed consideration of a Marxist publicity seeker. An analysis of this editorial is provided in chapter five.
9. The equation of secondary strike action and secondary picketing is justified because part of the Mail's definition of secondary picketing is the extension of strikes to workers in private steel firms and because MA7 and MA8 describe the intimidatory nature of the secondary picketing at Hadfields.
10. A full analysis of the Mirror's consideration of the judgment is provided in chapter five. For the moment the relevant issue is the basic nature of it's knowledge of pickets/picketing.
11. It should be pointed out that S6:2-S6:6 do not invite the argument that all previous secondary pickets and all steel strike secondary pickets are a bullying, threatening and sometimes violent menace. The issue of the level of generalisation will be returned to when evidence from the other editorials is available.
12. The use of the word picketing in S6:8 could be shorthand for secondary picketing or it could be that the author is noting calls for tougher laws against picketing and secondary picketing. It will be assumed that S6 is about secondary pickets/secondary picketing. This is assumed on the grounds that the first half of S6 clearly considers secondary pickets and S6:8 refers to the activities of these secondary pickets as a demonstration of the need for tougher laws. The issue of different kinds of pickets and picketing will be considered when clear evidence is available.

13. The contrast between Labour and Conservative responses to the problem of pickets also reinforces the Sun's knowledge of the relative merits of the Labour and Conservative parties (see chapter three).

CHAPTER FIVE

THE DEFENCE OF COMMUNITY

INTRODUCTORY COMMENT

In this chapter a feature of some of the editorials, which will be referred to as the defence of community, will be identified and analysed. To facilitate clear understanding I will now briefly describe the general nature of the defence of community. The editorials suggest that certain events, arguments or knowledge pose a threat to the arguments and knowledge preferred by a newspaper. They challenge the validity of the newspaper's preferences. In order to maintain the validity of preferred arguments and knowledge and reject the claims of alternative arguments and knowledge a newspaper must resist or in some way deal with the threat. In the most general terms the defence of community refers to the process whereby a newspaper deals with threatening events, arguments or knowledge.

As suggested in chapter one
 There is a sense in which all editorials which relate the steel strike to a stock or consistent body of knowledge are defending community. They are dealing with potentially threatening events, arguments or knowledge by suggesting that they can be understood in terms of a stock or consistent body of knowledge. Hence the community's knowledge is re-affirmed and alternatives are ruled out. However, in some of the editorials defensive operations *of a particular kind* seem to be particularly evident and, in the light of the newspaper's community, important.¹
 This chapter is only concerned with these editorials.²

RESISTING SYMPATHY FOR THE STEELWORKERS

As was seen in chapter three a major dimension of the Mirror's knowledge of the economics of the steel strike is an invitation to sympathise with the steelworkers. The author draws the reader's attention to things like the lowness and unfairness of the pay offer, the loss of jobs and the destruction of communities. The Sun also draws the reader's attention to some of the things highlighted in the Mirror. Moreover, the Sun understands them in terms of sympathy for the steelworkers and thereby acknowledges the validity of the Mirror's arguments. However, the intention in the Sun seems to be to invite readers to resist arguments which invite people to sympathise with the steelworkers.

The main invitation to resist such arguments is found in S2 and S5 (see Appendix Four). In S2 the author begins by drawing the reader's attention to a threat: "BRITAIN'S railmen threaten to black steel imports if our own steelmen go on strike" (S2:2). This part suggests to the reader that the railmen are sympathetic towards the steelworkers case (i.e. they are prepared to support them by taking industrial action). The author proceeds by suggesting that "OF COURSE, there is sympathy for the 50,000 steelworkers who are to lose their jobs. OF COURSE, it is understandable that a two per cent increase should be regarded as derisory when inflation is above 17 per cent" (S2:3-S2:4). These parts suggest to the reader that there are good reasons for having sympathy for the steelworkers, that it is natural that some people will have sympathy for them (i.e. of course lost jobs and a low pay increase lead to sympathy for the steelworkers).

The intention in the early parts of S2 seems to be to introduce the topic of sympathy for the steelworkers and to acknowledge that sympathy for them is legitimate.

The author proceeds by inviting the reader to consider a fact. He/she suggests "But the fact is that the steel industry cannot afford even one per cent. It is already £300 million in the red" (S2:5). In the light of S2:2-S2:4 this part invites the reader to consider the following argument: while sympathy for the steelworkers is understandable, support for them based on comparisons between the low pay offer and the high rate of inflation is undermined because it ignores financial reality. It would seem that the author having introduced the topic of legitimate sympathy wants to invite the reader to challenge the notion of legitimate sympathy on financial grounds. The use of the But which introduces S2:5 invites the reader to challenge arguments which invite sympathy for the steelworkers in the following way: YES sympathy is legitimate BUT when financial reality is considered a sympathetic stance towards the steelworkers can be challenged.

In S2:6-S2:10 the author further undermines a sympathetic stance. As was demonstrated in chapter three these parts invite the reader to make the following logical/causal connections: there is clear evidence that despite high investment the productivity of British steelworkers is relatively low; the steel unions' restrictive practices and insistence on over-manning are responsible for the low productivity of British steelworkers; which is in turn responsible for the current financial state of the steel industry; the financial state of the steel industry undermines the legitimacy of the pay claim, they cannot afford to offer any pay rise. In the context of this chapter the significance of this chain of knowledge is that it invites the reader to consider the following argument: while there is a sense in which sympathy for the steelworkers is legitimate, a sympathetic stance not only ignores the financial reality it also ignores the fact that the steel unions are responsible for low productivity and that low productivity

is the cause of the current poor financial state of the steel industry; given the financial reality and the part played by the steel unions in bringing about this reality, the notion of legitimate sympathy for the steelworkers is undermined. Put another way in S2:2-S2:10 the author offers the reader: an instance of sympathy for the steelworkers (S2:2); reasons why sympathy is legitimate (S2:3-S2:4); reasons for undermining the notion of legitimate sympathy (S2:5-S2:10).

In the last parts of the editorial the author reinforces the critique of sympathy. In S2:11-S2:12 it is suggested that "Sooner or later, realism will have to dawn in our steel industry. It makes no sense at all for the railmen to help postpone the inevitable day of reckoning". As suggested in chapter three these parts invite the reader to see the chain of logical/causal connections established earlier in the editorial as a realistic assessment of the state of the steel industry. The significance of this in this chapter is that to suggest that sympathetic support for the steelworkers by the railmen would merely help postpone "... the inevitable day of reckoning..." is to suggest that, if the fortunes of the steel industry are to improve, the realistic reckoning of the Sun's chain of knowledge will have to be applied and unrealistic sympathy resisted.

The suggestion that those who are sympathetic towards the steelworkers are ignoring the realities of the situation is further reinforced in S2:13-S2:14. It is suggested that "... the National Union of Railwaymen... has often shown moderation and responsibility in its own demands. Do these sensible, moderate men really want to go to the wall in defence of the indefensible?" In the light of the rest of the editorial these parts suggest that sympathy for the steelworkers simply cannot be rationally grounded. The suggestion is that given the reality of the situation and the part played by the steel

unions in bringing about this reality, anyone who has sympathy for the steelworkers is defending the indefensible. The strength of this challenge to a sympathetic stance (i.e. defence of the indefensible) suggests that the author is inviting a rejection of the notion of legitimate sympathy for the steelworkers rather than just inviting readers to challenge or undermine the notion. Hence in S2 as a whole the reader is invited to consider; an instance of sympathy for the steelworkers (S2:2); reasons why sympathy is legitimate (S2:3-S2:4); reasons for undermining the notion of legitimate sympathy (S2:5-S2:10); a rejection of the notion of legitimate sympathy on the grounds that it is an unrealistic defence of the indefensible (S2:11-S2:14).

This kind of invitation is also found in S5. After referring to the tragic failure of the steel talks (S5:1-S5:2) the author suggests that "It is not difficult to have sympathy with both sides in the dispute..." (S5:3). He/she proceeds by inviting the reader to consider some reasons why it is not difficult to have sympathy for the steelmen. It is suggested that "THE STEELMEN have seen their position in the wages league being gradually eroded. They have seen state-subsidised miners win 20 per cent increases. And they have been told that only a wholly self-financing wages deal is open to them" (S5:4-S5:6). It is then suggested that despite the absurdity of the steelmen's demand for production bonuses in advance (S5:7) "... it is easy to understand their resentment" (S5:8). The provision of reasons why sympathy for the steelworkers is legitimate is followed by a consideration of the Steel Corporation's case (S5:9-S5:12). A case which the author suggests is stronger but which "... has been put with monumental ineptitude" (S5:9). It is then suggested "But no amount of official ineptitude can disguise the brutal facts... The industry is losing money at the rate of something like a million pounds A DAY. On the very day the talks

break down, devastating figures are produced showing that productivity in two Japanese steel plants last year was up to SIX TIMES greater than in Britain. The British industry has not lacked for investment. In the past six years £4,000 million of state cash- OUR CASH- has flowed into it" (S5:13-S5:17).

As in S2, the intention in S5:3-S5:17 seems to be to acknowledge that it is legitimate to have sympathy for the steelworkers and to proceed by providing information which undermines the legitimacy of a sympathetic stance. Readers are invited to consider the following kind of argument; while there are reasons why sympathy for the steelworkers is legitimate, sympathy for them based on these reasons is undermined because it ignores the fact that, despite investment, productivity is low and the industry loses enormous sums of money. Again the use of a But bridges the two parts of this argument. The author seems to be saying: YES it is possible to have sympathy for the steelworkers and the Steel Corporation has handled the negotiations badly BUT the brutal facts are... . As in S2 the author proceeds by suggesting that over-manning and restrictive practices are the cause of low productivity and financial losses (S5:18-S5:20). It is then suggested that "... the unions will have to move out of Never-Never Land... TO ACCEPT that it is no longer sensible to live now and pay later. TO RECOGNISE that increased prosperity for the industry and the nation can only come through drastic pruning and drastic reforms" (S5:22-S5:24). These parts suggest to the reader that anyone who has sympathy for the steelworkers is being unrealistic. In the light of the earlier parts of the editorial the suggestion is that when the issue of sympathy is considered the financial state of the steel industry and the part played by the steel unions in bringing about this state cannot be ignored; anyone who ignores this is, like the steel unions, living in never-never land (i.e. being unrealistic). True there are no direct references to sympathy in S5:13-S5:24,

the author is describing and accounting for the state of the steel industry and suggesting that the steel unions will have to recognise the validity of this description and account. However, it is clear that the intention seems to be to invite the reader to reject, or at least undermine, the notion of legitimate sympathy for the steelworkers. To raise the possibility of legitimate sympathy and to proceed by detailing the steel unions unrealistic failure to recognise that their inefficiency has caused financial losses is to invite readers to undermine the notion of legitimate sympathy. Competent readers are not expected to be sympathetic towards people who are responsible for large financial losses.

As in S2 there are indications that the intention in S5 is to invite readers to reject rather than merely undermine the notion of legitimate sympathy. In S5:26-S5:27 it is suggested that "Meanwhile, they are losing money, customers and valuable goodwill. They are further damaging their capacity to compete, and their own long-term employment prospects, and further delaying the day when the industry at last becomes viable". These parts invite readers to reject the notion of legitimate sympathy by adding to the list of adverse effects associated with the steel unions. In the light of the earlier parts of the editorial the author is inviting consideration of the following kind of argument: not only are the steel unions responsible for the current state of the steel industry, they are losing... and damaging...; consequently, the argument that the steelworkers deserve sympathy has to be rejected.

As in S2 this invitation completes the following overall invitation: the possibility of sympathy for the steelworkers (S5:13); reasons why sympathy is legitimate (S5:4-S5:8); reasons for undermining the notion of legitimate sympathy (S5:13-S5:24); a rejection of the notion of legitimate sympathy on the grounds that it is, in the terms of S2:14, defending the indefensible (S5:26-

S5:27).

RESISTING SYMPATHY FOR THE STEELWORKERS AS THE DEFENCE
OF COMMUNITY

Clearly, the overall intention in S2 and S5 seems to be to raise the possibility of sympathy for the steelworkers, to acknowledge that there are reasons why sympathy is legitimate and to provide reasons for rejecting the notion of legitimate sympathy. These editorials do not simply invite the reader to criticise the steelworkers, to castigate the railmen for threatening to support the steelworkers, to see the pay claim and the strike as damaging and unrealistic, to blame the steel unions for the current state of the steel industry, to uncritically reject the notion of legitimate sympathy for the steelworkers, etc. The invitation is to join a community which raises, examines and rejects an argument which threatens the Sun's preferred arguments and knowledge (i.e. the argument that sympathy for the steelworkers is legitimate). The author is logically (i.e. giving reasons) defending preferred arguments and knowledge by critically examining an alternative potentially threatening argument. An example of the way the argument that the steelworkers deserve sympathy threatens the Sun's arguments and knowledge is that if sympathy for the steelworkers is a valid argument it is difficult to make arguments which recommend that Mrs. Thatcher's government should resist the challenge posed by "unearned" wage claims and pursue a non-interventionist policy. It seems reasonable to assume that the examination and rejection of the alternative argument defends preferred arguments and knowledge in two senses. Firstly, the threat posed by the alternative argument is resisted. Secondly, the validity of the preferred arguments and knowledge is reinforced because the author has demonstrated that they can be defended against competitors, they appear to be superior arguments. The relationship

between the Sun's preferences and the threat posed by the sympathy argument will be considered in more detail later. For the moment it is sufficient to note that it is clear that in S2 and S5 a potentially threatening argument is being resisted, preferences are defended.

THE MIRROR'S INVITATION TO HAVE SYMPATHY FOR THE STEEL-
WORKERS

As chapter three demonstrated an invitation to have sympathy for the steelworkers is a central dimension of the Mirror's knowledge of the economics of the steel strike. From the point of view of this chapter the interesting feature of this invitation is that the Mirror often highlights the reasons why the steelworkers have been treated unfairly- why sympathy for them is possible and legitimate- referred to in the Sun. In MR1:2 readers are invited to consider the difference between the pay offer to the steelworkers and the rate of inflation. In S2:4 this difference is formulated as a reason why sympathy for the steelworkers is possible and legitimate. In the Mirror the author proceeds by introducing the sympathy invoking issue of pending lost jobs referred to in S2:3 (MR1:3-MR1:6). Later on in the editorial the reader's attention is drawn to the relatively high pay increase offered to the miners (MR1:8). This increase is formulated as a reason why sympathy for the steelworkers is possible and legitimate in S5:5.

As chapter three demonstrated in MR1 the references to the reasons why sympathy is legitimate identified in the Sun are part of a more general invitation to use the notion of fairness to sympathise with the steelworkers and to criticise the Government and/or the British Steel Corporation (i.e. it is suggested that they are responsible for things like lost jobs, low offers and inconsistent offers). As chapter three also demonstrated this

invitation is found in some of the other Mirror editorials. For the purposes of this chapter the important features of these editorials are as follows.

In MR5 the disparity between the treatment of the steelworkers and the awards/offers to other occupational groups (including the miner's 20 per cent referred to in S5:5) is formulated in terms of the question "So why pick on steel?" (MR5:1). In more detail, it is suggested that the logic of Sir Keith Joseph's view on the relationship between wages and productivity is correct: "The logic is undoubtedly right. Higher wages without higher productivity means higher prices or higher taxation" (MR5:4). The author challenges the appropriateness of this view by suggesting "But why single out steel? Was the miners' 20 per cent rise paid for out of higher productivity? Or the local government workers' 13 per cent?" (MR5:5-MR5:6). These parts suggest that while the logic of the view is correct it has not been applied fairly and consistently. Readers are invited to consider the following argument: YES if wages are not related to productivity the result will be higher taxes or inflation BUT why should the steelworkers be the only occupational group to have their wages related to productivity? As in the Sun the word But is used to challenge an argument previously formulated as legitimate. The sense of unfairness to the steelworkers invoked by the reference to the inconsistent application of a wages policy is reinforced by the suggestion that at the start of the steel strike the steelworkers would have accepted any of the rises given/offered to other occupational groups (MR5:7). In the last parts of the editorial the author reiterates the suggestion that the government has been unfair and inconsistent. It is suggested that it has, despite what it says, intervened in the steel strike and prevented a settlement, it has not done this in negotiations with other occupational groups (MR5:8-MR5:10).

In MR3 a question similar to the but why pick on/ single out steel? raised in MR5 is raised at the end of the editorial. Again the author invites sympathy for the steelworkers by pointing to the inconsistency and unfairness of the Government's policy; "If two per cent was the original limit for the steelmen why were the miners offered 20 per cent?" (MR3:11). In the earlier parts of the editorial the fact that the offer to the steelworkers has been progressively raised from its initial low level is used to criticise British Steel, specifically Sir Charles Villiers. It is suggested that the initial low pay offer to the steelworkers and the subsequent hesitant improvements reflects Sir Charles Villiers' disastrous chairing of British Steel (MR3:4-MR3:8). More specifically, the author suggests that the low initial offer started the steel dispute (MR3:5) and that the hesitant improvements have confused the negotiations (MR3:6-MR3:8). In MR2 the fact that Sir Charles Villiers is responsible for lost jobs is the dominant theme. The presentation of this sympathy invoking theme (MR2:2-MR2:6) is followed by a critical account of Sir Charles Villiers' views on the situation (MR2:7-MR2:9).

Clearly, the reasons why sympathy for the steelworkers is possible and legitimate found in the Sun and the Mirror are often the same. Equally clearly, the Mirror's invitation to use the notion of fairness to sympathise with the steelworkers is based on and/or leads to criticism of the Government and the British Steel Corporation, whereas the Sun rejects the notion of legitimate sympathy and goes on to prefer arguments and knowledge different from those preferred in the Mirror. This suggests that the Sun's rejection of sympathy for the steelworkers has inter-textual dimensions.

THE DEFENCE OF COMMUNITY: THE SUN AND THE MIRROR

The schematic representation of the overall invitations in the Sun and the Mirror (see overleaf) suggests that the Sun is not just defending preferred arguments and knowledge against an alternative argument, it is defending preferences against alternatives present in the Mirror.³

As suggested earlier the argument that the steelworkers deserve sympathy is a threat to the Sun's knowledge that it is desirable that the Government should resist "unearned" wage claims and pursue a non-interventionist policy. This threat can now be formulated as a threat to the Sun from the Mirror. The Mirror's sympathy argument threatens the Sun's knowledge in the following way. The invitation to have sympathy clearly involves the suggestion that the steelworkers should be granted a reasonable pay rise; that is, a rise similar to the offers/awards given to workers in other state-owned industries, a rise which is not necessarily related to productivity (i.e. in the Sun's and the Government's terms an unearned rise) and a rise which would involve Government intervention. Furthermore, the Mirror's invitation to use the notion of fairness to sympathise with the steelworkers and to criticise the Government suggests that criteria other than the economic ones preferred by the Government and the Sun can be used to assess the steelworkers situation and the actions/policies which effect them.

Clearly, the Mirror's preferences threaten the validity of the Sun's preferences. Hence the Sun's raising of the possibility of sympathy for the steelworkers is an acknowledgement of the threat posed by the arguments and knowledge preferred by the Mirror (A). The Sun's examination and rejection of the sympathy argument (B) defends its preferences against the threat. This

SUN

Acknowledgement of threatening argument: A
sympathy for the steelworkers is possible.

Reasons why threatening argument is valid:
lost jobs, a low pay offer, a higher award to workers in another state-owned industry.

Rejection of threatening argument: BUT THE FACTS ARE the steel industry loses enormous sums of money and the working practices/low productivity of the steelworkers is the primary cause of the financial plight of the industry.

D Conclusion/Statement of Preferences: If the industry and industry/the nation generally are to prosper wages have to be earned and not paid for with unearned money. The Government, quite rightly, has a policy of non-intervention.

MIRROR

Preferred argument leading to and/or produced by a consistent body of knowledge: sympathy for the steelworkers because/therefore fairness can be used to assess the steelworkers situation and the actions/policies which effect them.

Reasons why preference is valid: the actions/policies of the Government and/or the B.S.C. have led to lost jobs, a low pay offer, higher offers/awards to workers in other state-owned industries, threatened steel communities.

Acknowledgement of validity of threatening argument: true if wages are not related to productivity, inflation or taxation will rise.

Rejection of threatening argument: BUT WHY SINGLE OUT STEEL? The view about the relationship between wages and productivity is logically correct but has been applied unfairly and inconsistently.

C Conclusion/Statement of Preferences: the steelworkers deserve sympathy because they have been unfairly treated. The notion of fairness can be used to assess the steelworkers situation and the actions/policies which effect them.

Threat

B

Defence

Threat

E

F

Defence

defence enables the author to reject conclusion (C) and re-affirm the validity of conclusion (D). The end result of the process is that readers are able to defend preferred arguments and knowledge against alternative arguments and knowledge. They can logically support their preferences, logically reject threats to preferences and argue that other preferences are inferior. In all three cases the logical basis of their arguments is their ability to argue YES....BUT... .

This process also operates in the reverse direction—the Mirror defends its arguments and knowledge against the threat posed by the kind of arguments and knowledge found in the Sun. However, in this case the process is more indirect. As noted earlier the Mirror acknowledges that the logic of Sir Keith Joseph's views on the relationship between wages and productivity is correct (MR5:3-MR5:4). A similar acknowledgement occurs in MR1. After pointing to the low pay offer, the lost jobs and the closures which are devastating communities (MR1:2-MR1:4), the author quotes the following statement of Sir Charles Villiers "It is not possible to protect trade unionists from reality" (MR1:5). The author's response to the view that lost jobs and closures are a reality which must be faced is to suggest "Maybe not. But... that sounds like the skipper saying... Throw some more men overboard" (MR1:6). This response is an acknowledgement of the correctness of a view similar to that found in MR5. It is a YES-BUT type response to a view about the "logic/reality" of a situation. In both cases the acknowledgement of the correctness of the view is followed by a response which challenges the view: YES maybe the steelworkers cannot be protected from reality BUT they are adversely effected by the actions/policies of the Government and the British Steel Corporation, and other groups of workers are not effected in the same way (MR1:6-MR1:10); YES higher wages without higher productivity means higher prices or higher

taxation BUT the Government has applied this view inconsistently and unfairly, other groups of workers have not had their wages tied to productivity (MR5:4-MR5:10).

Hence it would seem that the Mirror performs a defensive operation similar in form to that found in the Sun. Namely, raising and acknowledging the validity of a threatening argument (E) and subsequently rejecting it (F). The basis of the threat is that if wages have to be tied to productivity sympathy for the steelworkers is impossible. The defence against this threat allows the Mirror to do three things: reject the argument that wages have to be tied to productivity; reject knowledge based on this argument (e.g. the steelworkers do not deserve sympathy, the Government should not intervene); assert the superiority of arguments and knowledge which emphasise fairness, sympathy for the steelworkers and criticism of the Government. In the schematic representation it is suggested that the threat to the Mirror comes from the Sun. However, the Mirror tends to focus attention on the arguments of the Government and the British Steel Corporation as opposed to the actual arguments found in the Sun. Nevertheless it does raise arguments similar to those found in the Sun. Hence it seems reasonable to suggest that intertextually the defence of community is a two way process between the Mirror and the Sun, even though the Sun's defence against the Mirror is more direct. In any case it is clear that Mirror readers, like Sun readers, can defend their preferences against threatening alternatives.

RESISTING SYMPATHY FOR THE STEELWORKERS: THE EXPRESS
AND THE MAIL

In the most general terms the Express and the Mail treat the issue of sympathy for the steelworkers in a

similar way to the Sun. They invite their readers to resist arguments which invite readers to sympathise with the steelworkers. The way(s) in which they do this is also generally similar to the strategy found in the Sun. However, in more specific terms there are differences between the three newspapers.

In the first section of E4 the author relates the steel strike to previous industrial disputes (E4:2-E4:4). It is suggested that an important difference between these disputes and the steel strike is that "There will be no General Election this year. The Government will not fall" (E4:4). The theme of strikes as challenges to Governments is developed via the suggestion that the steel dispute "... is a test of the Government's nerve" (E4:5). The author proceeds by suggesting that the situation testing the Government's nerve is that "The steel industry is losing around £1 million a day, yet the steel workers are demanding a wage increase of around 17 per cent- which is the going rate of inflation" (E4:5). It is then suggested that "The money is not there. Only if the Government printed more money, or raided the taxpayer, could more cash be produced. It will not happen. Why should it? Most people's wages are limited by what their firm or industry can actually earn. Why should the steelworkers occupy a privileged position? (E4:6-E4:7). These parts suggest to the reader two reasons why the steelworkers pay claim is illegitimate. Firstly, because in the light of the financial state of the steel industry the pay claim is simply ridiculous or in some sense unrealistic. This view of the pay claim is invited via the contrast between the £1 million a day losses and the 17% claim (i.e. losses of around £1 million a day, yet the wage demand is for...)). Secondly, because pay claims which are not directly related to the earning power of the industry and/or which can only be met by using taxpayer's/Government money contradict the general rule that wages are

directly limited by earning power. The suggestion is that there is no reason why the steelworkers should be an exception to this general rule.

Clearly, in E4:2-E4:7 the intention seems to be to formulate the steelworkers pay claim as a challenge to the Government and as illegitimate. The author proceeds by inviting the reader to consider the possibility of sympathy for the steelworkers. It is suggested that "Of course it is easy to understand how they feel about a prospective reduction in their living standard. It would be rough for anybody. Yet the assumption that their living standard should be maintained- as some sort of God-given right- irrespective of the real economic value of what they produce, is wholly unreal" (E4:8). The first section of this part invites the reader to recognise that sympathy for the steelworkers is both possible and legitimate. The reason why sympathy is said to be legitimate is the same as one of the reasons given in the Sun and the Mirror. Namely, that a pay offer which amounts to a reduction in living standard is rough or unfair. As in the Sun the acknowledgement that sympathy is legitimate is followed by an invitation to undermine/reject the notion of legitimate sympathy. The second part of E4:8 invites the reader to consider the following kind of argument: YES it is possible to have sympathy for the steelworkers BUT the assumption that wages should maintain living standards regardless of the economic value of the product is unrealistic; consequently, the notion of legitimate sympathy can be challenged. The function of the word But in the Sun is performed in the Express by the Yet in E4:8. This word bridges the two parts of the argument and signals the critique of the notion of legitimate sympathy. However, the Express does not perform the same defensive operations found in the Sun. The main difference is that in the Express the notion of legitimate sympathy for the steelworkers is rejected

before it is acknowledged. This difference can be illustrated via a comparison of the different overall invitations found in the two newspapers: The Sun- the possibility of sympathy for the steelworkers; reasons why sympathy is legitimate; reasons for undermining the notion of legitimate sympathy; reasons for rejecting the notion of legitimate sympathy; the Express- reasons for undermining the notion of legitimate sympathy for the steelworkers (E4:5-E4:7); the possibility of sympathy and a reason why it is legitimate (E4:8 first part); a reason for undermining the notion of legitimate sympathy (E4:8 part two).

It could be argued that the difference between the overall invitations demonstrates that, compared to the Sun, the Express does not place great emphasis on the possibility of legitimate sympathy for the steelworkers. This issue, so the argument would run, is not textually prominent, it is raised in the middle of an invitation to consider the reasons for undermining the legitimacy of the steelworkers pay claim. Readers are not invited to consider the following argument- YES it is possible and legitimate to have sympathy for the steelworkers YET... , but rather the following argument- the steelworkers pay claim is illegitimate, YES sympathy for them is legitimate YET this stance can be undermined/rejected. Clearly, the difference between these two arguments is that the second is somewhat dismissive of arguments which sympathise with the steelworkers. The rejection of such arguments is made easier because the illegitimacy of the pay claim is firmly established before the issue of sympathy is raised.

The argument that this difference is indicative of a particular stance towards the sympathy argument could be developed in the following way. The Express' dismissive approach indicates that it does not consider

the sympathy argument to be a major threat to its preferred arguments and knowledge. True materials which enable readers to resist the sympathy argument are provided, hence it must be assumed that this argument is considered a threat. However, it is considered a minor threat in that it can be easily rejected or resisted. If it was seen as a major threat it is reasonable to assume that the author would place it in a textually prominent position and proceed to examine and ^ereject it. As it is the author, so to speak, rejects it in passing. The sympathy argument does not introduce arguments about the economics of the pay claim, it is mentioned in the course of a consideration of such arguments. It follows that the author expects readers to radically reject rather than simply undermine or reject the sympathy argument. Clearly, for the Express the crucial thing about the steelworkers pay claim is that it must be understood in the context of an economic policy which insists that pay rises have to be earned by performance. Given the Express' clear and firm support for this knowledge the sympathy argument can be strongly and easily rejected. The reader is in a position to radically reject arguments which emphasise sympathy for the steelworkers and to radically re-affirm the superiority of the Express' arguments and knowledge. Readers are not expected to be strongly attracted by alternative arguments and knowledge.

The main problem with the above argument is that it assumes an extremely close relationship between a stance towards the sympathy argument and the fine details of the physical organisation of E4. It is, for example, quite possible to argue that the physical details of the rejection of the sympathy argument reflect a strategy for dealing with something considered to be a major threat. According to this argument the author seems to be effectively dealing with a major threat by disguising or under-emphasising the significance and/or

validity of the sympathy argument. It is difficult to see how textual analysis could adjudicate between these readings of the physical details of E4. Hence it must be concluded that it is impossible to impute any significance to the detailed differences between the Express and the Sun. However, one thing is clear; readers are invited to defend preferences against an alternative.

The Mail's treatment of the sympathy issue is found in MA1. In MA1:3, it is suggested that "You have to have a balance sheet, instead of a heart, not to feel some sympathy for the men who work in (the steel) industry". The author proceeds by providing reasons why sympathy for the steelworkers is legitimate. It is suggested that "No sooner had they become resigned to the disappearance of 20,000 jobs, than they are having to face the prospect of losing 32,000 more. Even worse, the pay rise they are being offered is a mere 2 p.c." (MA1:4 and MA1:6). After raising the possibility of sympathy and giving reasons why it is legitimate the author suggests that the lost jobs and the low pay offer have "...driven..." the moderate Mr. Bill Sirs "... to stand and make a fight of it" (MA1:7). The author proceeds by challenging this stance: "It is suicide. Sheer suicide" (MA1:9). The reasons why "... the poor chap and his 85,000 members..." (MA1:8) are committing, or are about to commit, suicide are given in MA1:10-MA1:12: shutting down the industry would worsen its financial state and thereby lead to more redundancies (MA1:10); similarly, any improvement in pay achieved by a strike would result in lost jobs (MA1:11-MA1:12). In the terms of the last sentence of MA1:12 the steelworkers "...can't win".

The intention in MA1:3-MA1:12 seems to be to invite the reader to consider the following argument: YES it is possible and legitimate to have sympathy for the steelworkers BUT a strike in support of their claim

would be self-destructive. This argument does not really challenge or undermine arguments which sympathise with the steelworkers, it simply suggests to the reader that sympathy is possible and legitimate but that a strike would be self-destructive. In MA1:16 the author proceeds by "suggesting that "The hard truth is that there is only one way forward for British Steel... many fewer men working... far more productively". It is then suggested that the current low productivity of British steelworkers is the reason why the steel corporation is offering a low basic pay rise with extra pay for improved efficiency (MA1:17-MA1:18). In a sense these parts invite the reader to challenge the sympathetic perspective provided by the heart. The suggestion is that despite the possibility and legitimacy of sympathy for the steelworkers, efficient production can only come through lost jobs (i.e. fewer men) and higher productivity (i.e. improved efficiency). In effect the author seems to be saying: the reality of the balance sheet overrules the sympathy of the heart. However, the author proceeds by suggesting that "It would be utterly dishonest... not to concede that improved productivity will... create yet more redundancies..." (MA1:19). This part invites readers to retain some sympathy for the steelworkers. The author is suggesting that even given improved productivity and thereby improved industrial performance and pay the steelworkers will still be adversely affected by job losses. Put another way the author is inviting the reader to be honest. He/she is suggesting that it must be clearly stated that improved productivity will not necessarily improve the steelworker's situation, even given improved productivity jobs will be lost. Readers are invited to see that there will, at least in the foreseeable future, always be reasons for sympathising with the steelworkers.

The retention of sympathy for the steelworkers is

also invited by the suggestion that "... when times were not so bad, successive Governments could not summon up the courage to back the tough measures required to make British Steel viable and competitive... painful changes are having to be pushed through now, when the economic weather is foul. A... strike will not avert these changes... only render them more traumatic..." (MA1:21-MA1:22). These parts invite readers to argue that there is nothing the steelworkers- or anyone else- can do to avoid low basic pay offers, job losses and pay offers tied to productivity. The suggestion is that these painful changes are, in the terms of MA1:16, the way forward, that it is inevitable that the steelworkers will be the victims of painful changes.

In a sense the overall invitation in the Mail is similar to that in the Sun. The possibility of sympathy for the steelworkers is raised, reasons why sympathy is legitimate are given and reasons for challenging the perspective of the heart/sympathy argument are given. However, it is possible that the intention in the Mail is not so much to reject the notion of legitimate sympathy but to suggest that it has to be considered in the light of the realities of the balance sheet. Overall the reader is invited to consider the following argument. Such things as lost jobs and a low pay offer make sympathy for the steelworkers entirely legitimate but the realities of the situation must be faced: a strike, as would improvements in pay, will lead to more redundancies; painful changes are inevitable, the industry's performance can only be improved if fewer men work more productively and if wages are closely tied to productivity. This argument accords priority to the Mail's knowledge of economic realities but also invites readers to sympathise with the steelworkers. True the legitimacy of sympathy is undermined in that the author invites the reader to let the balance sheet rule the heart. However, the

emphasis on the way the steelworkers are/will be adversely affected whatever happens invites the reader to remain sympathetic.⁴

The fact that the Mail seems to invite readers to retain rather than reject outright the notion of legitimate sympathy for the steelworkers does not affect its ability to defend preferred arguments and knowledge. Faced with the threat of the sympathy argument the reader, despite being sympathetic, is in a position to defend preferred arguments and knowledge (e.g. the illegitimacy of the pay claim and the strike, the validity of non-interventionist economic policies). This can be done via a reference to economic realities. Readers faced with the threat can argue: sympathy for the steelworkers is possible and legitimate but the facts of the matter are that the strike would be suicidal; that low basic pay offers/job losses are inevitable; that the way forward- fewer men working more productively- may not improve the steelworker's situation but is the only way forward. Clearly, the Mail, like the Express, the Mirror and the Sun, offers readers materials which enable them to defend preferred arguments and knowledge against threatening arguments and knowledge.

THE DEFENCE OF COMMUNITY: THE APPEAL COURT AND SECONDARY PICKETING

As the analysis of the issue of sympathy for the steelworkers suggests one of the defining features of the defence of community is that readers are provided with materials which enable them to resist threatening arguments and knowledge. In the case of an Appeal Court judgment about secondary picketing/secondary industrial action one of the main intentions in the Express and the Mail seems to be to invite resistance to Mr. Arthur Scargill's response to the judgment.

RESISTING MR. ARTHUR SCARGILL'S RESPONSE TO THE
JUDGMENT

In E7 (see Appendix Five) the author begins by suggesting that "IN a confused legal situation the latest ruling has to be accepted as the authoritative one. So unless the House of Lords overrules Lord Denning's court of Appeal, the court's ruling on the steel strike must be accepted. Which means the steel unions must call off strike action in the private sector, and the trade union ban on the movement of steel must be lifted" (E7:2-E7:3). These parts simultaneously invite an acceptance of the ruling and an acknowledgement that it could be criticised. For the author the ruling has to be accepted not because it is unequivocally correct but because the legal situation is confused and in such situations the latest ruling, unless it is changed, must be accepted. Similarly, certain trade union actions have to stop not because they are unequivocally illegal but because a ruling, which has authority because it is the latest ruling, means that they have to stop; if the ruling is changed the actions could be legal. Clearly, the introduction of the situation as "... a confused legal situation...", the criterion of the "... latest ruling ..." and the qualification of the need to accept the ruling ("So unless...") constitute an acknowledgement that the ruling which has to be accepted could be criticised.

The author proceeds by suggesting that "Of course, the present situation was tailor-made for Arthur Scargill, the Yorkshire miners' leader. This desparately ambitious man, with his thirst for personal publicity, can hardly be expected to neglect an opportunity to cast himself in the role of trade union hero- even martyr" (E7:4). It is then suggested that Mr. Scargill's ambition and desire for personal publicity led to his rhetorical demand to workers to defy the Court of

Appeal: "So he places himself on the rhetorical barricades, demanding defiance of the Court of Appeal. He asserts that the workers should pay more attention to their trade union than to the court" (E7:5). , In prefacing an account of Mr. Scargill's response to the judgment (i.e. he recommends defiance of the judgment) with an account of his motivations the author is inviting the reader to undermine the legitimacy of the response. He/she is suggesting that it is an illegitimate response because it is the result of ambition and a desire for personal publicity rather than a result of informed criticism of the judgment. The suggestion is that "personal factors" led to and explain Mr. Scargill's critical response. The reader's ability to delegitimise his response is reinforced by the formulation- rhetorical demand to defy the court. Again this suggests that the response is not the result of informed criticism. It is, the author suggests, simply a piece of rhetoric.

Additional reasons for undermining the legitimacy of Mr. Scargill's response are provided in the next two parts of the editorial. It is suggested that the doctrine that workers should pay more attention to their trade union than to the court is "... curious ..." (E7:6) and that "... if individuals, or organisations... are going to decide what laws to obey and what not, then we will live in a state of anarchy" (E7:7). As in the earlier parts of the editorial part of the delegitimising power of these parts is that they suggest that Mr. Scargill's response is not the result of and/or does not constitute informed criticism (i.e. it is simply a decision to recommend defiance of the law and obedience to a pressure group). However, E7:7 also invites de-legitimation because it suggests that the response involves an invitation to disobey the law and is the kind of thinking which leads to anarchy. Competent readers are not expected to afford legitimacy to

anarchistic invitations to disobey the law.

Clearly, the intention in E7:4-E7:7 seems to be to de-legitimise Mr. Scargill's response to the judgment. The reason why the author invites de-legitimation is that the response threatens some of the Express' knowledge. The basis of the threat is that the response suggests that the judgment is illegitimate because it places a ban on legitimate secondary industrial action, consequently criticism of it and support for the action is a legitimate stance. It might be argued that the author does not acknowledge that this is what the response suggests. True he/she does not refer directly to Mr. Scargill's legitimisation of criticism and support. However, connotations of criticism and support are present in the suggestion that "... demanding defiance of the Court of Appeal. He asserts that workers should pay more attention to their trade union than to the court" (E7:5). In this part the author, in order to facilitate the de-legitimation of Mr. Scargill's response, seems to have transformed a relatively neutral phrase (e.g. criticism of the ruling and support for the trade union actions) into a phrase with de-legitimising potential (e.g. rhetorical demands to defy the court and pay more attention to a trade union). Likewise a relatively neutral introduction to Mr. Scargill's response is transformed into "Of course, the present situation was tailor-made for Arthur Scargill... This desparately ambitious man..." (E7:4). These phrases reinforce the reader's ability to undermine the legitimacy of the response without impairing his/her ability to see that a response which criticises the judgment and invites support for the outlawed actions is being considered. Put another way the references to Mr. Scargill's response and the formulations which undermine the legitimacy of it tend to merge (i.e. Mr. Scargill said XYZ. This is a rhetorical demand becomes "... he places himself on the rhetorical

barricades, demanding definace..." (E7:5)).⁵ Clearly, readers know that the author is considering a response to the judgment which criticises it and which invites support for the actions it outlaws.

As chapter three demonstrated part of the Express' knowledge is the knowledge that secondary industrial action is undesirable and should be outlawed. Hence Mr. Scargill's invitation to criticise the judgment and support the secondary industrial action outlawed by it threatens the Express. It suggests that an instance of secondary industrial action is perfectly legitimate and that workers should support it. The Express' introduction to the judgment acknowledges the legitimacy of this suggestion by acknowledging that the judgment banning secondary industrial action can be criticised and/or challenged. Given this introduction and the Express' knowledge it follows that the de-legitimisation of an invitation to criticise the judgment and support secondary industrial action is an attempt to defend preferred knowledge against the threat posed by an alternative argument. True the overall invitation in E7:2-E7:7 is only to consider: an acknowledgement of the legitimacy of criticism of the judgment and thereby of invitations to support the actions it outlaws (E7:2-E7:3); references to Mr. Scargill's criticism and support (E7:4-E7:5); reasons for de-legitimising or rejecting Mr. Scargill's support for the secondary industrial action (E7:4-E7:7). Hence it might be argued that the intention only seems to be to defend a particular legal judgment and to undermine the legitimacy of criticism of it. There is, so this argument runs, no evidence to suggest that the intention is to defend preferred knowledge about secondary industrial action; the author is simply suggesting that a legal judgment should be obeyed and that invitations to disobey it are illegitimate. However, in the concluding parts of the editorial it is suggested that "What is most important

is that the Government's own legislation should be strengthened, clarified, and pushed through without delay. So that the Denning version of the law is laid down in black and white, unambiguously, on the Statute Book" (E7:10-E7:11). These parts relate the judgment to preferred knowledge. In the light of the earlier parts of the editorial they suggest to the reader that while the judgment outlawing secondary industrial action can be criticised, it is desirable that pending legislation should unequivocally outlaw the actions outlawed by the "... Denning version of the law...". Hence the author seems to be defending the preferred knowledge that secondary industrial action should be outlawed against the argument that it is perfectly legitimate and should be supported- rather than just defending a judgment against criticism. Clearly, given the concluding parts, the intention seems to be to reject the legitimacy of Mr. Scargill's invitation to support secondary industrial action and to re-affirm the knowledge that secondary industrial action is something which should be outlawed.⁶

If the Express was not considering and rejecting a threatening argument the editorial would probably have begun, or at least could have begun, as follows: The Appeal Court ruling means that strike action in the private sector must be called off and the ban on the movement of steel lifted, the Denning version of the law should be embodied in the pending legislation. Mr. Scargill's criticism of the judgment and support for the outlawed actions means that this use of the judgment as an occasion to simply state and re-affirm a preferred argument is impossible. The author is forced on to the defensive because Mr. Scargill's challenge to a legal judgment outlawing secondary industrial action challenges knowledge which supports and/or recommends the outlawing of secondary industrial action. Given this threat the author has to place the Express'

preferences in a YES-BUT type argument. Readers are invited to consider the following: YES the judgment can be criticised and thereby support for the secondary industrial action is legitimate- it is certainly not unequivocally illegal- BUT Mr. Scargill's invitation to support the secondary industrial action is not based on genuine, reasoned arguments but on a desire for personal publicity. Hence his arguments do not challenge the argument that secondary industrial action is illegitimate and should be outlawed. The important thing is that it should be outlawed. This YES-BUT argument allows the author to deal with a threat to a preferred argument (i.e. the secondary industrial action is a legitimate trade union practice) and to re-affirm preferred knowledge (i.e. secondary industrial action should be outlawed).

In general terms the Mail's treatment of the judgment and Mr. Scargill's response to it is similar to the Express'. The overall intention in MA6 seems to be to invite readers to acknowledge that the judgment can be legitimately criticised and to invite support for the spirit of the judgment. It is suggested that while "LORD DENNING is a very great lawyer... there is a limit to the good sense that even he can extract from bad law" (MA6:2). The author proceeds by suggesting that Lord Denning's views are acceptable and "... a splendid embodiment of the popular will" (MA6:3). The reader is then invited to consider why this is the case: "Secondary picketing is a thoroughly nasty practice..."; most people "...detest it and.. want to see it outlawed" (MA6:3); "The extension of the steel strike... is an excessive and authoritarian abuse of union power" (MA6:4); workers in the private steel firms are not involved in the dispute, do not want to strike and have not been balloted (MA6:4).⁷

This invitation to consider the acceptability or

correctness of Lord Denning's views is followed by an invitation to acknowledge that his judgment can be legitimately criticised. It is suggested that "The jump, however, from condemnation to legal judgment does appear to be one of the most audacious the Master of the Rolls has ever made. Tory plans to make secondary picketing illegal have not yet reached the statute book. Lord Denning's judgment... sounds to be in flat contradiction to the majority ruling of the Law Lords only a month or so back" (MA6:5-MA6:7). Clearly, these parts indicate reasons why it is possible and legitimate to criticise Lord Denning's judgment- it amounts to condemnation rather than legal judgment, it presupposes pending legislation and it contradicts legal precedent.

Having supported the judgment and acknowledged that it can be legitimately criticised, the author proceeds by suggesting that "For the moment, what Lord Denning and his two fellow Appeal Court judges have declared to be the law is, indeed, the law. Until and unless the Lords find otherwise, it must be obeyed by all the citizens in the land" (MA6:9). In suggesting that a judgment which can be legitimately criticised must be obeyed this part draws the reader's attention to the possibility that not everyone will automatically accept a judgment which can be criticised and which might be overruled in the near future. However, the author does not pursue the issues of criticism and possible disobedience. In the next two parts he/she reiterates preferred knowledge about secondary picketing. It is suggested that "For the future, this Tory Government must both strengthen and more speedily implement plans for responsible union reform. They can't leave it all to Lord Denning" (MA6:10-MA6:11). In the light of the earlier parts of the editorial these parts invite readers to consider the following YES-BUT type argument: YES the judgment can be

criticised- there is a possibility of disobedience- BUT disobedience is illegitimate because the declared law is the law; it is also good law, it should form the basis of future legislation. Hence it would seem that the author is not particularly interested in criticism of the judgment and disobedience, he/she is simply suggesting that they are possible, that the judgment must be accepted and that it is a good judgment. Put another way criticism and disobedience are not taken seriously, the author simply mentions them and proceeds by relating the judgment to preferred knowledge about secondary picketing (i.e. it is undesirable and should be outlawed).

However, when MA6 is seen in the light of MA10 it is clear that the author's raising of the legitimacy of criticism and the possibility of disobedience has a defensive purpose. The "... tale of two trade unionists" (MA10:1) told in MA10 is a contrast between two different responses to Lord Denning's judgment. It is suggested that Mr. Bill Sirs might be "WRONG-HEADED... But it is not easy to dislike (him). He is a trade unionist pure and simple. Trying to do what he can for his members. Understandably, he is critical of the... judgment... however, he is law-abiding. Martyrdom may be thrust upon him. But he hasn't done around looking for it" (MA10:2-MA10:5). It is then suggested "What a contrast to Arthur Scargill, champion bandwagon jumper... Nobody can get in on a militant trade union act with such indecent haste as this charmer with the carefully groomed Marxist quiff. There he was yesterday in time for the lunch time news.. and... early editions of the evening newspapers urging trade unionists to thumb their noses at the law and to carry on picketing... Wouldn't he love to be 'done' for contempt? He'd adore the publicity. The steel strike is not his dispute. He's muscled in on it. Like he barged his way into prominence at Grunwick. In spitting defiance at the law he draws attention to himself" (MA10:6-MA10:11).

The Mail's references to Mr. Scargill's response are similar to the Express' in that they invite the reader to undermine the legitimacy of the response via a reference to "personal factors". In the case of the Mail this takes the form of the suggestion that he is a professional interferer who is only interested in publicity. Clearly, the suggestion is that his invitation to criticise the judgment and to support the secondary picketing outlawed by it is the product of his personality rather than of reasoned argument. (As in the Express the reference to this invitation is couched in delegitimising terms, i.e. invitation to criticise and support becomes "... urging trade unionists to thumb their noses at the law and to carry on picketing..." (MA10:8)). The reason why there is an invitation to undermine the legitimacy of Mr. Scargill's response is that it threatens the Mail's preferred knowledge. The threatening nature of his response is apparent from the way the author contrasts it with Mr. Sirs' response. This contrast recognises that the judgment can be criticised and distinguishes between a legitimate and an illegitimate critical response: Mr. Sirs' is understandably critical of it, Mr. Scargill's criticism of it involves an invitation to actively defy the declared law. For the author the difference between the two responses is that Mr. Sirs' involves critical acceptance of the judgment (i.e. "...he is law abiding..." (MA10:5)), whereas Mr. Scargill's involves an invitation to actively defy the judgment. The latter response is illegitimate because it goes against the principle of obeying the law until/unless it is changed (MA6:9); in contrast, Mr. Sirs' response is legitimate because criticism of a controversial judgment which nevertheless accepts this judgment is understandable (MA10:4). Such criticism does not involve inviting people to defy the law and to support/carry on picketing, consequently it does not pose a threat to the Mail's preferred knowledge (i.e.

secondary picketing is undesirable and should be outlawed). Mr. Scargill's response is a threat, it challenges the preferred knowledge.

True Mr. Sirs' response implies support for the secondary picketing and therefore could also be considered a threat to the Mail's preferred knowledge. Clearly, it suggests, or at least implies, that the secondary picketing is legitimate. However, Mr. Sirs' response is not seen as an invitation to support secondary picketing but only as understandable criticism of the judgment. In contrast, Mr. Scargill's response is seen as a radical invitation to support the secondary picketing (i.e. support it regardless of the law) and consequently is a threat because it suggests that workers/trade unionists should pursue their interests via the legitimate tactic of secondary picketing regardless of the law. Clearly, this invitation to support the secondary picketing and to see it as a legitimate tactic is a threat to the knowledge that secondary picketing is undesirable and should be outlawed. The de-legitimisation of Mr. Scargill's response allows the author to resist the threat of arguments which invite radical support for secondary picketing (i.e. support which invites defiance of the law).

As in the Express, if the Mail was not in the business of resisting the threat of Mr. Scargill's response to the judgment there would be no need to acknowledge that it can be criticised and to discuss his response; the acknowledgement (MA6) and the discussion (MA10) are two sides of the same coin. In other words the judgment is controversial, the issue of criticism only arises, because of the existence of possibly legitimate responses which criticise it and invite radical support for the secondary picketing. Given the Mail's preferred knowledge in the absence of such responses it could simply invite readers to focus

on the correctness of the judgment (i.e. it rightly outlaws secondary picketing). As it is Mr. Scargill's response forces the author on to the defensive and consequently he/she has to invite readers to consider the following: acknowledgement of the possible legitimacy of criticism of the judgment (mainly MA6 but also MA10:4); two critical responses to the judgment, one of which is a radical invitation to support the secondary picketing (MA10); reasons for undermining the radical response (MA10:6-MA10:11).

The use of the contrast between two responses reinforces the reader's ability to resist the threat of Mr. Scargill's response because it invites readers to accept one version of the criticism of the judgment argument. This allows them to formulate Mr. Scargill's version as "extreme" in the sense that it goes beyond the limits of acceptable criticism. The implication is that ordinary trade unionists like Mr. Sirs are not interested in mobilising support for the secondary picketing, they only want to criticise the judgment. People like Mr. Scargill, on the other hand, are an extreme minority who want people to support secondary picketing regardless of the law. Put another way readers are invited to consider the following YES-BUT type argument: YES the judgment is controversial, criticism of it and support for the secondary picketing may be legitimate BUT Mr. Scargill's response goes beyond acceptable criticism/support. Most trade unionists are not interested in supporting illegal actions. This form allows the author to resist a threat to the knowledge that secondary picketing is undesirable and should be outlawed. In short the author's conclusion that "In spitting defiance at the law draws attention to himself" (MA10:11) is an attempt to draw the reader's attention away from Mr. Scargill's arguments by suggesting that he only wants personal publicity.

THE EXPRESS AND THE MAIL: MR. SCARGILL AND THE DEFENCE
OF COMMUNITY

The Express' and the Mail's knowledge of the Appeal Court judgment is similar in that they both invite their readers to acknowledge the possible legitimacy of a threatening argument and to resist the threat posed by this (i.e. Mr. Scargill's) argument. As the schematic representation (see overleaf) shows the preferred argument about the judgment (B) stems from preferred knowledge (A).⁸ As suggested earlier it seems reasonable to assume that were it not for Mr. Scargill's response to the judgment the Express and the Mail would simply draw on preferred knowledge about secondary picketing and state preferred argument (B). However, the threat of Mr. Scargill's response (C) makes this difficult, the preferred argument cannot be made because his response criticises the judgment and invites support for the secondary picketing. Consequently, the reader is invited to consider an understanding of the judgment which takes account of Mr. Scargill's argument (D). This means not just that a specific threat is resisted, it also allows the reader to resist and challenge any alternative knowledge which may emerge from Mr. Scargill's argument. For example, the implication of his argument is not just that the judgment can be criticised and the actions outlawed by it supported but also that secondary picketing in general is a legitimate trade union tactic which should not be curbed by pending legislation or Appeal Court judgments. Clearly, this knowledge challenges the Express' and the Mail's knowledge. Equally clearly, the de-legitimisation of Mr. Scargill's argument is ipso facto a de-legitimisation of the more general knowledge implied by his argument. In other words preferred knowledge can be defended against an alternative argument and alternative knowledge.

IN THE ABSENCE OF
THREAT AUTHOR
RELATES JUDGMENT
TO PREFERRED
KNOWLEDGE.

UNDERSTANDING WHICH
PROVIDES DEFENCE
AGAINST THREATENING
ARGUMENT.

Express and Mail:
preferred knowledge-
secondary picketing
is undesirable, pend-
ing legislation must/
should deal with this
problem.

Acknowledgement of
possible legitimacy of
threatening argument:
the judgment must be
accepted because it is
the law. However, it is
controversial and
could be overruled.
Hence criticism of it
and support for the
actions it outlaws have
some legitimacy.

An Appeal Court
judgment about SP:
steel strike SP is
illegal

Mr. Scargill's argument:
Mr. Scargill has invited
defiance of the
judgment and support for
the SP.

Preferred argument
about judgment: the
judgment is correct,
it should form the
basis of future
legislation.

Rejection of validity of
threatening argument:
Mr. Scargill is an
ambitious man who makes
arguments for personal
reasons. Consequently,
his arguments have no
rational basis.

THREAT TO PREFERRED ARGUMENTS
AND KNOWLEDGE: Mr. Scargill has
urged trade unionists to defy the
law and obey their trade union.
This argument suggests: the
judgment is controversial; it
does not have to be obeyed; it
outlaws legitimate actions;
support for the actions is legit-
imate; more generally, SP is a
legitimate trade union tactic
which should not be curbed by
legislation.

D

A

B

C

Another more general point is that it seems reasonable to assume that Express and Mail readers are in a position to de-legitimise anyone who makes the kind of argument made by Mr. Scargill and/or who holds the knowledge implied by his argument. True there is no direct textual evidence to support this assumption; the editorials only deal with Mr. Scargill. However, in assessing his argument the authors are defending knowledge against an alternative argument and, at least potentially, alternative knowledge - not against Mr. Scargill but against his argument. Hence competent readers will be able to reject other similar arguments. However, it should be pointed out that the de-legitimisation materials offered may be specific to Mr. Scargill. There is no guarantee that they would work in other cases. Presumably if the newspapers were faced with an argument made by someone who could not be de-legitimised via a reference to "personal factors", they would have to provide other reasons for de-legitimisation. Clearly, their preferred knowledge makes the de-legitimisation of public support for secondary picketing essential.

THE MIRROR: RESISTING THE RESPONSE OF PEOPLE LIKE ARTHUR
SCARGILL

The Mirror's invitation to accept a controversial judgment is different from the Express' and the Mail's. There is no accompanying invitation to see the judgment as a correct one. Indeed the Mirror invites criticism of the judgment which goes beyond merely acknowledging the possible legitimacy of criticism of it. However, in an important respect the overall intention seems to be similar to that in the Express and the Mail. Namely, to deal with the threat posed by a certain kind of response to the judgment.

(In MR6 the invitation to acknowledge the

controversial nature of the judgment is made via the suggestion that "The legacy of this dispute will be sour and long-lasting. And Lord Denning's extraordinary judgments will make it worse. His decisions- about spreading the strike and on secondary picketing- mean that the law is different from what many lawyers thought it was. And from what the House of Lords said it was only a few weeks ago" (MR6:5-MR6:6). These parts suggest to the reader that Lord Denning's judgment(s) can be criticised because it contradicts dominant legal opinion and legal precedent. The reference to the private sector steel-workers who defied the ruling (MR6:3) adds weight to the suggestion that criticism of the judgment is legitimate. It draws the reader's attention to an instance of active defiance of the judgment. Clearly, in MR6:3-MR6:6 the intention seems to be to invite criticism of Lord Denning's judgment.

The author proceeds by qualifying this invitation. He/she suggests that "Nevertheless the steel union leaders, rightly, will abide by (the judgment). People like Martin Flannery, MP for Hillsborough, who hoped the workers wouldn't take notice of Lord Denning, are foolish, wrong and dangerous" (MR6:7). This part suggests to the reader that while the judgment is controversial and criticism of it is possible and thereby has some legitimacy, criticism which involves an invitation to disobey the judgment is illegitimate. It is then suggested that the risk is that Lord Denning's judgment may "... set loose the unofficial (leaders). He has given provocation to those wanting and waiting to be provoked" (MR6:8). The suggestion here is that disobedience inciting statements by unofficial leaders (i.e. people like Martin Flannery) are not rational statements. Such people, in that they want and await provocation, are professional provocators. Consequently, any statement they make about Lord Denning's judgment lacks a rational basis. These statements, it is suggested, are not reasoned responses

to the judgment because the people concerned will make such statements given any opportunity and regardless of the merits of particular cases.

Clearly, the Mirror seems to be inviting readers to de-legitimise the arguments of those whose criticism of the judgment involves an invitation to defy it (i.e. "... People... who hoped the workers wouldn't take notice of Lord Denning..." (MR6:7)) on the grounds that they are not rational, reasonable arguments. There does not seem to be any attempt to relate the "... foolish, wrong and dangerous ..." (MR6:7) views of those who want to be provoked to preferred arguments and/or knowledge. In the concluding parts the author suggests that a preventable strike could have been stopped once started (MR6:9) and that "... its time the Government moved to break the deadlock" (MR6:11). While these parts state some preferred arguments they are not directly related to the analysis of the judgment. The intention seems to be to consider the judgment and then move on to the separate issue of a deadlocked strike. Hence the analysis of the judgment is a specific analysis in the sense that arguments about the judgment are not related to more general preferred arguments/knowledge.

However, when MR6 is seen in the light of MR7 there is evidence that the judgment is being related to general preferences. In MR7 there is a more general consideration of why arguments which invite defiance of the judgment are wrong/foolish/dangerous. The author begins by quoting an extract from a speech by Mr. Arthur Scargill: "Trade unionists... have a simple choice to make. They either accept the decision of three men in wigs sitting in a remote part of London or accept the advice and instruction of their trade union" (MR7:2). The first part of the editorial text draws the reader's attention to the possibility that this response is illegitimate because it is the product of personal factors. It is suggested that "MR. SCARGILL is a martyr in search of a strike, and he

trails his opinions from one strike meeting to another in the hope of finding it" (MR7:3). This part suggests that Mr. Scargill's arguments have no legitimacy because they are not specific reasoned responses to specific events but more general opinions which he applies to any available event (i.e. trailing from meeting to meeting) in order to pursue or reinforce his status as a martyr. The possibility of a relationship between his response and personal factors is not referred to again until the end of the editorial. The other parts focus on the actual response. It is suggested that parts of Mr. Scargill's response are not relevant to the issue at hand (i.e. his statement that the Appeal Court judges wore wigs and met in a remote part of London (MR7:4-MR7:5)). The author suggests that regardless of location and appearance "... their rulings... still have to be accepted. Otherwise a democratic society would slip into anarchy" (MR7:6). As in the Express and the Mail the reader is invited to accept the principle that the judgment is the law "... unless and until it is overturned..." (MR7:8). It is suggested that while Mr. Scargill "... is perfectly free to disagree with the judges. The Daily Mirror does... Neither (he) nor anyone else is free to incite disobedience to it" (MR7:8). For the Mirror the reason why people are not free to incite disobedience is that this would lead to anarchy. In addition to the reference to anarchy in MR7:6 the reference to the idea that if one category of person can flout the law why should not other categories (MR7:9) and to the fact that with one possible exception systems of government do not place union leaders above the law (MR7:10) suggest that Mr. Scargill's incitement threatens orderly life.

Clearly like the Express and the Mail, the Mirror invites its readers to undermine the legitimacy of Mr. Scargill's response to the judgment. In the Mirror's case three strategies are used: drawing the reader's attention to the relationship between the response and personal factors (the last section (MR7:11) develops

MR7:3 by implying that the response was motivated by a desire for prosecution); challenging the relevance of some of Mr. Scargill's statements; and associating his response with anarchy. The overall chain of knowledge in the Mirror is also generally similar to that in the Express and the Mail. Namely: acknowledgement of the controversial nature of the judgment and thereby of the possible legitimacy of criticism of it and support for the trade union actions; references to responses to the judgment which involve such criticism and support; grounds for undermining the legitimacy of certain responses, especially Mr. Scargill's response (i.e. especially in the sense that a whole editorial is devoted to his response).

This chain of knowledge invites the reader to defend a preferred argument against the threat of the response to the judgment of Mr. Scargill and others like him (i.e. "People like Martin Flannery" (MR6:7) and "King Arthur" (MR7:1) are similar in that their arguments involve an invitation to disobey the judgment and are not reasoned responses to it). The preferred argument is one which acknowledges the possible legitimacy of criticism of the judgment and support for the trade union actions, and invites disagreement with the judgment but which nevertheless also invites acceptance of it. Hence the Mr. Scargill type response is a threat because it challenges the argument that despite its controversial nature the judgment must be accepted and criticism of it limited to disagreement. As in the Mail the contrast between criticism of the judgment limited to critical disagreement (in the Mail's case Mr. Sirs' acceptable response) and criticism which invites disobedience reinforces the reader's ability to undermine the legitimacy of Mr. Scargill's response. This response can be formulated as "extreme" and thereby illegitimate not simply because it invites disobedience but also because it goes beyond normal and thereby legitimate criticism (i.e. disagreement). The reader is invited to consider the following

YES-BUT type argument. YES criticism of the judgment is legitimate, we disagree with it, BUT the judgment has to be accepted; criticism of the kind made by Mr. Scargill is quite illegitimate.

There is also a sense in which the response of Mr. Scargill and others like him is a threat to the Mirror because it could form the basis of an alternative knowledge. This is so because the understanding of secondary picketing implied by his arguments makes secondary picketing an important topic (i.e. by formulating it as a legitimate trade union tactic which should not be curbed he raises and addresses potentially radical issues). As was demonstrated in chapter four while the Mirror invites acceptance of the view that picketing/secondary picketing is a legitimate trade union tactic, this invitation does not involve radical support for secondary picketing, or, more generally the trade union movement. It seems reasonable to suggest that the Mirror sees Mr. Scargill, and others like him as radical supporters of secondary picketing/the trade union movement. True this is only a reasonable assumption if it is accepted that readers equate radical criticism of the judgment with radical support for the activities outlawed by the judgment. However, while a de-legitimisation of critical responses does not in itself invite this equation, competent readers could make the equation (i.e. radical criticism at least implies radical support). Hence it is not unreasonable to suggest that there is a sense in which MR6 and MR7 provide a defence against radical knowledge.

THE SUN AND THE APPEAL COURT

The defensive operation in the Sun involves an invitation to support the initial judgment because it is a good interpretation of a bad law. In S12 the author begins by noting that the House of Lords has overturned Lord Denning's judgment (S12:2). The reader is then invited to acknowledge the controversial nature of the

judgment and the possible legitimacy of criticism of it. This invitation is contained in the suggestion that "Most people expected this decision (i.e. the overturning). Albeit with the best of motives, Lord Denning seemed to many of us to be creating law instead of interpreting it" (S12:3). Hence the judgment is controversial and open to criticism because it was a creative interpretation of the law which many people expected to be overturned. The implication that the spirit of the judgment is acceptable (i.e. "... the best of motives...") is developed in the form of the suggestion that "But the law as it stands is BAD law" (S12:4). The introduction of this suggestion invites the reader to consider the following YES-BUT type argument: YES the judgment was controversial and is open to criticism and YES a correct interpretation of the law allows the extension of the steel dispute to private industry BUT the existing law is bad law. The author proceeds by specifying some reasons why the law is bad law; the extension of the steel dispute affects workers who are not involved in the dispute (S12:5) and is an attempt to blackmail the Government by inflicting "... wilful damage to the economy..." (S12:6-S12:7).

The intention behind the invitation to see the law as bad law and the YES-BUT argument referred to above seems to be to defend a preferred argument about the extension of the steel dispute to private industry. The House of Lords overturning of Lord Denning's judgment poses a threat to the argument that the extension is unacceptable because it legitimises this extension by declaring it legal. In order to resist this threat the Sun simultaneously acknowledges and undermines the legitimacy of the House of Lords decision (i.e. YES it was expected BUT the correct law is bad). Similarly, there is an acknowledgement of the incorrect nature of Lord Denning's decision and an undermining of criticism of it (i.e. YES it is incorrect BUT the law is bad).

In contrast to the Express, the Mail and the Mirror the Sun is distinctive in that the consideration of the judgments does not include a reference to Mr. Scargill or the defiance/possible defiance of the law. However, clearly S12 has a defensive form. The more general knowledge defended is that picketing/secondary picketing is undesirable because it causes damage.

FOOTNOTES

1. It might be thought that the implied distinction between the re-production of community and the defence of community takes the research away from the main hypothesis. However, as will become apparent, the analyses in this chapter provide important information about the existence and nature of the re-production of community/knowledge.
2. The editorials in question can be found in appendices four and five. Some of these editorials have been analysed and/or referred to in chapter three or four. Repetition of analyses has been avoided as much as possible. On occasions summaries of previous analyses are provided. Readers who wish to inspect the full analyses can consult the relevant parts of chapter three or four. Conversely, a few editorials or parts of editorials are analysed more fully in this chapter. This is because they are directly relevant to the concerns of this chapter.
3. The schematic representation is a general summary of the overall invitations found in the Sun and the Mirror. It is not necessarily the case that each particular editorial makes all the arguments and connections represented. However, it is assumed that inter-textual competence is such that readers will be able to make this kind of summary of the arguments and knowledge found in their newspaper.

The suggestion that the Sun is defending preferences against alternatives found in the Mirror does not involve the claim that readers necessarily know that they are resisting alternatives found in another newspaper. Readers are invited to acknowledge the validity of a threatening argument, examine and reject it, and thereby can defend and assert the superiority of their preferences. Objectively, whatever the subjective reality, the threatening alternative is found in another newspaper.

4. It could be argued that inviting the retention of sympathy for the steelworkers is an effective way of inviting the rejection of sympathy. According to this argument in emphasising the significance/validity of the sympathy argument the author is rejecting it in a subtle manner (i.e. YES, YES, YES, BUT...). This analysts' preference is grounded in the grammatical/physical structure of the text: there are clear indications that

the intention is to invite the retention of sympathy because the steelworkers deserve sympathy.

5. It should be stressed that it is not being suggested that either of these phrases is a truer or fairer account of Mr. Scargill's response or that readers will automatically distinguish rhetorical and relatively neutral formulations. All that is being suggested is that readers will know that a critical/supportive response is being considered. This analyst's distinction and general presentation is intended only as a way of illustrating that a critical/supportive response reading is plausible.
6. E8 is instructive in that it responds to the overturning of Lord Denning's judgment by suggesting that the law should be changed. Hence it is clear that the desirability of outlawing secondary industrial action is knowledge which will be re-produced in the face of new events/arguments. The defensive operation in E8 will not be analysed because the analysis of E7 is sufficient to demonstrate the form and content of the Express' defensive operation, E8 simply reinforces this operation. An analysis of E8 can be found in chapter four.
7. Clearly, in MA6 the Mail is inviting readers to see Lord Denning's judgment as a judgment about secondary picketing. Throughout the analysis of E7 it was assumed that the author was considering a judgment about secondary industrial action. This seems to be an adequate general description of the activities the author describes. However, as two of the newspapers refer to secondary picketing in their considerations of the Appeal Court judgment it seemed reasonable to use the phrase "The Appeal Court and Secondary Picketing" as a general title for the analyses of the considerations of the judgment. As will become apparent the fact that different newspapers refer to the activities outlawed in different ways is not particularly important (i.e. not important in this chapter).
8. Again the schematic representation is just a general summary of the overall invitations. Consequently it does not show the full complexity of or the differences between the two invitations.

CHAPTER SIX

THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY: THE STAR, TRADE UNIONISM
AND THE STATE OF THE STEEL STRIKEINTRODUCTORY COMMENT

This is the last of the chapters which analyse the editorials. It analyses the editorials produced by the Star and the remaining editorials produced by the other newspapers (see appendix six). In respect of the latter the majority of the editorials not analysed in the last three chapters consider, in general terms, one of two issues. The Express, the Mail and the Sun consider aspects of trade unionism; the Mirror considers the state of the steel strike, particularly the relationship between the strike and the Government.

DAILY EXPRESS OPINION

In E18 the author begins by suggesting that "THE 10-week-old steel strike must surely now come to an end. Mr. Bill Sirs, the leader of the main steel union, has been totally discredited by the turnout- and vote- in British Steel's ballot on whether there should be a union ballot on the 14.4 per cent pay offer. A massive 65 per cent of workers have defied his instructions not to participate in the British Steel ballot- and of those 65 per cent, 69 per cent have voted for a union pay ballot" (E18:2-E18:3). The author proceeds by suggesting that "This... double slap in the face... can only be a knockout blow for the unions proposal to increase the present 14.4 per cent offer. The workers' defiance comes as no surprise considering that the strike has so far lost each of them £1,000. A democratic postal ballot has once

again demonstrated how unrepresentative union leaders are of their own members" (E18:4-E18:7). The last sentence of these parts invites readers to draw a general conclusion from the author's formulation of the turnout in and the result of the ballot. It suggests that the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which affirm the validity of the knowledge that trade union leaders are unrepresentative of their members. Clearly, the use of the phrase "... once again demonstrated..." re-produces this knowledge. The two concluding parts, amongst other things, reinforce this view of trade union leaders. They suggest that Mr. Sirs has had his "... his position totally undermined by his own workers" (E18:8) and that union leaders have lost creditability (E18:9).

Under the heading "Undemocratic striking" (E17:1) the author begins E17 by suggesting that "THE steelworkers of Consett never wanted to strike and now they want to return to work- that is the unequivocal message they have given to the Daily Express" (E17:2). It is then suggested that "... the steel union demanded their support- or else it would not help them get redundancy pay. So... (they) were blackmailed into striking and are now being blackmailed into staying out" (E17:3). The author proceeds by suggesting that the steelworkers in question were not given an opportunity to vote for or against a strike and that they have been ordered by Mr. Bill Sirs "... to ignore the postal ballot being paid for by the British Steel Corporation" (E17:4). In conclusion he/she suggests "... the introduction of such democracy would instantly expose how unrepresentative our union leaders can be. So often they speak not for their members- just for their own egos or extreme political views" (E17:5). The overall intention in E17 seems to be similar to that in E18; that is, to re-produce the knowledge that trade union leaders in general are unrepresentative of their members. The author is suggesting that the steel union's refusal to acknowledge the views

of the Consett steelworkers and refusal to solicit these views via a ballot are indications of the unrepresentativeness of trade union leaders. True there is a sense in which the concluding part offers the reader a predictive argument (i.e. a ballot would expose unrepresentativeness). Hence it might be argued that the author is not taking the steel union's attitude towards the Consettt steelworkers as indications of unrepresentativeness but rather suggesting that if this attitude was tested via a ballot then unrepresentativeness would be exposed. However, competent readers will recognise that the steel union's refusal to acknowledge or solicit the views of the Consett steelworkers is in itself an indication of the unrepresentativeness announced in the title of the editorial. True if E17:1-E17:4 are isolated from the conclusion in this way there can be no justification for the claim that the author is re-producing knowledge about trade union leaders in general, these parts deal specifically with the unrepresentativeness of steel unions leaders. However, the conclusion is not entirely predictive. To suggest that "... such democracy would instantly expose how unrepresentative our union leaders can be..." is to suggest that trade union leaders are unrepresentative and that a ballot would demonstrate (i.e. ipso facto re-demonstrate) this rather than to suggest that a ballot would demonstrate (i.e. demonstrate for the first time) how unrepresentative our union leaders are. The first suggestion pre-supposes the knowledge that trade union leaders are unrepresentative, whereas the second produces this knowledge. Hence the conclusion involves both the re-production of knowledge and an explicit reference to the predictive value of the Express' knowledge. It uses the references to the unrepresentativeness of the steel union leaders to re-produce knowledge about trade union leaders in general and predicts that democratic ballots would re-demonstrate the validity of this knowledge. This prediction is confirmed in E18.

In E11 the knowledge re-produced in E17 and E18 is re-affirmed. The author suggests that the workers at Hadfields, in returning to work, have ended "... their "reluctant" support for the dispute at State Owned British Steel, they are not only defying their union and its intimidatory pickets, they are also giving a dramatic lead which the rest of the private steel sector would do well to follow" (E11:3). It is then suggested that the return to work is a triumph for "... "Desperate Dan" Norton... his employees rightly regard (him) not so much as a boss, more as a leader... it is also a triumph for the common sense of the British worker, a common sense which we hope will rapidly infect Her Majesty's ministers- and induce them to outlaw, with all haste and effectiveness, both secondary picketing and blacking" (E11:4-E11:5). One of the suggestions in E11 seems to be that there is more communality between a group of steelworkers and their boss than there is between this group and their union leaders. Clearly, this suggestion does not re-produce the knowledge that trade union leaders in general are unrepresentative of their members but equally clearly it re-affirms this knowledge.

In E19 the author begins by suggesting that "BEFORE Christmas there was a general fear that the steel strike would bring British industry to its knees... Yet... British industry is nowhere near a state of collapse. No doubt there are difficulties... But life goes on without the contribution of the steelworkers... As a strong weapon that was to coerce the Steel Corporation and the Government, the strike has failed" (E19:2-E19:4). The author proceeds by formulating the steel strike as an example of a more general phenomenon. It is suggested that "Some time back another example was afforded by the fireman. There was a strike which was billed to have even more horrendous consequences. But the troops coped. For years the strike was held to be an irresistible weapon. And some workers, such as the miners and power workers, do

have the capacity to bring the economy grinding to a halt" (E19:4-E19:6). Clearly in E19:1-E19:6 the author is understanding the steel strike in terms of the general issue of the ability or inability of strikes to succeed. In the rest of the editorial the author begins by pursuing this issue. It is suggested that workers who can succeed in the way indicated "... are a minority. More important is the prevailing climate of tight money... In this climate strikers risk putting themselves on the dole queue.. Then there are the lost wages... All the more important then to give the workers themselves a more direct say in whether they go on strike- through the secret ballot" (E19:7-E19:9). The author proceeds by developing the argument about secret ballots. It is suggested that "The government should strengthen its bill so as to make strike ballots compulsory to give more power to the workers whose jobs and living standards are placed in the firing line by ambitious union leaders" (E19:10). These concluding parts re-affirm the knowledge that trade union leaders are unrepresentative of their members. More specifically they suggest that future ballots are even more likely to lead to the rejection by members of their policies. For the author this increase in demonstrated unrepresentativeness is likely because members will recognise that their jobs and living standards are threatened by ambitious union leaders. The reference to ambition suggests that union leaders are not only unrepresentative but that they also act and think in accordance with their own personal interests rather than in accordance with their members interests. This reinforces the suggestion in E17:5 that leaders speak for "... their own egos or extreme political views..." rather for their members. As this suggestion and the suggestion about ambition are both parts of re-productive parts it seems reasonable to assume that the Express' knowledge about trade union leaders is that they are unrepresentative of their members and act/think in ways which favour their

own rather than their members interests. True ambition, own egos and extreme political views are not necessarily the same thing; however, they are all formulated as instances of self-interest.

Clearly, part of the Express' stock of knowledge is that past and present are similar because trade union leaders are unrepresentative and act/think in ways which favour their own personal and/or political interests. This knowledge develops the reader's knowledge of the industrial action/industrial relations problem. To suggest that the Government should introduce compulsory ballots to enhance the power of trade union members is to suggest that the Government can solve the problem posed by unrepresentativeness (i.e. problem- damaging strikes are imposed on trade union members and the nation). The analysis of E19 also suggests that knowledge about the relative failure of some strikes is part of the stock of knowledge. If E19 is seen in the context of the editorials analysed in previous chapters the suggestion is that the relative failure of the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which demonstrate that while all strikes threaten Governments and damage the economy only a minority of occupational groups can threaten and damage to a successful extent. In a sense this suggestion modifies the Express' knowledge of industrial disputes. Readers are invited to distinguish between damaging and threatening strikes which are successful and damaging/threatening strikes which are unsuccessful. They are also invited to see that the majority of strikes probably fall into the latter category. Put another way the suggestion that "For years the strike was held to be an irresistible weapon" (E19:6) indicates that the argument that strikes are irresistible is part of an old stock of knowledge. The author is suggesting that this stock of knowledge should be replaced by a more accurate one; one which distinguishes between irresistible and resistible strikes.¹

DAILY MAIL COMMENT

In MA12 the author begins by suggesting that a group of steelworkers are to be punished by the executive of their union (MA12:2). He/she proceeds by describing the nature and reason for the punishment. It is suggested that "They are to be excommunicated: To lose their union cards. What heinous offence have these workers committed? They have refused to join a steel strike in which they see themselves as having no part" (MA12:3-MA12:4). It is then suggested that most people will think that the steelworkers in question have been unjustly treated (MA12:5). In MA12:6-MA12:8 the author suggests that "They are well paid, productive, and work for a profitable private steel firm. They have no dispute with their employers. They have withstood mass picketing. They have not been balloted... Surely, they have earned the freedom to determine their own industrial destiny. If ever this country is once again to have a prosperous future it is men like these working for firms like these who are going to make it possible". Having praised the steelworkers and private enterprise the author criticises modern trade unionism. It is suggested that "Fortunately, the feudal tyranny of the union barons in Britain has never been complete and shows increasing signs of breaking down. The robust and independent-minded workforce at Sheerness, together with their cool employers, are not to be intimidated. And there are more and more men and women in Britain who are coming to resent being treated as union serfs. That same union card, which should be the badge of brotherhood, is all too often assuming the appearance in modern times of a passport to subservience" (MA12:11;MA12-13). These parts suggest that the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which affirm the validity of the knowledge that trade union leaders impose their will on their members. Clearly, the use of the phrase "... all too often..." re-produces this knowledge. This knowledge is

reiterated in the concluding parts. It is suggested that "A century and a half ago, a small band of farm hands from a village near Dorchester were sentenced to transportation for combining together. They were martyrs to the union cause. The martyrs of today are those who stand out against the unions. From Tolpuddle to Sheerness is a long and winding road. But all those who have trudged defiantly down it arm in arm- be they agricultural workers in their smocks or private steel workers in their donkey jackets- march under the same banner: Freedom from oppression" (MA12:14-MA12:17). Clearly, the author is suggesting that the steel strike affirms the validity of the knowledge that trade union leaders are unrepresentative of their members in the sense that they coerce them. He/she is also reproducing the knowledge that increasing numbers of people are reacting against union leaders. In the context of the suggestion that the "... feudal tyranny..." of union leaders "... shows increasing signs of breaking down" the references to the workforce at Sheerness suggest that these workers are another example of people reacting against union leaders.

It will be recalled that in MA11 the author praised private enterprise and offered the following conclusion: "The banners behind which our unions march still proclaim the brotherhood of man. Some brotherhood when the only solidarity they can show is to bite the hand that feeds them" (MA11:9-MA11:10). In the context of MA12 these parts are significant because they suggest that aims and values like brotherhood/solidarity/communality are no longer accurate descriptions of trade unionism because it damages the agency (i.e. private enterprise) which supports the nation (see MA11:5-MA11:8). This kind of suggestion is also found in MA12. True this editorial suggests that appeals to brotherhood are inappropriate because trade union leaders coerce their members. However, it also praises private enterprise

and suggests that the actions of trade union leaders adversely effect people who work for the kind of firm which makes prosperity possible. Hence it seems reasonable to suggest that the Mail's stock of knowledge suggests that the traditional appeals of trade unionism are no longer appropriate because trade unions, specifically trade union leaders, coerce their members and thereby damage part of the agency which provides for the nation. It follows that it is highly probable that the author is also suggesting that the steel strike affirms the validity of the knowledge that private enterprise supports the nation. Put another way for the Mail private enterprise and people who resist trade unionism embody the original and worthy aims of the trade union movement.

Like the Express, the Mail reads the British Steel Corporation ballot as evidence for the unrepresentativeness of trade union leaders. Under the heading "See the forces of reaction marching by" (MA14:1), the author begins MA14 by inviting a contrast between the poor turnout at a trade union rally and the participation in- and result of- the ballot. It is suggested that "... how many actually turned out for this great feudal show of strength by the unions yesterday in London? The TUC organisers talked hopefully of 100,000. The real figure was probably closer to 50,000. More impressive, to our way of thinking, were the 58,000 steel men, who voted for a chance to hold a ballot on the... pay offer. Their unions wanted them to have nothing to do with this ballot... How dare the bosses try to inject even the mildest dose of industrial democracy into a strike that was union property! Steel men were told by their union leaders to boycott this ballot... or to vote 'No'. Of the 132,000 ballot papers sent out... more than 85,000 were completed and returned. And the vote was an uncowed seven-to-three in favour of having the pay ballot" (MA14:3-MA14:9). This contrast suggests

to the reader not only that the steel union leaders are unrepresentative of their members but also that among trade union members generally there was a lack of enthusiasm for a recent official union event. The co-existence of these suggestions is also found in MA14:10-MA14:11. It is suggested that "The number of steel men who demonstrated their democratic virility... would have more than filled those special trains and coaches provided to transport the forces of union reaction to London. They are fed up with being taken for granted. They want to be heard... consulted... not treated as cannon fodder in some grandiose war between the union barons and a Tory Prime Minister". These parts as well as referring to the lack of enthusiasm for the rally (i.e. the implication is either that the trains/coaches were empty or that more trains/coaches would have been necessary to cater for the steelworkers) and the unrepresentativeness of the steel union leaders also suggest that one of the ways in which the steelworkers have not been properly represented is that their consent has not been gained for the use of their case in a conflict between union leaders and a Conservative Prime Minister. Hence, in the context of MA12 and MA11, the contrast re-affirms and develops the knowledge that trade union leaders are unrepresentative of their members and the knowledge that people are rejecting the views and policies imposed from above. Readers can see that the contrast is an unequivocal demonstration of the validity of this knowledge.

In the concluding parts the author suggests that "Len and Moss and David and Alan talk about the trade union movement as if they own it. But what do they really know or even want to know about the opinions of the millions they claim to represent. While the TUC blimps strut and preen, the poor bloody union infantry are in no mood for industrial war games" (MA14:12-MA14:13): These concluding parts re-affirm the knowledge that trade union leaders are unrepresentative and that their

members are resisting the views and policies of their leaders.

Under the heading "Suicide is ceasing to be fashionable" (MA9:1) the author begins MA9 by suggesting that "A NEW spirit of dour realism seems to be gaining ground at last in Britain" (MA9:2). He/she proceeds by specifying three instances of dour realism. It is suggested that "Faced with the warning that their firm could well go out of business, the men at the private steel firm of Hadfields have yet again nerved themselves to return to work. They have done so in defiance of the official instruction of the steel unions and with the memory of mass intimidatory picketing fresh and bruising. In Wales, the miners have rejected by a five-to-one majority the advice of their local union leaders to strike in support of the steel workers. Their bitter calculation is that such action could only accelerate the pace of pit closures. At British Leyland, the work-force has refused to come out in protest strike against the dismissal of Derek Robinson" (MA9:3-MA9:5). Clearly, these parts re-affirm the knowledge that trade union leaders are unrepresentative and the knowledge that trade union members are resisting the views and policies imposed on them. This knowledge is reiterated in the concluding parts. It is suggested that "These are hard lessons learned the hard way. This is the restraint of men edging back from the precipice, despite the blind union pressure still coming from behind. Industrial suicide is becoming less fashionable with British workers. That is something. The real breakthrough will come when our union leaders also wake up to economic reality" (MA9:7-MA9:8). These parts develop as well as re-affirm the Mail's knowledge. They suggest that the issue of representativeness is partly an economic issue. In the context of the rest of the editorial the reference to economic reality suggests that one of the ways in which union leaders are

unrepresentative is that they, in contrast to their members, fail to see that strikes damage the viability of the industry in question and are therefore undesirable.

The editorials analysed in this chapter suggest a modification of the stock of knowledge identified in previous chapters. Clearly, the author is suggesting that the actions of trade union leaders, as opposed to trade unionists, damage particular industries/industry in general/social expenditure and threaten Governments. Similarly, it is likely that the author is associating trade union leaders with the undesirable practice of secondary picketing. For example, the argument that it is undesirable because it imposes strikes on people who are not and do not want to be involved in strikes suggest a distinction between trade union leaders and trade unionists. Obviously the analyses in this chapter also reveal additional dimensions of the stock of knowledge. Past and present are considered similar because: trade union leaders are unrepresentative of their members, they coerce them and impose views and policies on them; trade union members are resisting the imposition of views and policies; trade union leaders adversely effect the agency (i.e. private enterprise) which provides for the nation; modern trade unionism no longer embodies or implements the aims and values of the trade union movement. This statement can be qualified in three ways. Firstly, a strong implication of the stock of knowledge is that trade union members not only reject the views and policies of their leaders they also recognise that the trade union movement no longer offers brotherhood or communality. Secondly, there are two particular views or policies which members reject: they do not want to be involved in a conflict with the current Government and they recognise that strikes are undesirable because they damage the industry in question. Thirdly, the references to "... Marxist publicity-seekers who stand dictator-like at the head of their union heavies and deny

to law-abiding men and women... the right to work" (MA8:20); the intimidation practiced by "Arthur Scargill and his irregulars..." (MA7:2); and to Arthur Scargill who has "... carefully groomed Marxist quiff" (MA10:7) and who gets involved in strikes which are none of his business (MA10:11)- suggest that the Mail is arguing that some trade union leaders, particularly Arthur Scargill, use strikes to pursue extreme political ends. Finally, the argument that "... the feudal tyranny of union barons in Britain has never been complete and shows increasing signs of breaking down" (MA12:11), suggests that for the Mail while it is possible that instances of trade union leaders imposing views and policies may become less frequent in the majority of cases, past and present, the knowledge that they impose in this way is valid.

MIRROR COMMENT

Under the heading "Desperation stakes" (MR8:1) the author begins MR8 by suggesting that "THE Government started the steel strike and it is now about time that they stopped it" (MR8:2). It is then suggested that documents leaked to a television programme prove that the Government prevented the Steel Corporation from making a 13% pay offer (MR8:4-MR8:5). This argument is developed via the suggestion that "As a result of instructions from Sir Keith Joseph, the Corporation was only able to offer a "zero increase". That's official jargon for an Irishman's rise. Nothing" (MR8:7). These early parts establish that the Government is responsible for the strike. The author proceeds by drawing the reader's attention to the adverse effects of the strike: "The inevitable strike is now in its sixth week and growing more reckless every day... the men are threatening to withdraw safety cover from the steel plants... The bosses of Hadfields... threaten to withdraw taxes... both men and management are acting

from desperation. The issue is not whether the Government should "win" the strike, but that it should be ended. It has already cost the taxpayer dear. More than a settlement would have done. Now it looms as a threat to the jobs of thousands in other industries. It is not a fight to save the economy. Only to save the Government's face" (MR8:9-MR8:15).

The overall intention in MR8 seems to be to blame the Government for starting a damaging strike and to suggest that the main issue is the possibility of ending a damaging strike. Clearly, this is a similar intention to some of the intentions found in the Mirror editorials analysed in previous chapters. However, while there is some continuity of knowledge MR8, like the other editorials, is a local text. There is no evidence for the re-production of knowledge. The author is producing local arguments/knowledge about the relationship between the steel strike and the Government. There are, for example, no arguments like: this Conservative Government, like previous ones, has provoked a strike; the steel strike, like all strikes, costs the taxpayer a lot; past Governments, like this current one, have tended to try to win strikes rather than end them.

Nor is there any evidence for the re-production of knowledge in MR9. Under the heading "THE INVISIBLE MAN" (MR9:1) the author suggests that "SIR KEITH JOSEPH isn't interfering in the steel strike in the same way as the Russians aren't interfering in Afghanistan. There's hardly a platform or a studio from which he isn't heard or seen broadcasting his policy of non-intervention. He non-intervenes by insisting that the Steel Corporation can't have any more money to end the strike... (and) by saying that because of the strike the steel industry will be smaller and employ even fewer men" (MR9:2-MR9:5). After criticising this approach to the size of the industry (MR9:6) the author provides another ironic

reference to non-intervention (i.e. irony- the "He non-intervenes by..." which begins MR9:4, MR9:5 and MR9:7 introduces examples of intervention) and a criticism of Sir Keith Joseph's suggestion that Steel Corporation assets should be sold to the private sector (MR9:7-MR9:8). These criticisms, like the suggestion in MR8:6 that "Ministers who ducked the challenge from the miners were ready to take on the steel men instead", relate the steel strike to arguments about more general issues. To argue that the size of the industry should be dependent on future demand (MR9:6), that a selling assets policy can be criticised (MR9:8) and that the Government took on one group of workers rather than another is to transcend, or at least begin to transcend, arguments about local issues like who started a steel strike which should be stopped? However, while these arguments are in a sense non-specific, they are not clear generalisations about Government policy and they are not re-productions of knowledge. There is, however, some continuity between MR9:1-MR9:8 and the Mirror editorials analysed in the previous chapters (e.g. criticism of the Government).

In MR9:9 the author does seem to offer readers a definite generalisation about Government policy. It is suggested that "It's obvious the steel strike is now caught up in another battle. The one between Left and Right in the Cabinet about new laws to curb the trade unions. That should be resolved at leisure. Steel is more urgent" (MR9:9-MR9:10). These parts clearly relate the steel strike to Government policy about trade unions in general and the general state of the Cabinet. However, they only produce the knowledge that there is a Cabinet battle about legislation to curb trade unions. There are no indications that knowledge about this conflict is being re-produced. There are, for example, no statements like; as the steel strike demonstrates

the Cabinet is still split; in this Government, as in previous Conservative Governments, there is a split between Left and Right. Nevertheless readers are being offered knowledge which is not local. Though it is possible to argue that the fact that the author suggests that the steel strike is caught up in a battle and proceeds in MR9:11-MR9:13 to consider the possibility of Sir Keith Joseph ending the deadlocked strike suggests that he/she is not particularly interested in producing general knowledge about the Cabinet.

A consideration of the state of the Cabinet is also found in the first two parts of MR10. It is suggested that "THERE are now four sides in the steel strike. The Corporation, the unions and the two halves of the Cabinet. One of these halves is desperate to settle. The other is determined to fight on. The Steel Corporation- and the men- must be utterly confused" (MR10:2-MR10:3). These parts only seem to consider the state of the Cabinet in respect of the steel strike not the state of the Cabinet in general. The highest level of generality which can be read into them is the suggestion that the Cabinet is split into two halves. However, it seems unlikely that the main intention in MR10 is to produce or reinforce general knowledge. This seems unlikely because the author, having referred to the two halves of the Cabinet involved in the steel strike, proceeds by referring to a public disagreement between Mr. Jim Prior and Mrs. Thatcher about Sir Charles Villiers (MR10:4-MR10:5) and Sir Keith Joseph's repudiation of "... reported Cabinet optimism about a swift end to the strike" (MR10:6). These parts refer to disputes between members of the Cabinet in the specific context of the steel strike. Put another way they are developments of- and proof of the validity of- the argument that there is conflict in the Cabinet over aspects of the steel strike.

The author proceeds by suggesting "None of this has helped a solution to the strike, which starts its ninth

week on Wednesday" (MR10:7). This part draws the reader's attention away from conflict in the Cabinet by suggesting that the possibility of ending a long strike is the important issue. This suggestion is developed in the rest of the editorial. It is suggested that "So far, the Government has rejected every proposal... to take action to end (the strike)... Its dilemma is that if it moves to settle the strike it will look like surrender to the unions: the one thing it was elected NOT to do. But if it waits... for the unions to surrender, a critical industrial and economic situation will get worse. Either way the Government loses. But the stark truth is that the country would be better off if the strike were over, even if the Government suffered" (MR10:8-MR10:11). These parts as well as suggesting that the settlement of a damaging strike is the important issue, more important than the health of the Government, also touch on a more general issue. Namely, the idea that struggles between trade unions and Governments have occurred in the past and that the steel strike is the latest of these struggles. To suggest that the Government was elected not to surrender to the unions is to suggest that in the past Governments have surrendered to the unions. However, this issue is only touched on. The local issues of the need for a solution to a damaging strike and the Government's dilemma are given prominence. Clearly, MR10 is a predominantly local text.

Like the other newspapers the Mirror considers the British Steel Corporation ballot. In the first two parts of MR13 it is suggested that "THE steel strike might end now if both sides gave a little, because it looks as if a little would be enough. Despite the glee of Sir Charles Villiers, the result of the Corporation's ballot about a ballot isn't a victory for him, even if it is a defeat for the union's leaders" (MR13:2-MR13:3).

The author proceeds by formulating the result of the ballot as an indecisive result (MR13:4-MR13:5). This formulation relates the ballot to the issue of a possible end to the steel strike; the author is suggesting that the indecisive result indicates that the strike could end if both sides gave a little. The rest of the editorial concentrates the reader's attention on the possibility of ending the unresolved strike. In MR13:6 it is suggested that "The trouble is that both sides have dug their trenches so deep they can't see over the top of them". After suggesting that the Corporation can hold out longer (MR13:7) and that holding out would be self-destructive because it would adversely effect the workforce (MR13:8), the author proceeds by suggesting that "Independent examination of the industry by a court of inquiry would be the best solution, because there's a lot more wrong with steel than the wages it pays. But the Government won't have that. The next best would be a more informal mediation by someone able to see both sides of the question" (MR13:9-MR13:10). These parts concentrate on the possibility of ending the strike but also touch on a more general, non-specific issue. This is also the case in MR13:12: "... an honourable compromise now might prevent more trouble in the future". To suggest that the level of wages is not the only thing wrong with the steel industry and that there might be more trouble in the future is to raise, or at least touch on, the general issue of the state of the steel industry. However, there is no detailed consideration of this issue, MR13 is a predominantly local text.

A more detailed consideration is found in MR14. The author begins by suggesting that "THE inquiry into the steelworkers' wage claim may bring an end to the present strike but it won't do much to prevent the next one. That will be up to the Government. The British steel industry is in a mess. An embittered and exhausted

workforce is ranged against a defeatist and incompetent management" (MR14:2-MR14:4). He/she proceeds by suggesting that the worst stoppage that the industry has experienced is to be followed by "... its most calamitous sackings" (MR14:5) and that this jobs policy "... puts whole communities at peril... (and) adds to the destruction of Britain as an industrial nation" (MR14:7). Clearly, these parts raise a number of general issues: specifically, there is authorial concern about the general health of the steel industry, the jobs and communities' of steelworkers and the Britain's status as an industrial nation. Some of these concerns are also found in the concluding parts. It is suggested that "As soon as the pay inquiry is over the Government should appoint a powerful court of inquiry which can examine every aspect of the industry, future, present and past... a new inquiry would help a new chairman to make a new start. It could give the men new hope. And, with luck, it could give the industry a new future" (MR14:8-MR14:10). These parts, like MR14 generally, raise some general issues. In one of the parts of MR14 (MR14:7) there is evidence for the re-production of knowledge. The author is suggesting that the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which demonstrate that Britain is a declining industrial nation.

In the first three parts of MR11 it is suggested that "THE MAIN steel union threatens to expel 600 men working in the private steel plant at Sheerness because they won't strike to support the public sector workers. It is a decision taken in anger. And like most such decisions, it is wrong. The steel strikers have a good case. But they'll spoil it by punishing fellow union members who have no direct part in the dispute" (MR11:1-MR11:4). Clearly, these parts offer local arguments about the threat to expel some members of a steel union. The author proceeds by suggesting that the men in the private sector are in a difficult position (MR11:5-MR11:6);

that the union leader is rightly unhappy about the threat (MR11:7); and that workers at a number of private steel plants are refusing to strike (MR11:8-MR11:9). Again, all these suggestions are local. In conclusion the author suggests that "There's a lot of public support for the steel strikers. (sic) People recognise it was provoked by a rigid Government and an incompetent Corporation. But expulsions won't help the strikers' cause. Only throw away the public's goodwill" (MR11:10-MR11:12). Clearly, these parts, like the editorial as a whole, offer local arguments and knowledge. However, the author is reinforcing some of the knowledge found in the other editorials, e.g. criticism of the Government and the Corporation, support for the steelworkers, secondary picketing (i.e. trying to involve workers who are not directly involved in the dispute) is a legitimate tactic.

Clearly, the editorials analysed in this chapter re-affirm the Mirror's body of knowledge. Given the recurring emphasis on the possibility of ending a damaging strike it seems reasonable to add the argument that the strike is damaging and should be settled to the Mirror's body of knowledge. As has been demonstrated there is evidence which suggests that the Mirror is re-producing two pieces of knowledge. However, the majority of the editorials analysed in this chapter, like those analysed in previous chapters, do not re-produce knowledge.

STAR COMMENT

In contrast to the other newspapers, one of the outstanding features of the Star is the absence of extensive editorial comment (six editorials). Furthermore, two of the six editorials provide readers with a totally humorous understanding of the steel strike. It would seem that the Star is unable and/or unwilling to

provide the kind of detailed understanding of the steel strike found in the Express, the Mail, the Mirror and the Sun.

In ST2 the reader is invited to understand the steel strike in terms of the Government's stance towards a potentially damaging strike. The author begins by contrasting the worsening hopes of peace and the Government's non-interventionist stance: "HOPES of peace in the steel strike go from bad to worse. And still the Government sits defiantly on the fence" (ST2:2). The author proceeds by re-stating and developing this contrast. It is suggested that "Talks between the unions and BSC have collapsed. Both sides admit that they are further apart than ever. Flying pickets are out. Other unions are helping to tighten the screws. And what is the word from Industry Secretary Sir Keith Joseph? Nothing" (ST2:3-ST2:4).² These parts re-state and develop the initial contrast by drawing the reader's attention to the ways in which the hopes of peace are getting worse and the Industry Secretary's failure to respond. (i.e. the agency of "Flying pickets..." and "Other unions..." is seen as an indication of the distance between the two sides and the failure of the talks, which are in turn seen as indications of the ways in which hopes of peace have got worse).

The author proceeds by suggesting that the Government's stance could be costly: "The Tories insist that industries have to sort out their own problems. But what is that going to cost the rest of the economy?" (ST2:5). In the next three parts he/she indicates what the cost to the economy could be. It is suggested that "THE MOTOR TRADE has warned that... foreign firms could grab 75 per cent of the British car market... THE SHIPBUILDERS have only two weeks supply of steel. Both face a loss of business from which they may never recover. Meanwhile, Britain's rivals jostle to snatch

that business" (ST2:6-ST2:8). In conclusion the author suggests that "... the Government should step in..." before a serious situation becomes fatal (ST2:9).

The Star's critical analysis of the Government's stance towards a deadlocked and potentially damaging steel strike does not re-produce knowledge. Clearly, ST2 is a local text: it makes specific statements about a particular Government's stance towards a particular strike. The structure and content of ST5 is similar to that of ST2. The title and the first part introduce a contrast ("And... still..." (ST5:2)) between the disastrous course of the steel strike and Sir Keith Josephs' continued support for the non-interventionist stance of the Government. In ST5:3 the contrast is developed via the suggestion that his stance has actually made the difference between unions and management worse: "All along he has stuck by his aim to force unions and management to reach a settlement.. The result has been to force them further apart". It is then suggested that "The unions are now threatening to halt vital maintenance work on furnaces worth millions of pounds. Private steel firms are threatening to halt vital maintenance work on furnaces worth millions of pounds. Private steel firms are threatening to halt payments of income tax, VAT and National Insurance. Their customers are already laying off thousands of workers and the CBI has warned that several firms face bankruptcy" (ST5:4-ST5:6). These parts do not invite the reader to focus on the actual threats, lay offs and warning. As in ST2, the reader is invited to understand actions and processes which are damaging, or potentially damaging, in terms of the stance of the government. However, in the case of ST5 these damaging affects are not just the consequences, or possible consequences, of the government's passive stance, they are also related to the active agency of the government. The threats to expensive equipment, income, jobs and the viability of firms are seen as indications

of the distance between unions and management and as the potentially damaging affects of a situation which the government, specifically Sir Keith, are responsible for. The reader is invited to read the information in ST5:4-ST5:6 as "... the present situation..." which the government deny responsibility for but which is the consequence of a dispute caused by "Sir Keith's decision to impose strict cash limits on the British Steel Corporation..." (ST5:8). A decision which is one aspect of the policies that do not work and lead to disaster (ST5:10). Clearly, ST5 is a local text, it simply re-affirms and develops the arguments made in ST2.

In ST6 the author begins by suggesting that "THE peace deal thrashed out by the... inquiry into the steel strike offers the first real hope that it will soon be over. For that, the whole country owes them three hearty cheers. FIRSTLY for finding a compromise which both sides seem willing to accept. SECONDLY for achieving it in just two days- something that unions and management found impossible in thirteen weeks. THIRDLY, and most important of all, for making their report unanimous- giving neither side any excuse for continuing the fight" (ST6:2-ST6:5). After suggesting that the peace deal is fair to both sides (ST6:6-ST6:7) the author proceeds by suggesting that "After the longest official strike since the war there can be no winners- only losers. BSC workers have lost about £1,500 each in wages, on top of a third of their jobs. Management says it has lost orders worth hundreds of millions of pounds. But the biggest loser, once again, is the British economy. The real lesson of the past three months is that we must never let it happen again" (ST6:7-ST6:9). One of the intentions in ST6 seems to be to re-produce the knowledge that strikes damage the economy. The use of the phrase "... once again..." suggests that the steel strike is the latest in a series of events which affirm the validity of the knowledge

that strikes damage the economy.

In ST3 the author begins by suggesting that the fact that Mrs. Thatcher is to meet steel union leaders indicates that she is "... prepared to be less hide-bound than some of her diehard supporters wish" (ST3:2-ST3:3). He/she proceeds by suggesting that "It is fashionable to sneer at Labour's midnight "beer and sandwiches" strike-settling dramas. But there are times when the workers' leaders must be allowed to go right to the top" (ST3:4-ST3:5). Clearly, this editorial includes a historical reference to Labour's policy on industrial disputes. Hence there is a re-production of knowledge in the sense that the author is reminding readers what the nature of this policy is, and suggesting that sometimes it is a good policy.

In the first of the humorous editorials the author suggests that "WITH the holidays ending, the steel strikes starting, and rising prices, icy roads and earthquakes to contend with, it's hardly surprising that Britain came bottom of the poll in a 23-nation survey on optimism. Worse still- prices expert Colin Mitchell predicts that beer could reach 60p a pint by June. Enjoy that cut-price hangover!" (ST1:2-ST1:3). Clearly, this editorial does not re-produce knowledge and does not provide any arguments about the steel strike. The intention would seem to be to offer readers a humorous account of the beginning of the New Year. In the second of the humorous editorials the author suggests that the steelworkers have received messages of solidarity from foreign trade unions and that some foreign workers are offering practical help by joining the picket lines (ST4:3). It is then suggested that a strike co-ordinator has suggested that the foreign workers think they can learn from this experience (ST4:4). In conclusion the author suggests that "If more foreign workers take advantage of this specialised education, their "skills" could be adapted

for a new version of Jeux Sans Frontieres- with Jim Prior taking over from Eddie Waring as the host of "It's a Lockout" (ST4:5). Again, there does not seem to be any re-production of knowledge in this editorial, it provides a humorous account of pickets and picketing.

Clearly, despite the brevity of the Star's editorial comment it does re-produce some knowledge. For the Star past and present are similar because strikes damage the economy and because meetings between Governments and trade union leaders are sometimes an appropriate way to settle strikes; a way which is rightly adopted by the Labour Party. This statement can be qualified. There is no suggestion that any particular agency (i.e. workers or Government) is responsible for the damage associated with strikes. The suggestion that the damaging steel strike is a consequence of the Government's action and/or inaction is a local suggestion. Similarly, the suggestion that the Government should act to end the strike seems to be a local suggestion.

THE SUN SAYS

In the early parts of S11 the author suggests that the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation has large financial resources (S11:2-S11:3) and has "... plenty of money for pickets and for the miners and students who are joining the line" (S11:4). He/she proceeds by suggesting "But the confederation is not providing a penny in strike pay. The members have been told to go... to the state for family benefits... already more than £1,000,000 has been paid out. Isn't this incredible?" (S11:5-S11:8). In the rest of the editorial the author places the contrast between the non-use of large financial resources and the use of state resources in a more general context. It is suggested that "The steel men have every right to strike. But they have no right at all to expect the rest of us to pick up the

bill. At the last election, the Tories declared that unions must be made to bear a fair share of the cost of supporting strikers. That was the promise. Where is the fulfilment?" (S11:9-S11:11).

This placement of the issue of financial support for the striking steel men in the more general context of the right to strike and a promised policy towards strikers in general re-produces knowledge. The reference to a past promise (i.e. "At the last election...") to do something which the Sun approves of (i.e. promising to get the unions to bear a fair share of the cost of support = avoiding making incredible payments from public resources) is a re-production of the knowledge that trade unions should support strikers and that a reliance on public resources should be avoided. To ask where is the fulfilment of a past promise is to ask readers to remember the promise and the knowledge which gave rise to the promise. Put another way, readers are invited to see the steel strike as the latest in a series of events which affirm the validity of the knowledge that trade unions- not the taxpayer- should support strikers. The concluding parts reinforce this invitation. It is suggested that "Alas, we are still waiting for Employment Secretary Jim Prior to gallop to the rescue. Someone seems to have shot his horse" (S11:2-S11:13). The use of the phrase "... we are still waiting..." suggests that the author expects readers to be impatiently waiting for legislation which makes trade unions "... bear a fair share of the cost of supporting strikers" (S11:10).

The form and content of S15 is similar to that of S11. The early parts invite a contrast between the non-use of large trade union resources to support strikers and the extensive use of state funds (S15:2-S15:4). It is then suggested that "In their manifesto at the last Election the Tories pledged that they would ensure that the unions, not the taxpayers, would bear the cost of

strikes. Now we learn that the Social Security authorities are finding it "difficult" to implement the pledge. In heaven's name, why? It is nine months since the last Election. Before that the Tories had FOUR YEARS not merely to produce promises but to discover how they could best be honoured. What is so difficult about honouring this one? (S15:5-S15:10). These parts clearly refer to a past promise to do something which the Sun approves of (e.g. approval is present in the critical questioning of the inability to honour the promise- "In heaven's name, why?"). Hence they re-produce the knowledge that trade unions should support strikes/strikers and that a reliance on public funds should be avoided.³

In contrast to S11 and S15 the Sun's consideration of the British Steel Corporation ballot does not seem to involve the re-production of knowledge. Under the heading "Why not vote?" (S17:1) the author suggests that "THE COLLAPSE of the steel talks is... especially grave for the workers. They are suffering most. One... has written to the Sun, saying that he has already lost £1,000, and, even if the unions' claim were met in full, it would take him SEVEN YEARS to recoup that money" (S17:2-S17:4). He/she proceeds by suggesting that "The mood of disenchantment was certainly reflected in the recent poll in which steelmen voted two-to-one in favour of a ballot on the latest pay offer" (S17:5). The overall intention in the first half of S17 seems to be to suggest that the result of the poll is a reflection of disenchantment among steelworkers. This is clearly a local suggestion. It does not, for example, refer to financial suffering and disenchantment in past strikes or to suffering and/or disenchantment among workers generally. In the rest of the editorial the author begins by drawing the reader's attention to Mr. Bill Sirs' response to the poll. It is suggested that he has refused to accept the result and has said it is indecisive (S17:6). It is then suggested that given Mr. Sirs' response "... why do not the unions

organise their own ballot? If Mr. Sirs is RIGHT about the mood of his men such a poll could... only... strengthen his hand. Could it be that he is resisting the idea because of a secret fear that he might be wrong?" (S17:7-S17:9). These parts clearly invite support for the argument that Mr. Sirs may be unrepresentative of his men. However, as in the earlier parts of the editorial there is no re-production of knowledge and no generalisation. It would seem that in S17 the author is producing completely local knowledge.

This would also seem to be the case in S18. The author begins by suggesting "ARE THE bosses of the Steel Corporation really seeking increases of 40 per cent, or £250 a week?" (S18:2). It is then suggested that one of the bosses has denied this but that while the Sun believes this boss Mr. Sirs and other union leaders do not seem to (S18:3-S18:4). The author proceeds by suggesting that "It would be tragic if suspicion damaged whatever prospects there are of ending the steel strike. The Government are the bosses' paymasters. They must nail the lie" (S18:5-S18:6). Clearly, in S18 the author is producing local knowledge, there is not the slightest hint of re-production. The main intention would seem to be to formulate the report that a large pay increase is being sought by British Steel Corporation bosses as untrue.

There do not seem to be any direct links between the arguments/knowledge found in S11, S15, S17 and S18 on the one hand and the arguments/knowledge found in the Sun editorials analysed in previous chapters on the other. Hence the suggestion that past and present are similar because the taxpayers rather than trade unions bear the cost of supporting strikes/strikers and because this situation is unfair and should be remedied is a distinct dimension of the Sun's stock of knowledge. However, this dimension does reinforce some of the arguments and knowledge identified in the previous chapters. In general terms it reinforces the suggestion that the

Government should not use or allow the use of taxpayers money to support workers and it reinforces the Sun's negative image of trade unionists, strikers and strikes. There are no indications that the author is suggesting that there are any exceptions to the Sun's knowledge about the way strikes and strikers are supported. Hence it must be assumed that this knowledge is considered an adequate and comprehensive description of this issue.

FOOTNOTES

1. E16 has not been analysed. Clearly, it is a short and local editorial which deals with the specific issue of the relationship between Sir Charles Villiers and Mr. James Prior. It does not re-produce or re-affirm any part of the Express' stock of knowledge.
2. As in the case of the Sun the Star's underlining of parts of the editorials has been ignored.
3. In S11:10 the author refers to the cost of supporting strikers, in S15:5 he/she refers to bearing the cost of strikes. However, given the overall nature of these editorials and the close association between strikes and strikers it seems reasonable to assume that readers will see the issue as the cost of supporting strikes and strikers.

CHAPTER SEVENFORMS AND LEVELS OF THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITYINTRODUCTORY COMMENT

This chapter draws together, reviews, elaborates on and discusses the analyses, in particular it refines the theoretical approach by distinguishing different forms/levels of re-production and by assessing the senses in which the re-productive processes identified are quasi-scientific; relates the findings/theory to some of the existing literature; discusses the significance of the theory/findings in the context of this literature;¹ and makes briefer and more general comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the specific focus of the research, the contribution of the research, the possibilities for further research and the possibility of extending/supplementing the specific focus.

For various reasons it is inappropriate to limit the conclusions to brief statements about the existence and nature of different forms/levels. Firstly, as suggested (see p. 28), it is necessary to highlight and discuss different forms/levels, the relationships between them, the links between the various dimensions of particular communities and the similarities/differences between the forms/contents of different communities. Secondly, non-re-produced knowledge and knowledge which does not precisely take the identified forms is relevant to the theory and the existing literature. Thirdly, and more generally, a more comprehensive statement of forms, contents and sources of power will facilitate a clear consideration of the contribution/value of the research.

THE COMMUNITIES

A review of the Express' community will provide the basis for establishing the differences between it and the other newspapers and a more general typology of forms and contents.

DAILY EXPRESS OPINIONPLACEMENT AND CONTEXTUALISATION

1. The Express' introduction to the pay claim/threatened strike re-produces knowledge in a relatively simple and unreflexive manner.

True it suggests that: the pay claim is the latest problematic winter wage claim; there have been a series of winters characterised by problematic wage claims; high wage claims adversely effect employment levels and economic/industrial performance; all industrial disputes are disastrous because they have crippling effects on industry; the steel strike is potentially one of the most disastrous/crippling; the steel strike, like previous strikes, would be (is) a threat to a Government but this Government will be able to resist the threat because no General Election is due (see also 2.1). Hence there is an explicit invitation to draw on, apply, develop and re-demonstrate the validity of a stock of knowledge. However, this re-productive process essentially involves placement and contextualisation. The author does not so much provide detailed/reasoned arguments and analyses but rather re-affirms that certain categories provide the most appropriate understanding of wage claims/threatened strikes/strikes (ie. disastrous strikes, crippling effects, problematic strikes/wage claims, winter strikes/wage claims). This is not to say that the re-productive process is completely unreflexive or that it is not powerful. Readers are not simply expected to argue that the pay claim/strike will have (has) adverse effects or to simply assert that this is the case. The author evaluatively relates the issues to the concerns and interests of the reader (ie. crippling OUR industry, threatening an elected Government) and re-affirms that X is problematic because of Y. Hence the form, content and power of the knowledge is the re-demonstration of the validity of a stock of evaluative arguments, categories or images.² This argumentative process provides further evidence for the validity of a stock of knowledge but, in contrast to other processes, it is not particularly quasi-scientific; it re-demonstrates and resists threats via a contextualisation which re-produces categories/evaluations as opposed to, for example, quantitative empirical evidence or reasoned adjudications.

REASONED ADJUDICATIONS BETWEEN COMPETING DESCRIPTIONS, PERSPECTIVES AND POLICIES

2. Elements of 1. are part of a more complex and reflexive analysis, one which provides detailed arguments and an adjudication

between competing stocks of knowledge. The forms and contents of this analysis are as follows:

2.1 The steel strike re-demonstrates that pay claims are problems and strikes threaten Governments. More specifically, the current strike is a threat because it is in support of an unearned/unrealistic wage claim. The Government could deal with the situation by using taxpayers money or by printing money. However, they are rightly determined to resist this option and are likely to be successful because they are determined, have a big majority and do not have to face an election.

2.2 a) DESCRIPTIONS + ADJUDICATION- YES there are reasons for being sympathetic towards the steelworkers; the notion of fairness can and has been used to understand wage levels and claims. BUT the steel industry loses enormous sums of money and therefore cannot afford increases which are not earned by higher productivity. YES the taxpayer could pay for increases or the Government could print more money BUT why should this happen, why should the steelworkers- in contrast to other groups- be allowed unearned/uneconomic and thereby unrealistic increases?

b) PERSPECTIVES + ADJUDICATION- The fact of the matter is that wages must be directly related to the economic value of the product; that is, to the amount of money the industry earns and the productivity of the workforce. The unions and others who operate with the notion of fairness should be able to understand this fundamental principle/perspective and the consequences of not applying it (see a)).

c) PERSPECTIVES/POLICIES + ADJUDICATION- If the country does not learn and implement the lesson that the Government cannot continue to subsidise wages/industries and accept/act on the principle that the only criterion is the real economic value of the product as opposed to fairness or sympathy, then the fortunes of particular industries, the economy and the country as a whole will never improve. True the success of economic policy is dependent on a solution to the industrial action/relations problem (see 6-6.1), but the economic aspect of the appropriate policy is clearly distinguishable from the general policy.

d) REVIEW OF DESCRIPTION-PERSPECTIVE-POLICY LINK- The steel strike re-demonstrates that British industry tends to delay necessary changes (eg. closing uneconomic plants, rationalising manning and

production levels) and rush them through in unfavourable conditions but, more importantly, it provides an opportunity to demonstrate (see 4) an economic principle and to introduce it in to our affairs and into public/union perceptions of these affairs.

3. At one level the analyses reviewed in 2 involve arguments or images which evaluatively relate the issues to the interests and lives of readers (eg. Hall et al 1978). More specifically, it is arguable that there is a clear sense in which the author is suggesting- at least implicitly- that interventionist policy (ie. policy based on subsidies and notions like fairness) involves spending OUR money in an unprofitable/unrealistic manner and that OUR society can only be successful if WE recognise that wages/profits have to be earned. In Hall's (1983) terms the contrast between the reality of earning wages/profits and the sheer unreality/unprofitability of subsidising wages/industries translates monetarist policy into "...the language of experience, moral imperative and common sense...", it debates "...the national economy... on the model of the household budget" by suggesting that "'You can't pay yourself more than you earn...'" (pp. 28-29) However, there is equally clearly a sense in which the analysis is not an experientially based, moralistic and commonsensical account of how OUR money is being spent unprofitably, how it is possible for us to remedy this situation and achieve prosperity by insisting that wages/profits- like individual livings- have to be earned. The reader is detached from reality and the issues in the sense that he/she is positioned as a reader of an objective analysis and thereby as an objective analyst.³ More specifically, he/she can provide objective evidence for the validity of descriptive claims about what is the case and what is not the case; adjudicate between competing descriptions of or theories about what is the case; derive a perspective from descriptions and adjudicate between perspectives; derive a policy from a perspective and adjudicate between policies. This is not to say that there is an absolutely clear cut distinction between descriptions, perspectives and policies. However, the author does not, for example, simply argue that if wages are not earned financial losses result, OR that the notion of productivity as opposed to fairness provides the most

appropriate perspective on wages/industrial issues, OR that we must apply policy based on productivity rather than fairness. He/she describes and/or theorises- eg. the fact is that the steel industry loses enormous sums, therefore it cannot afford... and wages not based on productivity/economic value would be unearned/uneconomic/unrealistic; derives a perspective from this description/theory- eg. given the fact of financial losses and the factual consequences of applying notions like fairness, then the appropriate way to understand... is to adopt a perspective based on realism/productivity/economic value as opposed to fairness; derives a policy from the perspective- eg. given the above then the appropriate policy for wages, industry and the nation is... and is not... . The parts of this adjudicative chain of reasoning may well imply description-perspective-policy links, but the author does not rely on the implications of statements which conflate the three phenomena, he/she invites a logical/derived distinction between D/P/P and a reasoned adjudication between competing D/P/P links.

This is not to say that evaluative and common sense ideas/images which evaluatively identify the issues with readers- and other argumentative devices- do not play a part in the process; it is to say that the process takes quasi-scientific forms and that the detachment of the reader is an important part of the process. True it, for example, de-legitimises the notion of sympathy/fairness and legitimises the emphasis on productivity/non-intervention by appealing to OUR national economic interest, equating fairness with unrealism and non-intervention with realism, and contrasting realism and unrealism in a way which identifies with common sense experience (see p. 220). However, these kinds of identification; equation and contrast appear as reasons, are part of a reasoned adjudicative chain and the reader is to a significant extent detached from experiential reality. He/she can, in a clear sense, provide a logical/reasoned account of the issues and can logically/reasonably demonstrate the superiority of preferences and the inferiority of alternative, competing preferences. The reader is not just expected to invoke the national interest, contrast realism and unrealism or discuss the issues in experiential terms, but rather is invited to demonstrate through a detailed empirical analysis that it is unequivocally

the case that X is... and is not... . Elements of this process are inherently evaluative and the process as a whole involves evaluations (ie. a perspective and policy); but it is in a clear sense quasi-scientific, readers can demonstrate the validity/superiority of preferences and the invalidity/inferiority of a threatening alternative. The form, content and power of this process is the placement of inherently powerful arguments, ideas and images in quasi-scientific forms. Further examples of this kind of process are discussed shortly, firstly consideration of what seems to be a clear case of the production of knowledge, the demonstration as opposed to the re-demonstration of validity.

THE PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE: THE STEEL STRIKE AS A SIGNIFICANTLY SPECIFIC AND UNIQUE EVENT

4. There was no strong evidence to suggest that the reasoned and adjudicated economic theory/principle-perspective-policy link was re-produced. One possible explanation is that while the link is considered important, a solution to the industrial action/relations problem is seen as a necessary condition for the success of other policies (see 6-6.1), consequently the author is preoccupied with the detailed re-production of knowledge about the fundamental problem. Relatedly, it is arguable that concern over the inadequacy of the Government's - specifically Mr. Prior's - solution to the problem dominated the coverage (see 6.1). On the other hand it might be argued that the link is an implicit re-production of knowledge. However, a more important point is that the Express sees the strike as a significantly specific and unique event. It is seen as a test of the Government's ability to resist interventionist options; the first empirical test of a theory which has not been applied to a relevant and challenging instance, has not fully entered public consciousness, and must be applied to the steel strike and in future considerations of industrial/economic issues. Hence the author, given a stock of knowledge which in general terms supports the Government's theory/approach, is primarily concerned with demonstrating the practical applicability and relevance of the theory; indicating how it can be applied to a relevant empirical instance. The re-productive process here is prescriptive: the author, at least in general terms, draws on

an existing stock of knowledge but sees the strike primarily as a practical demonstration of the validity, importance, relevance and applicability of an untried theory. He/she is preparing the way for a future well confirmed and detailed dimension of the stock of knowledge (ie. as the steel strike demonstrated...).

4.1 This kind of demonstration has been seen as a crucial ideological process; as part of the attempt to change a postwar consensus, to popularise "Thatcherism" (Hall 1983). Given this argument then part of the significance of this research is that the process took particular, very powerful forms.⁴ In the case of the Express readers are not just in a position to adjudicate between competing arguments, they can also demonstrate the validity of the Government's theory/approach. This may seem a trivial point: there is, so the argument runs, an obvious sense in which a demonstration of the validity of the Express' preferences is ipso facto a demonstration of the Government's preferences. However, readers are not invited to argue that the Government's approach is correct but rather that analysis demonstrates that it is correct. Put another way there is a clear sense in which the author is not suggesting that the approach is valid because it is the Government's or that the Government's approach is valid, but rather that objective analysis and an adjudication between competing theories demonstrates that a particular approach is valid. This suggests to the reader not only that their preferences and the Government's preferences are critical, informed and reflexive, but also that the Express' support for the Government is critical, informed and reflexive.

There are links between the analyses reviewed and discussed in 1-4 and the analyses of phenomena like picketing/secondary picketing/secondary industrial action/trade union leaders, there are also links between the various dimensions of the analyses of these latter phenomena. The links will become apparent as the review and discussion process progresses.

THE INTERACTION OF FORMS OF RE-PRODUCTION: INTIMIDATORY PICKETING

5. A central feature of the analysis of picketing/secondary picketing is the suggestion that it is unequivocally the case

that it involves intimidation, bullying and thuggery as opposed to attempts to peacefully persuade. Specifically: the author suggests that eye witnesses (ie. a chairman of a firm and a convener) have confirmed the undisputable fact that mobs and gangsters, who were often led by professional picket organisers (eg. Mr. Arthur Scargill), have intimidated law-abiding citizens and threatened public order. He/she proceeds by suggesting that this kind of action/activity is illegal- a clear violation of the criminal law- and is disapproved of by the majority who voted for Mr. Prior and his Government because they want a solution to the recurring problem of intimidatory picketing, a defence against the actions/activities exemplified by the steel strike. This re-produced 'problem perspective' involves and is reinforced by the suggestion that one of the crucial issues in industrial disputes is the desirability and effectiveness of firm responses to the problem; specifically, it is suggested that the Government should ensure that the police carry out their duty to enforce the law and should strengthen/modify existing laws.

5.1 The above analysis, amongst other things, uses common sense and emotive language/images which emphasise the undesirable, anti-social, abnormal and extreme nature of actions/activities, eg. intimidation, bullying, thuggery, mobs, gangsters; criminalises these actions/activities and thereby criminalises and de-politicises dissent; suggests that they threaten civil liberties and the civil national interest, ie. freedom from intimidation, public order; contrasts reasonable/legitimate/law-abiding dissent and unreasonable/illegitimate/illegal/anarchistic dissent; invokes the knowledge and disapproval of the majority; appeals to the power of the authorities, especially to the rule of law. Hence, as in the case of the analyses discussed in 3, phenomena like evaluative identifications and common sense/emotive language play a crucial part in the re-productive process.⁵ Indeed in the case in question there is a clear sense in which the author (re) identifies a sinister THEY who do not just adversely effect some of OUR interests but rather threaten the very basis of the socio-economic order. In Hall's (1973a) terms signifying issues, specifically dissent, in terms of categories/images like law-and-order, violence and illegality switches the debate to a "...primordial ideological level...", it invokes and refers to

"...the sacred nature of the social order itself" (p. 28).

Relatedly, it is arguable that this kind of debate is premised on and re-produces a consensus which excludes actions, activities and alternative knowledge from definitions of what is reasonable, normal, justified, appropriate, acceptable and relevant via a reference to the reasonable/worthwhile actions/values of a WE and the unreasonable/unworthwhile and threatening actions/values of a THEY (see also, eg, Chibnall op cit, Hall et al op cit). However, these and the more specific argumentative forms listed above appear in quasi-scientific argumentative processes.

5.2 Readers are invited to consider an analysis of an empirical instance which re-demonstrates through analysis the validity-unequivocal validity- of the claim that picketing/secondary picketing is... . More specifically, it is suggested that the claim that P/SP involves intimidation is indisputable because eye witnesses from 'both sides' (ie. a chairman and a convener) have observed/experienced intimidation during the steel strike, and because the majority have observed/experienced intimidation on a number of occasions. To a significant extent this detaches the reader from subjective/evaluative involvement in the analysis and reality. The author provides an account of what is the case, supports this account via reference to the evidence provided by eye witnesses from both sides, suggests that this account and evidence supports a general theory of picketing, and re-affirms this suggestion via reference to the knowledge, experience and views of the majority. In a sense this process is "...based on direct perception of the world... (it) offers a direct picture of 'how things seem'..." (Brunsdon & Morley op cit, p. 89); there "...is a SENSE OF WITNESSING... a 'reality' which is... made to seem 'out there', separate from and independent of those positioned as witnesses." (Connell op cit, pp. 154-55). This kind of non-subjective, direct perception is an important part of the re-productive process. However, the reader is not so much invited to be a witness or a direct perceiver but rather an objective analyst. He/she can point to a series of confirming instances, analyse an empirical instance in a way which supports a general theory and support this analysis/theory by referring to the nature of reality and the evidence provided by eye witnesses and the majority. Moreover, he/she can derive a perspective and policy

(ies) from descriptions of what is the case. Part of the invitation to be an objective analyst and policy maker involves an indirect address to Mr. Prior. The author suggests that he should listen to the majority who voted for him and his Government because they want a defence against the kind of intimidation seen during the steel strike, and thereby develops descriptions by identifying a problem and recommending policy but also associates the analysis (ie. picketing/secondary picketing involves..., is a problem and should be dealt with) with the public (ie. it is the analysis of the public) and, consequently, reinforces and objectifies the Express' analysis and provides further indication that it is critically independent of the Government (see also p. 223). On the other hand the consideration of the specific policies which implement the general perspective/policy primarily appear as the Express' analyses. However, the author does not just suggest that the authorities have and can/should respond to the problem in certain ways but rather provides further evidence for the validity of the knowledge that picketing/secondary picketing is widely disapproved of and is a problem which can/should be solved. Readers are invited to condemn, criticise and evaluate but this invitation is firmly grounded in an analysis which re-demonstrates the validity of a description-perspective-policy (ies) link. Again, the distinction between description, perspective and policy may not be absolutely clear cut but it is empirical/real as opposed to implicative, and the relationship between the three forms of re-production is reasoned in the sense that there is an analytical and derivatory chain of argument. The author does not conflate the distinction or imply the link by simply making one of the following kinds of argument: picketing/secondary picketing is intimidatory/criminal; the problem of intimidatory/criminal P/SP can and should be dealt with by doing X,Y,Z: the problem posed by intimidatory, criminal and widely disapproved of P/SP can and should... . He/she provides evidence and empirical analyses which re-demonstrate the validity of the claim that P/SP is an intimidatory and criminal threat to... and is widely disapproved of because it is..., derives a perspective from these descriptions (ie. P/SP is a problem which should be dealt with because it is...), and re-demonstrates the validity/appropriateness of policy (ies) which are derived from

the re-produced descriptions/perspective, ie. enforcing and/or strengthening the existing law is re-demonstrably an appropriate way to deal with the problem of intimidatory and criminal acts. True the three elements of the chain of reasoning may be entailed in one another, any of the three arguments not made (see above) may involve a description-perspective-policy link. However, the author clearly distinguishes and discusses the descriptive nature of picketing/secondary picketing, the appropriate way to understand it and the appropriate way (s) to respond to it; re-produces a derived D/P/P link and provides further empirical evidence for the validity of the link. This is not to say that evaluative identifications are unimportant, that identifications with the public are not also identifications with readers, that the re-productive process is not inherently evaluative, or that it is some form of genuine scientific inquiry as opposed to accounts grounded in common sense/emotive language. It is simply to say that there are clear sense in which it is quasi-scientific. To briefly review and reiterate. The argument, for example, that picketing/secondary picketing is intimidatory and criminal- a threat to civil liberties and public order- is in itself a powerful form of argument. It involves and appeals to, for example, evaluative arguments or images which define P/SP as illegitimate, unreasonable, unacceptable and illegal; as a problem which must be solved because it involves a threat to OUR interests and social order. However, these definitions, arguments or images appear in quasi-scientific argumentative processes. The author does not simply provide or rely on the power of these phenomena but rather places them in processes which invite readers to point to a series of confirming empirical instances, analyse a particular instance in a way which provides further 'objective' evidence for the validity of a stock of knowledge, and formulate evaluations and recommendations which are objective in the sense that they are derived from and develop descriptions of what is the case. Hence the forms, contents and power of the re-productive process is the interaction between evaluative argumentative forms (see list at beginning of this section) and quasi-scientific argumentative processes (ie. re-demonstrations, forms of evidence, forms of objectivity); specifically, the placement or appearance of the former in the latter. ⁶

THE QUASI-SCIENCE OF TRADE UNIONISM

6. For the Express intimidatory picketing/secondary picketing is only one dimension of the trade union problem, in particular the industrial action/relations problem. The steel strike is seen as the latest in a series of events which re-demonstrate: a) intimidatory picketing/secondary picketing is..., ... (see above); b) various forms of illegal and legal industrial action (eg. non-intimidatory secondary picketing, secondary industrial action- ie. extending strikes, blocking or stopping the movement of goods) enable trade unionists to blockade/cripple British industry and the economic system; c) trade union leaders misrepresent their members and use trade union activities as an occasion to pursue self-interest and/or extreme political views; d) the public disapprove of intimidatory picketing/secondary picketing and want something done about this aspect of the problem, the authorities have responded and can and always should respond to the problem by enforcing the existing law or modified versions of it (see 5); e) with one exception (see j)) the various forms of legal and illegal industrial action are a fundamental problem and are widely disapproved of- if management cannot manage and workers cannot work, if industry cannot function in a normal manner, then the nation will never prosper; f) the major necessary condition for prosperity is the removal of the industrial relations/action cancer; g) a central and essential part of the solution to the problem is to make secondary industrial actions illegal; h) the introduction of compulsory ballot policy would solve the general problem of misrepresentation (ie. strikes could no longer be imposed on workers and the nation), and would also provide a medium for the expression of the anti-strike mood and realism of workers; i) the Government has a clear mandate to deal with the various dimensions of the trade union problem; j) non-intimidatory picketing of a strikers own place of work which attempts to inform and peacefully persuade is legitimate and reasonable; k) all strikes have disastrous effects but a distinction between resistable/irresistable strikes has replaced a concern over omnipotent strikes.

6.1 The analyses of the trade union problem involve a major modification/development of the stock of knowledge. It is suggested that: a) For some time we have campaigned against the

various forms of industrial action, in particular we have fought a battle to outlaw secondary actions. b) The Government rightly understood the importance of these policies but have mistakenly begun the implementation of economic policy without tackling the industrial action/relations problem. c) Moreover, analyses of the steel strike indicate that their- in particular Mr. Prior's- proposals are completely inadequate and impractical. d) The Government's radical ideas for changing the fortunes of the nation are correct but will not work if the fundamental problem is not addressed. e) They must recognise this: the Bill must be strong and effective, it must unequivocally criminalise secondary actions. More generally, if enforcing existing, modified or new laws means facing a General Strike then so be it: the problem must be tackled.

6.2 Major dimensions of the knowledge reviewed in 5-6.1 are part of, re-affirm and develop- and are re-affirmed, developed and defended by- the analysis of Mr. Scargill's argument (see 6.7).

The analyses summarised in 6-6.2 are discussed in 6.3-6.8.

6.3 A distinctive feature of the analysis of the trade union problem is particularly evident in the analysis of legal secondary industrial actions. This analysis is generally similar to other analyses in that the author re-produces a description-perspective-policy link. However, he/she emphasises and underlines the community's own analyses, especially its policy making and evaluative voice.⁷ This involves not simply a perspective/policy but rather the re-production of a campaign against legal secondary actions in particular and industrial action in general. Readers are expected to be outraged and incensed by the various forms of industrial action, the Government's response to the trade union problem and their failure to recognise that an effective, practical and radical solution to this problem is the precondition for prosperity. This is not simply an invitation to criticise trade unionism or to emphasise adverse effects but rather to condemn it, to argue that it simply cannot be conceived of as anything other than a fundamental problem, a cancer which must be removed once and for all. For the Express there can be no concessions, no equivocation, no doubt about what the major issue is: the country is involved in and must fight a war against

the enemy- modern trade unionism; anything less than, for example, criminalising legal forms of dissent, prosecuting those involved in re-demonstrably illegal and unacceptable forms, and restricting dissent to peaceful picketing of the strikers own place of work is considered totally inadequate. This is significant partly because it identifies a major dimension of the Express' inferential framework (see p.253) and partly because it highlights the explicitly/strongly evaluative, critical and policy orientated nature of the community. However, this critical and evaluative voice is firmly grounded in quasi-scientific knowledge.

6.4 The analysis of the crippling economic effects of secondary industrial actions involves descriptions of what is the case and what is possible during the steel strike, and what is possible in industrial disputes per se. The evidence here- compared to the analyses reviewed in 2 and 5- is essentially brief, qualitative authorial descriptions of problematic and potentially catastrophic effects. The perspective and policy are partly derived from the suggestion that secondary industrial actions during the steel strike are another instance of the prevention of normal working, ie. management/workers cannot function normally, the crippling/blockading of industry/the economy. Again, evaluations (ie. perspective and policy) and arguments which are inherently evaluative and identify the issues with readers (ie. crippling OUR industry, damaging OUR economic interest) appear in quasi-scientific forms. Readers can re-demonstrate that it is unequivocally the case that certain actions are... and involve... ; re-demonstrate that they are a problem because... ; and re-demonstrate that the only appropriate/practical policy is to outlaw them (see 6.1). Moreover, the analysis of economic effects is related to the analysis of intimidatory/illegal picketing not just in the sense that they are two aspects of the trade union problem, but also in the sense that the latter is seen as part of the threat to normal working/the economic system. Hence the two analyses reinforce one another and taken together provide a detailed account of how, why and in what ways various aspects of trade unionism can only be conceived of as a problem which must be dealt with. More generally, these analyses 'flesh out' the general categories

used to introduce the strike (ie. disastrous/crippling strikes, see pp. 217-18).

6.5 The analysis of the difference between trade union leaders and their members/ordinary workers suggests that the former misrepresent the latter and use strikes/the trade union movement to pursue self-interest and/or extreme political views. More specifically (see also 6.6-6.8), it is suggested that many steelworkers did not want to strike, that the failure of the steel unions to hold a ballot and their instructions to ignore a B.S.C. ballot is indicative of unrepresentativeness, and that the turnout/result in/of the subsequent ballot is another unequivocal re-demonstration of the validity of the Express' knowledge. As in the case of the reference to the convener's experience/observation of intimidation (see p. 225) the quantitative evidence provided by another ballot is particularly powerful because it unequivocally re-affirms that trade unionists perceive the activities of the movement and their leaders as illegitimate/problematic. Moreover, there is a 'double' re-demonstration of the validity of knowledge: the unwillingness of many steelworkers to strike and the failure to hold a ballot are descriptive re-demonstrations of what has been established in the past (especially by previous ballots); the eventual ballot supports the hypothesis suggested by the stock of knowledge and provides further quantitative evidence which suggests that the unrepresentativeness of trade union leaders is beyond reasonable doubt. Faced with an event or argument which cast doubt on unrepresentativeness or the the lack of grassroots support for trade unionism readers could point to a series of confirming instances and resolve any doubt by invoking quantitative and thereby unequivocal evidence.

6.6 The suggestion that the steel strike is another example of a failed strike and thereby of the need to replace a concern over omnipotent strikes with a distinction between resistable/irresistable strikes is developed in two ways. Firstly, by the suggestion that nowadays the majority of strikes are likely to fall into the former category because only a minority of occupational groups (the miners, the power workers) can damage, threaten and coerce to a successful extent. Secondly, by the suggestion that one reason why strikes are no longer an

omnipotent weapon is that in the prevailing economic climate workers recognise that jobs/living standards are put at risk by ambitious/unrepresentative trade union leaders, and are aware that it takes a long time to make up the wages lost by strikes. Hence, the author suggests, the introduction of compulsory ballot policy would provide a medium for the expression of the anti-strike mood and realism of workers; it would solve the problem of misrepresentation (ie. strikes could no longer be imposed from above) and in practice would lead to a significant decrease in the number of damaging strikes.

The analysis of the resitable/irresistable distinction involves a general form of further evidence in that the author simply notes that the failure of the steel strike is another instance of... and refers to the relative power of different occupational groups. However, aspects of the development of this analysis re-affirm the distinction between trade union leaders/trade unionists by specifying that the realism of the latter is a central part of the difference. More generally, this and some of the other analyses considered in 5-6.6 are part of, re-affirm and develop- and are re-affirmed, developed and defended by- the analysis of Mr. Scargill's argument.

6.7 The forms and contents of this analysis and relationship between analyses are as follows:

a) Mr. Scargill's argument suggests that trade unionists have a legitimate right to pursue their interests via secondary industrial actions regardless of the law. This alternative argument threatens the validity of the knowledge that trade union actions/activities are illegitimate, widely disapproved of and should be curbed/outlawed.

b) The de-legitimisation of the threatening argument takes two forms: it is suggested that if individuals/group simply decide to obey some laws and not others then anarchy results, and that Mr. Scargill's argument is not reasoned or the result of informed reflection but rather the result of extreme political views, self-interest, personal ambition, a desire for publicity and a desire to be seen as a hero/martyr.

c) This de-legitimisation allows the Express to reject Mr. Scargill's argument, defend the preferred stock of knowledge

and re-demonstrate the superiority of preferences and inferiority of an alternative. More specifically, readers are invited to consider the following: YES criticism of the law and support for trade union actions/activities is possible and can be seen as legitimate, BUT the law must be obeyed otherwise anarchy results and criticism/support/perceived legitimacy is confined to an extreme, unreasoning, unreasonable and self-interested minority. Clearly, trade union leaders pursue self-interest and/or extreme political views rather than legitimate causes which have popular support. More generally, it is re-demonstrably the case that trade union actions/activities are illegitimate, widely disapproved of and unsupported, and should be curbed/outlawed: dissent must take legal and legitimate/socially acceptable forms, ie. peaceful picketing of the strikers own place of work but no secondary actions.

6.8 This YES-BUT logic is less rational than the one reviewed and discussed in 2-3 in the sense that it deals with a threatening, alternative argument by addressing, at least to a significant extent, the personality/character of the arguer (s). Relatedly, the author does not describe and illustrate in detail phenomena like self-interest, personal ambition and a desire for publicity/martyrdom; but rather tends to simply equate radical criticism of the law and radical support for trade unionism- an invitation to disobey the law- with these phenomena. Moreover, the analysis of the ballot (see p. 231) describes and re-demonstrates unrepresentativeness and a lack of enthusiasm for trade unionism, but simply includes the suggestion that trade union leaders pursue self-interest and/or political views in the analysis; that is, this suggestion is 'tacked on' to the re-demonstration and is warranted by association with this re-demonstration. A further, related point is that the author appeals to a stark and fundamental contrast between obeying the law and the consequences of disobedience, ie. democracy versus anarchy. Again (see also pp. 224-25), there is a clear sense in which he/she identifies a sinister THEY- specifically but not exclusively a HIM- who are a fundamental threat to the social order; re-produces a consensus which invokes and appeals to a definition of reasonable/worthwhile actions/values/views and defines or labels- as opposed to analyses- alternatives as illegitimate, unacceptable and abnormal via a

reference to the ways in which they are unreasonable/unworthwhile because they challenge or conflict with what is reasonable/worthwhile, ie. self-interest, extremism, anarchy, see also, eg, p. 224- intimidation, crime, and so on (eg. Chibnall op cit, Hall 1973a, Hall et al op cit). However, there is a form of reasoned adjudication (ie. a YES-BUT logic) and, more generally, readers can use a variety of analyses to re-affirm, develop, elaborate on and defend their knowledge of how, why and in what ways trade unionism- specifically the vast majority of the actions/activities associated with it and trade union leaders- is/are illegitimate/problematic, widely disapproved of and unsupported inside/outside of trade unions, and should be curbed/outlawed. They can unequivocally re-demonstrate that trade unionism must be understood in a particular way and cannot be understood in other ways, specifically as a legitimate activity which has popular support. These analyses include ones which describe extremism/anarchy by indicating that people like Mr. Scargill organise/lead intimidatory pickets. However, the author tends to 'tack on' the self-interest/rhetoric argument, it appears in a YES-BUT logic but the author tends to argue by definition- extremism, anarchy, radical criticism/support therefore self-interest, ambition, rhetoric, self-publicity.

THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY: THE APPEARANCE OF FORMS OF (DE) LEGITIMISATION IN QUASI-SCIENTIFIC ARGUMENTATIVE PROCESSES

7. The above has identified what can be called forms of (de) legitimisation and quasi-scientific argumentative processes. The former are arguments/definitions/images which allocate legitimacy/approval and illegitimacy/disapproval by evaluating phenomena in terms of their positive or negative relation to worthwhile social, economic, political, normative and moral structures; and thereby evaluatively identify them with/relate them to the interests, concerns and lives of readers. These evaluative forms appear in quasi-scientific argumentative processes.⁸ Namely, re-productions of descriptions of what is the case which via an analysis of an empirical instance provide further evidence for a well established understanding and which are- in the sense described- objective accounts of a seemingly external reality. Specifically: there are particular kinds of objective analysis/evidence, ie. quantitative/qualitative evidence, evidence provided by eye witnesses, 'both sides,' the majority, detachment from Government; re-productions of perspectives/

derived from and develop descriptions; re-productions of policies which apply perspectives and are derived from and develop descriptions/perspectives; YES-BUT logics which provide a reasoned adjudication between competing stocks of knowledge and place descriptions, perspectives, policies and forms of evidence in reasoned and adjudicative chains.

In a sense it is legitimate to say that forms of (de) legitimisation and quasi-scientific argumentative processes are two kinds of form, content and source of power. This suggestion allows an analytical breakdown of knowledge processes and gives due weight to the existence and role of evaluative/emotive forms and contents. However, the analyses and review clearly show that they are interrelated. Hence, for example, a re-produced description-perspective-policy link is a form of reasoned or quasi-scientific argument because it objectively re-demonstrates what is the case and re-derives and re-demonstrates the validity of a perspective and policy; but it also involves and appeals to powerful (de) legitimisations, it places the latter in a reasoned argumentative structure. The idea (eg. intimidation, profitability, unrepresentativeness) is in itself powerful but is not completely independent of the argumentative structure. This structure is an essential part of the form and content of the idea. Put another way to identify forms of (de)legitimation indicates and highlights the role of evaluative phenomena and allows us to specify what kind of logic and reason is involved, to recognise the inherently evaluative nature of the editorial language. However, in clear senses these phenomena appear in quasi-scientific argumentative processes. This is not to ignore the differences between the Express' analyses, ie. placement and contextualisation as well as more reflexive analyses, the different YES-BUT logics or the relatively brief/undetailed descriptions of the economic effects of secondary actions; different levels of re-production, ie. the re-production of a consensus or inferential framework; different forms of (de) legitimisation; evidence for demonstration; nor is it to equate forms of re-production and forms of knowledge. ⁹ It is simply to say that the maintenance, development, legitimation and defence of the Express' stock of knowledge takes, in general terms, a particular and very powerful form; that is, the appearance

of powerful arguments, definitions or ideas/images in quasi-scientific argumentative processes.

There are differences but also significant and persistent similarities between the Express, the Mail and the Sun. Hence the latter two communities can be reviewed in the light of the above, and further comment on the re-production of community in general can be incorporated into this review.

NON-INTERVENTIONIST POLICY: DESCRIPTIONS, PERSPECTIVES, POLICIES AND ADJUDICATIONS

8. The Mail's and the Sun's preference for non-interventionist policy can be reviewed as follows.

DAILY MAIL COMMENT

The steel strike re-demonstrates: DESCRIPTIONS- a) A non-interventionist policy is the best approach to wages, strikes and industry in general. b) Interventionist policy is inappropriate because it unrealistically and uneconomically involves using unearned money to subsidise workers/industries and buy off strikes. c) If wages are not related to productivity and the amount of money the industry earns then industries, industry and the economy will never be viable/successful. PERSPECTIVE & POLICY- a) Non-interventionist policy should have been applied in the past and should/must be applied today. b) The Government must stand firm and practice what it has preached; we cannot continue to subsidise workers/industries who/which do not earn a living. c) The steel strike is a good opportunity to apply and establish this principle/perspective and to abandon a perspective based on intervention/sympathy/fairness; the fact and reality is that wages must be related to productivity and the amount of money the industry earns. ADJUDICATIVE ANALYSES- a) YES there are reasons for being sympathetic towards the steelworkers; the notion of fairness can and has been used to understand wage claims and levels. BUT the steel industry loses enormous sums of money and is already heavily subsidised. b) YES the Government or the taxpayer could provide more money BUT this is uneconomic/unrealistic and would lead to more losses and redundancies. c) It would be wrong to claim that the application of non-interventionist policy will not lead to more job losses and closures, consequently it

is legitimate to retain a sense of sympathy for those affected by it. BUT the fact and reality is clearly re-demonstrated by the steel strike- unearned wages and subsidies are unrealistic and uneconomic.

THE SUN SAYS

Analysis of the steel strike re-demonstrates: DESCRIPTIONS-

a) The interventionist policy preferred and practiced by the Labour Party is inappropriate. It leads to higher inflation, higher taxation and less jobs; involves spending large amounts of taxpayers (ie. OUR) money to subsidise workers and industries who do not earn their living; creates a large national debt; and leads to a situation whereby individuals, industries and industry cannot achieve success and prosperity. b) The non-interventionist policy preferred by Mrs. Thatcher's new Conservative Government is appropriate. It avoids the effects noted in a) because it ties wages to productivity and/or to the financial state of the industry in question, and thereby leads to a situation where individuals, industries and industry earn their livings. PERSPECTIVE & POLICY-

a) We must recognise that we cannot go on subsidising wages and industries; if we do not apply the perspective of economic realism- recognise that WE HAVE TO EARN OUR LIVING- industries, industry and the nation in general will never become viable. .b) The steel strike is a good opportunity to demonstrate and drive home this crucial lesson; the Government must seize the chance to introduce realism into our affairs. ADJUDICATIVE ANALYSES- a), YES there

are reasons for being sympathetic towards the steelworkers; the notion of fairness can and has been used to understand wage levels and claims. YES the taxpayer or the Government could provide more money. b) BUT the fact and reality of the matter is that the steel industry is already heavily subsidised and loses enormous sums, and the low productivity of the steelworkers is the primary cause of the financial plight of the industry. c) As this example clearly demonstrates viability is only possible if wages are directly tied to productivity and/or the financial state of the industry, if we adopt ~~an~~ interventionist/realist perspective and abandon interventionist/sympathy/fairness perspectives.

8.1 As the above suggests while the Express', the Mail's and the Sun's analyses are essentially and significantly similar there

are differences between them. Firstly, they all emphasise the steel strike as a significantly specific event- an opportunity to apply the new Government's policy and thereby to change the fortunes of the nation. However, the Mail and the Sun also emphasise the re-production of knowledge about interventionist/non-interventionist policy, in particular the need to practice what has been preached. Secondly, the Mail invites a retention of a sense of sympathy for the steelworkers and others who are/will be effected by a painful policy. Thirdly, the Sun emphasises the facts/figures and consequences of low productivity, the misuse of OUR money and the need to EARN A LIVING (ie. the Sun explicitly uses and emphasises phrases like OUR money, EARNING A LIVING). In a sense these differences are insignificant; what is emphasised and underlined in one newspaper is by no means inconsistent with or radically different from the forms and contents of the other newspapers. However, they arguably reflect differences between the communities and different authorial assumptions. Hence a contrast between the realism of earning wages/profits and the unrealism/unprofitability of subsidising wages/industries is a central form of (de) legitimisation in all three newspapers; it allocates legitimacy/illegitimacy by, for example, equating non-interventionist policy with realism, success and profitability and invoking a 'household budget model' (Hall 1983, see pp. 220-21). However, in the case of the Sun the explicit emphasis on OUR money and earning a/our living- not living now and paying later- arguably involves the assumption that a particularly direct "...language of experience..." (Hall *ibid*, p. 28) is an appropriate and powerful way to address the community. Relatedly, all of the newspapers refer to the facts, figures and consequences of low productivity but the Sun's emphasis on and underlining of these phenomena arguably reflects the assumption that a relatively straightforward emphasis on the fact and consequences of productivity formulated as manifestly low productivity is more appropriate to the community. On the other hand, at one level, there is a very similar interaction between forms of (de) legitimisation and quasi-scientific forms in all three newspapers, ie. a contrast between the reality of earning wages/profits and the unreality of subsidising them appears in a YES-BUT logic which places descriptions, perspectives, policies and facts/figures

about low productivity and financial loss in a reasoned adjudicative chain.

Similarly, the Mail invites rejection of sympathy/fairness/interventionist arguments but also invites retention of a sense of sympathy. This arguable reflects the assumption that a more 'balanced' view is appropriate to the community; one which recognises, rejects and retains a sense of the legitimacy of sympathy based arguments. The absence of any explicit and detailed re-production of knowledge about interventionist/non-interventionist policy in the Express is a slightly different case. True there is evidence for some continuity and all three newspapers emphasise the specificity of the steel strike, consequently the lack of detailed emphasis on re-demonstration does not necessarily mean that the Express has not previously considered the issues in detail. As suggested (see p. 222) it may be that the Express was particularly concerned with the trade union problem, in particular the inadequacy of the Government's response and its failure to recognise that priority must be given to non-economic policy. However, the longer term nature of the analysis of interventionist/non-interventionist policy must be seen as an empirical question. To assume radical discontinuity ignores the possibility of extensive continuity, to assume extensive continuity ignores the possibility of radical discontinuity. In contrast, in the other two newspapers the evidence for interaction between continuity and discontinuity is clear. ¹⁰

8.2 Again, as stressed in the discussion of the Express, the description-perspective-policy link may not always be absolutely clear cut, the YES-BUT logics are inherently evaluative and evaluatively identify issues with the reader and evaluations/recommendations (ie. a perspective and policy) are integral parts of the logics. Moreover, not all aspects of description-perspective-policy links are re-demonstrated in detail by the analysis of the steel strike, eg. the Sun's reference to higher inflation. However, there is a clear sense in which the argumentative processes are quasi-scientific, readers are detached from evaluative/subjective involvement, positioned as objective analysts, in the sense that they are offered a YES-BUT logic which places evaluative identifications, references to facts

and figures, empirical assessments of Government policy, and descriptions/perspectives/policies in a reasoned adjudicative chain, and which thereby provides a form of reasoned account of the validity of preferences and inferiority of alternatives.

TRADE UNIONISM: THE MAIL AND THE SUN

9. The rest of the Mail's and Sun's analyses can, in general descriptive terms, be referred to by the heading trade unionism. These analyses are summarised below, they are discussed and the three communities are related to one another in 10-22 . 11

DAILY MAIL COMMENT

Analysis of the steel strike re-demonstrates the validity of: DESCRIPTIONS- a) Strikes have crippling effects on particular industries and industry/the economy in general. b) Strikes threaten/coerce Governments, in particular they test their will to resist interventionist options. Mrs. Thatcher's new Government may be able to resist the particular threat of the steel strike, she is determined and has a definite policy of no surrender/intervention. c) Picketing/secondary picketing involves intimidation and gangsterism as opposed to peaceful persuasion. d) The mobs and gangsters, who are often led by professional and politically motivated picket organisers (eg. Mr. Arthur Scargill), intimidate people (ie. workers & management) who want to work rather than strike and threaten public order/the rule of law. e) These actions/activities are illegal- clear violations of the criminal law- and are disapproved of by the majority. f) Apart from the problem of intimidation, secondary picketing/industrial action is also undesirable because it: imposes strikes on people who are not and do not want to be involved, even in the absence of physical intimidation freedoms and liberties are threatened; damages industry and industry/the economy in general to a crippling extent; damages the agency which ensures social and economic well being (ie. private enterprise). g) Trade union leaders are responsible for attempts to wreck the economy and coerce Governments; they act against the interests of everyone, including themselves and, relatedly, damage the very agency which ensures success/prosperity. h) They are unrepresentative of their members and coerce them. The latter, in sharp contrast to the former, are economic realists;

they recognise that strikes threaten jobs and industries and, more generally, do not support those leaders (eg. Mr. Scargill) who use strikes/the movement to pursue self-interest and/or extreme political views. i) Ordinary trade unionists are increasingly rejecting actions/policies imposed from above and recognise that the movement no longer embodies/realises aims/values like brotherhood, solidarity and communality. For the Mail the modern heroes/martyrs are those who stand against the movement and recognise the rhetorical nature of its appeals. PERSPECTIVES AND POLICIES- a) The majority disapprove of- detest- and want something done about the nasty/undesirable practices of intimidatory picketing/secondary picketing and legal secondary picketing/ industrial action. b) Mr. Prior and his party have a clear mandate to deal with the various dimensions of the industrial action problem. c) The existing law can and should/must be used to deal with the physical intimidation dimension of the problem, but he might consider strengthening existing laws and/or introducing new ones to deal with physical intimidation. d) The Government has a clear mandate to outlaw legal, "non-intimidatory" secondary picketing/industrial action; the vast majority want a solution/policy which unequivocally criminalises this kind of action. e) The steel strike re-demonstrates the various aspects of the trade union problem and the fact that the Government has a mandate to deal with it. However, the specific lesson of the strike is that proposed legislation must be strengthened and implemented faster; it demonstrates the enormity of the effects of trade union actions/activities and the need to effectively and quickly deal with the problem. If it is not solved the crucial agency of private enterprise will not be able to prosper.

THE SUN SAYS

Analysis of the steel strike re-demonstrates the validity of: DESCRIPTIONS- a) Picketing/secondary picketing involves bullying, threatening and sometimes violent behaviour. b) The bully boys, who are being advised by a professional picket organiser (ie. Mr. Arthur Scargill), threaten normal working, basic rights (ie. the right to live and work in peace), and the country's civil (ie. public order) and economic interests. c) These actions/activities are illegal, clear violations of the existing law.

d) Secondary industrial action blackmails Governments via the infliction of damage to the economy; the aim is to damage to an extent which makes Governments grant unearned wage increases.

e) The taxpayer supports strikes, strikers and their families but trade unions have enormous financial resources. PERSPECTIVE (S) AND POLICIES- a) Picketing is a problem which can and should be solved. b) The authorities (ie. the police and the Government) can and should respond to the problem by invoking and enforcing the existing law. Other groups (eg. trade union leaders, trade unionists) can and should respond by disciplining the bully boys or by calling the relevant authorities. c) This Government has responded more adequately than previous Labour Governments but it must introduce the tougher laws promised in the manifesto. d) The Government promised to solve the 'economic' dimension of the secondary industrial action problem by outlawing this kind of action, but they have failed to fulfill this promise, why? e) The taxpayer should not have to support strikes, strikers and their families. The Government promised to remedy this unfair situation by making trade unions use their own resources, why have they failed to fulfill this promise?

INTIMIDATORY PICKETING: THE EXPRESS, THE MAIL AND THE SUN

10. As in the Express the basis of the Mail's and the Sun's analyses of picketing/secondary picketing as- to use a general term- intimidatory is a form of direct perception/description of a seemingly external and objective reality (Connell op cit, Brunson & Morley op cit, see p. 225). More specifically, the Mail describes and underlines the brute fact and reality of intimidation, and suggests that the majority simply will not believe that this latest instance of intimidation involves peaceful persuasion or some kind of legitimate picketing; it is unequivocally and incontrovertibly- and is widely/almost universally perceived as- a blatant attempt to intimidate workers and management, to involve those who do not want to be and are not involved in the dispute. The Sun likewise describes the reality of violence and threats, in particular it suggests that a number of specific events (eg. punching a woman, stopping deliveries) are further unequivocal examples of bullying/threatening/violent behaviour; behaviour which threatens various groups and entities

(eg. steelworkers, other trade unionists, trade union representatives; the human, material and economic dimensions of normal working, the more general civil and economic national interest) and is perceived as a problem/threat by various groups (eg. trade unionists and their representatives, the steel union leader, Conservative MP's, Governments, the Home Secretary). Similarly, the Mail emphasises the knowledge and disapproval of the majority, the Lord Chancellor and ordinary trade unionists/management; the way in which ordinary trade unionists/management are adversely effected by activities which damage specific and more general entities (eg. individual rights and liberties, the viability of firms and the economy generally, public order, the rule of law); and the fact that ordinary trade unionists/workers reject and stand out against official actions/activities and organised/politically motivated intimidation (see also & esp. 11-15) Hence all three newspapers objectify/externalise their analyses and reinforce the objectivity of their direct descriptions, deny legitimacy to any argument which suggests that picketing is legitimate and approved of/supported by sections of society, and more generally- provide and legitimate the argument that P/SP is... by suggesting that it is unequivocally the case not simply that P/SP has universal effects (ie. different groups/entities and the whole socio-economic order are threatened) but that it is universally perceived as being... (ie. the analyses are the analyses of everyone or at least of either the vast majority or a wide range of persons/groups). Put another way the references to 'different groups/entities are part of the communities' knowledge and very powerful legitimations of it: the universalisation of adverse effects and the universalisation of the perception of adverse effects. Moreover, these references are part of quasi-scientific descriptions and description-perspective-policy links, ie. the authors do not simply claim that various groups/entities are threatened by X and that the problem/threat is perceived as... by ... , but rather provide analyses which unequivocally re-demonstrate that this is the case.

10.1 Again, the description-perspective-policy link and distinction may not always be clear cut and it must be stressed that quasi-scientific refers to a very particular kind of logic or reason. This can be further illustrated by considering sentence versions of

arguments not made (see also p. 226): 1) it is re-demonstrably the case that picketing is undesirable; 2) picketing is an intimidatory/criminal threat to various groups and the civil/economic national interest; 3) it is re-demonstrably the case that picketing is intimidatory/criminal and... : it is also perceived as such by various and diverse persons/groups; 4) it is re-demonstrably the case that picketing is a problem; 5) it is re-demonstrably the case that the problem of intimidatory picketing can be solved by... . The first kind of statement is a particularly neutral form of objectivity/realism or empirical perception, it re-demonstrates via analysis of an empirical instance the validity of descriptions without using language which is strongly evaluative/emotive/commonsensical (ie. undesirable as opposed to gangster like intimidation). The second is more evaluative/emotive but makes an unwarranted claim, ie. no re-demonstration via an analysis of an empirical instance. The third places evaluative arguments and identifications in a quasi-scientific argumentative process (ie. analysis suggests that it is unequivocally the case that THEY intimidate and break the law), implies a perspective/policy and a d-p-p link (ie. intimidatory/criminal acts are a problem which should be dealt with), but does not explicitly address/derive a link and does not provide specific kinds of evidence for the views of different/diverse groups or include arguments about these views in an empirically based re-demonstration. The fourth re-demonstrates the validity of a perspective but does not clearly distinguish, address and discuss description-perspective-policy. The fifth re-demonstrates the validity of a perspective-policy link but does not specifically and clearly address the issue of description, description may be implied but it is not clearly distinguished from and related to a perspective and policy. Major elements of all five arguments are important- indeed central and crucial- dimensions of the communities but the authors clearly if not absolutely distinguish description-perspective-policy and re-derive the link in a reasoned manner via analyses of an empirical instance which are based on, in general terms, a form of objective/realist description and, more specifically, on particular kinds of such description, eg. descriptions of brute/factual reality, analyses of specific examples of intimidation, quoted or direct references to- as opposed to ^{indirect} claims about- the views of Government

officers (ie. the Home Secretary, the Lord Chancellor), eye witness evidence from both sides of industry, quotes from or direct references to the views and experience of workers, management, trade unionists, trade union representatives, MP's, Governments. These analyses also re-produce perspectives which are based on and develop- but are distinct and derived from- descriptions, ie. picketing/secondary picketing is X,Y, is a problem and is widely regarded as X,Y and a problem; and policies which are based on/develop and distinct/derived from description- perspective links, ie. the widely perceived reality and problem of intimidatory/criminal acts can be solved by enforcing/strengthening the law, internal union discipline, calling the relevant authorities.

10.2 Again, powerful, evaluative arguments interact with- appear in- quasi-scientific argumentative processes. To identify, for example, a criminal and intimidatory THEY who are a THEY because THEY are involved in activities which threaten everyone's/DUR interests and, more generally, to use common sense/emotive language and evaluative identifications is to provide extremely powerful arguments. ^(see pp. 224-25) However, when these arguments and identifications interact with and appear in quasi-scientific processes the result is an extremely powerful stock of knowledge. One which is highly resistant to falsification, a powerful defence against alternative arguments and threatening events/situations, and invites readers to be objective analysts, evaluators, castigaters and policy makers rather than simply direct perceivers, moralisers, deplorers, insisters, denouncers. They are invited to evaluate, castigate, denounce and so on, and the processes are inherently and powerfully evaluative but it is the interaction and appearance described which constitutes the stocks of knowledge.

DAILY MAIL COMMENT: TRADE UNIONISM, TRADE UNION LEADERS AND PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The similarities and differences between the three communities can be highlighted by considering the rest of the Mail's and Sun's analyses. Firstly, the Mail.

11. Like the Express but unlike the Sun, the Mail emphasises a distinction between trade union leaders and ordinary workers/trade unionists. However, in the Mail the role of trade union

leaders is underlined and a contrast between trade unionism and private enterprise is a major preoccupation. In part the analyses of these issues involve placement and contextualisation (see p. 218): the author suggests, for example, that the strike is another example of the way in which strikes- in particular trade union leaders- cripple and wreck particular industries and industry/the economy in general, and thereby damage ev^eryones interests, including their own. As in the Express a variety of analyses flesh out the major dimensions of categories like wreck, cripple, threat, coerce. Hence, for example, the author analyses a particular instance of the financial damage caused by secondary/intimidatory industrial^{action}: specifically, he/she supports claims about crippling financial damage with a quote from the chairman of a firm. This example is seen as an instance of a more general phenomenon- the way in which trade unionism- specifically trade union leaders- damage the very agency which ensures social and economic well being (ie. private enterprise) and thereby damages everyones interests, including their own.

This emphasis on a contrast between the positive (private enterprise) and negative force (trade unionism- especially and specifically trade union leaders) in society is specific to the Mail. True it is not inconsistent with the other two communities discussed and central aspects of it are prominent in these communities, but it is a particular and distinctive inflection of a more general stock of knowledge.¹² Whereas the Express is particularly concerned with its own campaign to outlaw secondary actions and the argument that economic success for the nation is dependent on a solution to the trade union problem, and the Sun is particularly concerned with the misuse/waste of OUR money (see next section); the Mail, in contrast, re-produces a community which is particularly concerned with the positive role of private businesses and the negative role of trade unionism/trade union leaders.

12. The specifics of this emphasis are particularly evident in the analyses of the differences between trade union leaders and their members/ordinary workers. The proposed disciplining (ie. expulsion) of private steelworkers who will not join the strike is seen as another clear example of an attempt by trade unions/trade union leaders to coerce members. More specifically, it is suggested

that the fact that a group of well paid/productive/private steelworkers have stood out against intimidation and have not been balloted is another example of ordinary trade unionists reacting against the imposition of actions/policies from above, and that such groups working for such firms are the only medium for future socio-economic success. For the Mail the heroes/martyrs of today are those who stand against trade unionism/trade union leaders. More specifically, the equation of Tolpuddle martyrs in smocks and Sheerness steelworkers in donkey jackets re-affirms and summarises the argument that private enterprise now embodies the original/worthy aims/values of trade unionism (ie. brotherhood, communality, success/prosperity via collectivism), and that increasing numbers/groups of workers are reacting against the imposition of actions and policies. They recognise the rhetorical nature of modern trade unionism- the redundancy of the idea of trade unionism and the ascendancy/importance of private enterprise. These analyses re-affirm and develop- and are re-affirmed and developed by- the empirical identification of three groups of workers who have recently resisted official actions/policies, in particular they- in sharp contrast to trade union leaders- have recognised that economic reality is such that these actions/policies are self-defeating/suicidal.

13. As in the Express the turn out in and result of the B.S.C. ballot is seen as an 'absolutely unequivocal' re-demonstration of the validity of knowledge. Specifically, the Mail suggests that anyone not (re) convinced by the above evidence should consider the contrast between a lack of support for a trade union rally and the turnout in/result of the ballot. This unequivocal quantitative contrast, the author suggests, is further crystal clear evidence for the rejection of official/unrepresentative/coercive/unrealistic actions and policies. More specifically, it suggests that the steelworkers are unwilling to be used in another battle between trade union leaders and a Government, in particular a Conservative Government.

14. Again, the inherently evaluative arguments, definitions, ideas or images identified in 11-13 (eg. unrepresentativeness, coercion, economic unrealsim, crippling the socio-economic national interest, crippling financial damage, intimidation, rhetoric, productivity, profitability) appear in quasi-scientific forms. Again, this is

not to play down the role of evaluative phenomena or to suggest that the author provides detailed empirical analyses of every aspect of the stock of knowledge, nor is it to ignore the explicitly evaluative nature of the community. It is to suggest that readers can- in a particular but clear sense- use a variety of analyses to provide a reasoned re-demonstration of the positive role of private enterprise and the negative role of trade unionism- specifically trade union leaders (ie. re-demonstration through quantitative/qualitative descriptions of the reality of financial damage supported by management quotes, qualitative descriptions of a series of specific examples, qualitative/quantitative descriptions of unrepresentativeness and the views of the workforce, quantitative/qualitative contrasts). More generally, the analyses of- to use general categories- economic policy, intimidatory picketing, secondary industrial actions, trade unionism/trade union leaders- reinforce one another and constitute a more general level of argument, ie. the analyses of private enterprise and the need to earn wages/profits as two analyses of the need for and benefits of economic realism, analyses of the various inter-related dimensions of the trade union/trade union leader problem (eg. economic, human, moral, political), the universalisation of positive effects (ie. everyone benefits from private enterprise, non-intervention, trade union legislation), the universalisation of negative effects (ie. everyone- the whole socio-economic system- suffers from the various manifestations of the trade union/trade union leader problem), and the universalisation of perceptions and experience (ie. the vast majority inside and outside of trade unions perceive and/or directly experience the problem). However, while the Mail identifies a multi-faceted problem it, unlike the Express, is not particularly concerned with a specific solution to the problem of unrepresentativeness but rather emphasises the reality of the contrast between private enterprise and trade union leaders. Though, of course, the Mail's policies, like the Express', involve limiting dissent to peaceful, primary actions (ie. no secondary actions of any kind under any circumstances). Specifically, for the Mail secondary action is inherently intimidatory, even in the absence of physical intimidation it threatens the freedoms and liberties of workforces because it attempts to involve them in actions which they re-demonstrably do not want to be involved in.

15. As in the Express the analysis of Mr. Scargill's argument re-affirms, develops and defends- and is re-affirmed, developed and defended by-a variety of analyses. The Mail's de-legitimisation of the argument is as follows. He is a professional and politically motivated interferer whose argument is not reasoned or the result of informed reflection, but rather of extreme political views, self-interest, personal ambition and a desire for martyrdom; and he and his argument invites defiance of the law and thereby contradicts the principle of accepting and obeying the declared law. The explicit contrast between Mr. Scargill and the moderate leader of the steel unions (Mr. Sirs) reinforces this de-legitimisation and provides the following YES-BUT logic: YES criticism of the law and support for the trade union actions is possible and can be seen as legitimate. BUT Mr. Scargill's argument goes beyond the limits of acceptable criticism and support. Most trade unionists are not interested in radical criticism/support, it is confined to an extreme, unreasonable, unreasoning and self-interested minority. It is re-demonstrably the case that trade union actions are illegitimate and widely disapproved of inside and outside of trade unions, and should be curbed/outlawed: dissent must take legal and legitimate/socially acceptable forms, ie. peaceful picketing but no secondary actions. Trade union leaders like Mr. Scargill pursue self-interest and/or extreme political views rather than legitimate causes which have popular support.

15.1 As in the Express there is a sense in which this YES-BUT logic is less rational than the 'economic' one, it deals with a threatening, alternative argument by addressing, at least to a significant extent, the personality/^acharacter of the arguer (s). Relatedly, again as in the Express, rather than discussing in detail phenomena like self-interest, personal ambition and unreason the author tends to equate radical criticism of the law and radical support for trade unionism with self-interest, personal ambition, rhetoric and a desire for martyrdom. However, both the Mail and the Express place competing arguments in an adjudicative chain of reason and readers can use a variety of analyses to re-affirm, ^{de}velop, elaborateⁿ and defend their knowledge of how, why and in what ways trade unionism- for the Mail especially the actions/policies of trade union leaders-

is illegitimate, widely disapproved of, should be curbed and does not involve actions/activities which have popular support either inside or outside of trade unions. Moreover, the vast majority of the elements of what can be seen as a consensus based definition of what is reasonable/unreasonable (see, eg. pp. 233-34) are, at least relatively, described in detail and appear in specific quasi-scientific forms (eg. the brute and widely perceived fact/reality of intimidation, civil/economic damage, unrepresentativeness and coercion). Furthermore, the analyses of intimidatory picketing clearly illustrate extremist and anarchistic behaviour and specify that people like Mr. Scargill organise and lead intimidatory pickets. On the other hand there is a clear sense in which phenomena like self-interest, ambition and rhetoric- despite the fact that they appear in a YES-BUT logic and the author sees the timing of Mr, Scargill's views as a publicity stunt and contrasts them with a moderate response- are 'tacked on' to activities like public and volatile criticism of the law, public and active involvement in industrial action carried out by another union. Again, there is a labelling process or argument by definition- extremism, anarchy, radical criticism/support, inter-union activity, therefore self-interested, ambitious and politically motivated interference.

However, as in the Express, readers are in a position to reject arguments which posit the legitimacy of trade union actions/activities and popular support for them, and the more specific argument that breaking the law is a legitimate and supported activity/intention. Put another way there is a two-fold reproduction of a consensus: a general, fundamental one which involves definitions of actions/intentions/values as unreasonable/illegitimate via a reference to the need to obey the law and the consequences of not obeying it; and a more specific one which involves arguments which tend to define trade unionism per se as illegitimate via a reference to, for example, intimidation, breaches of the criminal law, financial damage, unrepresentativeness. Though, of course, there is a relation between the two processes: Mr. Scargill and people like him defined as extreme, radical and anarchistic are seen as a specific, particular manifestation of a more general phenomenon- extreme, anarchistic and problematic trade unionism. ¹³

THE SUN SAYS: SIMILARITY AND DIFFERENCE

16. Unlike the Express and the Mail (and the Mirror), the Sun does not consider Mr. Scargill's argument. However, it provides a related YES-BUT defence of a preference: YES secondary industrial action is legal/legitimate in the sense that it is not illegal BUT the spirit of the initial judgment which declared it illegal was correct- the law must be changed it is bad law. Secondary actions are re-demonstrably illegitimate, re-demonstrably part of the trade union problem. The analysis of legal, non-intimidatory secondary actions, in contrast to other analyses and the Express/Mail's analyses, is brief and undetailed. The author simply formulates steel strike secondary actions as another instance of blackmail which aims via damage to the economy to force Governments to grant unearned increases, and offers the above, relatively simplistic YES-BUT logic. The analysis of the ballot and the trade union leader-member/ordinary worker distinction is equally brief: it is suggested that the result is an indication of disenchantment among the steelworkers and the unrepresentativeness of their leader. It would seem that the Sun is concerned to emphasise and provide relatively detailed analyses of issues like (non) interventionist policy and intimidatory picketing/secondary action, but instead of emphasising in detail issues like legal secondary actions and unrepresentativeness focuses on the fact that the strike provides further quantitative evidence for the fact that- despite the enormous financial resources of trade unions- the taxpayer (ie. US/YOU) supports strikes, strikers and their families. This is a particular identification with a particular community, ie. strikes like unearned wages/claims and interventionist policy involve the misuse/waste of OUR money (see also p. 238). However, it also translates a more general stock of knowledge into the language of a particular community: all three newspapers identify and analyse a multi-faceted trade union problem (ie. unearned wages, unproductive working, intimidation, blackmail, threats to Governments, individual liberties, normal working and the national civil/economic national interest); but the Sun emphasises an issue which can be readily understood in terms of a particular concern- OUR/YOUR money.

As in the case of the majority of the differences between the three newspapers (see p. 238 & above) there is interaction

between specific and more general, shared concerns. This interaction is reflected in the Sun's limitation of discussion of Government policy to straightforward demands for the implementation of pledges/promises, ie. why has it failed to outlaw secondary actions?, why has it failed to ensure that trade unions support strikes and strikers, existing laws can be used to deal with intimidation but the Government must introduce promised tougher laws. These demands involve a relatively straightforward analysis of policy (ie. why not ? as opposed to the lesson of the steel strike is that proposals must be strengthened and implemented faster (Mail), we have campaigned... analysis of the steel strike suggests that proposals are completely inadequate/impractical... the Government must realise... (Express)) which assumes that more elaborate analysis is not appropriate (see also p. 238), but also reflect and inflect the shared concerns of the three newspapers (ie. in essence solving the multi-faceted trade union problem), including criticism of and independence from Government.¹⁴ Similarly, the Sun's analyses do not emphasise the knowledge and disapproval of the majority, but the suggestion that trade unionism is completely negative and has no legitimacy and the analyses of the way in which a variety of different groups (ie. workers, trade union leaders, MP's, Governments) are faced with and perceive the problem, clearly invoke this kind of emphasis.

FORMS AND LEVELS OF THE RE-PRODUCTION OF COMMUNITY

17. The discussion of the three communities can be usefully restated and summarised by identifying inferential frameworks, forms of (de) legitimisation and quasi-scientific argumentative processes.

BASIC INFERENTIAL FRAMEWORKS

It is possible to distinguish various arguments about various phenomena and more general arguments which are involved in specific arguments or combinations of specific arguments, and which set the limits and terms of debate. The communities can be restated in the following more general terms-¹⁵

DAILY EXPRESS OPINION

a) The actions/activities of the trade union movement are completely negative; they have various kinds of adverse effect

and no one benefits from them. The movement threatens and acts against the economic and civil (ie. freedom from intimidation, public order) national interest.

b) These actions/activities can only be seen as a problem/threat. They have no legitimacy and the majority recognise this and want a solution to the problem.

c) The leaders of the movement refer to the legitimacy of actions/activities. The majority do not accept this: moreover, ordinary trade unionists do not support these actions/activities or those who use them to pursue self-interest and/or extreme political views.

d) Regardless of the absence or presence of support the law must be respected and dissent must take legal and legitimate/socially acceptable forms, ie. peaceful picketing of the strikers own place of work but no secondary actions.

e) Economic realism/monetarist economic policy is the best policy; policy based on notions like fairness/intervention/sympathy is unrealistic and unworkable- incompatible with realism/viability/profitability.

f) The actions and efforts of the workforce are the crucial determinant of the viability/unviability of industries and the economy.

DAILY MAIL COMMENT

as above but also-

g) The idea of trade unionism (ie. brotherhood, communality, collectivism) is redundant. The rhetoric and reality are completely different; there is an absolute contrast between the positive force in society and the negative force (ie. private enterprise/trade unionism-trade union leaders). The latter damages the very agency which creates the wealth which makes socio-economic well being possible.

THE SUN SAYS

as in a-f but no explicit emphasis on the knowledge of the majority or detailed/re-produced analysis of the difference between trade union leaders-ordinary members/workers.

FORMS OF (DE) LEGITIMISATION

18. There is overlap between the definitions, arguments, ideas or images which allocate legitimacy/approval and illegitimacy/disapproval by evaluating phenomena in terms of their positive or negative relation to worthwhile social, economic, political, normative and moral structures and thereby identify them with and relate them to the lives, interests and concerns of readers. Moreover, some of them could be sub-divided; however, the major distinctions are as follows, unless stated they are common to all three newspapers. ¹⁶

a) The identification of various kinds of adverse effect, the non-identification of positive effects and the universalisation of adverse effect, ie. everyone and the whole socio-economic system suffers from the trade union problem. b) The use of common sense/emotive/evaluative words/images which emphasise the undesirable, abnormal, anti-social and extreme nature of actions and effects, ie. crippling, blockade, coercion, threats, blackmail, bully boys, intimidation, violence, mobs, gangsters, thugs/thuggery, stormtroopers. c) The criminalisation of actions/activities, ie. the criminalisation and de-politicisation of dissent. d) The suggestion that they threaten specific civil/economic interests and the general, national civil/economic interest. e) A contrast between the realism of earning wages/livings/profits and the sheer unreality/unprofitability of subsidising wages and industries with taxpayers money (NB. a particularly direct emphasis on OUR/YOUR money in the Sun, plus persistent emphasis on the fact that strikes/strikers are supported by OUR/YOUR money). f) The identification of positive effects, the non-identification of negative effects and the universalisation of positive effect, ie. non-interventionist policy, enforcing the law against trade unionism and implementing new laws would benefit everyone/the whole socio-economic system. g) References to the experience, knowledge and disapproval of the majority and/or various and diverse groups/persons, ie. the universalisation of positive/negative effect and the universalisation of perceptions/experience. h) A contrast between reasonable, legitimate and law-abiding dissent, and unreasonable, illegitimate and/or illegal, anarchistic dissent. i) Appeals to the rule of law and a contrast between democracy and anarchy (not explicit in Sun but see h)). j) Appeals

to the power of the authorities, ie. calls for a defence against threats to rights and interests. k) A contrast between an extreme, unrepresentative, unreasoning, unreasonable, unrealistic, self-interested, politically motivated minority and a moderate, reasoning, reasonable and realistic majority (not explicit in the Sun but see, eg, b) & h)). i) A contrast between the rhetoric and the reality of trade unionism and the positive/negative force in society (specific to the Mail but not inconsistent with the other two communities, ie. non-interventionist policy and trade unionism as the positive and negative force).

QUASI-SCIENTIFIC PROCESSES/FORMS

19. The appearance of forms of (de) legitimisation in quasi-scientific processes and forms can be represented as follows-

Re-Produced description: Analysis of the steel strike suggests that it is re-demonstrably the case that X is Y and has positive/adverse effects.

This re-produced description involves and is extremely powerful because it involves an empirical analysis of the strike which provides further evidence for the knowledge, that X is Y and has Z effects;^{and} places powerful evaluations or (de) legitimisations in a quasi-scientific form and thereby re-produces empirical evidence for the reality of the desirability/undesirability of X. This process is inherently evaluative and implies a perspective (ie. X is a virtue/problem), but detaches the reader from subjective/evaluative involvement in the sense that he/she is positioned as an objective analyst of a seemingly objective and external reality. Specifically, he/she can analyse an empirical instance and point to a series of confirming instances, and is offered several of the following more specific forms of realism/objectivity/evidence: quantitative and qualitative analyses of reality, quantitative and qualitative contrasts, quantitative and qualitative evidence supported by quotes- including quotes from those directly involved, eye witness evidence from 'both sides' of industry, quoted references to and/or supported descriptions of the knowledge and experience of

various and diverse groups/persons, ie. the universalisation and thereby objectification of analyses and experience, quantitative/qualitative analyses of a series of specific examples/incidents, independence from Government.

↓
Re-Produced perspective: Analysis of the steel strike suggests that it is re-demonstrably the case that X is positive/negative or a virtue/problem.

This re-produced perspective involves and is extremely powerful because it involves an empirical analysis of the strike which provides further evidence for the knowledge that X is positive/negative because of...; derives a perspective from a description and extends this description, ie. it is re-demonstrably the case that X is Y and must/can only be understood as Y and therefore as positive/negative; places powerful (de) legitimisations in a re-produced and re-validated description-perspective link. This process is inherently and explicitly evaluative and implies policy (ie. support & encourage virtues, do something about problems), but the author makes clear distinctions between descriptions, perspectives and policies and perspectives are based on, develop and derived from descriptions.

↓
Re-Produced policy: Analysis of the steel strike suggests that it is re-demonstrably the case that X,Y,Z policies are appropriate/inappropriate.

This re-produced policy (ies) involves and is extremely powerful because it involves an empirical analysis of the strike which provides further evidence for the knowledge that X,Y,Z is appropriate/inappropriate; derives policy from a description-perspective link and extends this link (ie. it is re-demonstrably the case that X is Y, can only be understood as A, and can be practically responded to in terms of C); places powerful (de) legitimisations in a re-produced and re-validated description-perspective-policy link. This process is inherently and explicitly evaluative but policy is distinguished from description and perspective, and is based on, develops and derived from description-perspective links.



Defence/Adjudication: Analysis suggests that YES there are reasons for A and reasons why B,C is possible and legitimate, BUT A,B,C are inferior for the following reasons... and our preferences are re-demonstrably superior.

This YES-BUT logic involves and is powerful because it involves an analysis of the strike which places (de) legitimisations, descriptions, perspectives, policies and forms of evidence/objectivity in a reasoned adjudicative chain, and thereby provides a reasoned adjudication between preferences and alternatives. This process is inherently and explicitly evaluative and the phenomena it places are in themselves powerful and reasoned accounts of how, why and in what ways A is... and is not... - can only be understood as... and not as... - but the power of knowledge is considerably enhanced by the provision of reasoned adjudications which re-demonstrate the validity of preferences and inferiority of alternatives.

THE APPEARANCE OF FORMS OF (DE) LEGITIMISATION IN QUASI-SCIENTIFIC PROCESSES/FORMS

20. The representation in 19 has been deliberately stripped of substantive empirical content. This highlights the forms of the re-productive process, in particular the way in which evaluative arguments, definitions, ideas or images appear in quasi-scientific forms and processes, and the way in which these phenomena interact to produce an extremely powerful stock of knowledge. Even in the very simplest case the evaluative phenomena does not appear in isolation from a quasi-scientific form. If, for example, the references to intimidation were simply re-produced descriptions the author would be suggesting that it is re-demonstrably the case that picketing is... . All the evaluative phenomena listed are powerful in themselves but they do not appear as arguments, definitions, ideas or images: the power of evaluative phenomena is enhanced by the forms in which they appear and the power of argumentative forms/processes is enhanced by the evaluative phenomena.

A re-produced description-perspective-policy link plus a YES-BUT logic is the strongest knowledge in the sense that it

is a maximum combination of forms. As has been demonstrated the three communities considered to date possess knowledge which takes several of the forms; in a lot of cases it takes all the forms. The stocks of knowledge appear as and claim to be quasi-scientific in the sense that readers can distinguish descriptions, perspectives, policies; provide various kinds of objective evidence; point to a series of confirming instances; analyse an empirical instance in a way which provides further reasoned/objective evidence for the validity of a stock of knowledge; re-demonstrate and re-derive description-perspective-policy links; defend preferences and offer reasoned adjudications between alternatives. True- to reiterate and underline- the suggestion, for example, that an activity is criminal, intimidatory, unrealistic and unprofitable is itself a powerful suggestion; it allocates legitimacy/illegitimacy and implies a perspective and policy. But to unequivocally re-demonstrate through analysis that an activity is X and not Y and that a particular perspective and policy are valid, appropriate and superior is to suggest that there can be no reasonable doubt about the validity of knowledge. It appears as and claims to be a set of reasoned and well confirmed theories, evaluations, analyses and findings as opposed to a mere collection of claims, arguments, views, beliefs, opinions, assertions, evaluations, prejudices, denouncements, castigations, recommendations, campaigns. This is not to ignore the fact that a particular kind of reason is involved- indeed it is to stress that this is the case; the differences between different analyses; the evidence for the specificity of the steel strike (ie. the development of stocks of knowledge); the differences between different interactions between different forms of (de) legitimisation and different quasi-scientific forms/processes- nor is it to say that the stocks of knowledge are scientific in any strong sense or valid/true accounts. Moreover, produced and other forms of non-re-produced knowledge could be quasi-scientific in some of the senses described. However, the specifics of the various processes described in 1-16 can be placed in the more general framework described in 19; re-production is a particular and powerful form of knowledge because it analyses an empirical instance in a way which provides further reasoned evidence for a theoretical stock of knowledge and a reasoned

adjudication between competing stocks; and, in clear senses, the maintenance, development, legitimation and defence of stocks of communal knowledge and the rejection of alternatives takes particular, very powerful forms.

THE RE-PRODUCTION OF AN INFERENTIAL FRAMEWORK AND A CONSENSUS

21'. In a sense the listed inferential frameworks (framework) are misleading. The Express, for example, does not just argue a-f but rather provides a framework which is more complex, multi-faceted and quasi-scientific; that is, the more permanent, enduring framework which structures and limits the understanding of specific issues and events consists of a set of interrelated descriptions, perspectives, policies and adjudications. True readers can, for example, only conceive of the actions/activities associated with trade unionism as a fundamental problem which must be solved; but they can also analyse specific manifestations of the problem, provide reasons why the only and crucial issue is changing the law, reasons why certain actions/activities are illegitimate, a defence against and rejection of an alternative stock of knowledge, and so on. Moreover, and this is the point, these phenomena are, in a clear sense, part of the framework which structures and limits the community as opposed to fleeting, ephemeral employments of it. However, the list of frameworks is useful because it highlights and summarises the basic structure and limits of the communities and community. True there are differences between them and they inflect more general concerns in different ways, but they are clearly significantly similar in form and content. The list is also useful because, as suggested, it indicates the way in which the findings develop existing usages of the concept of inferential framework. These tend to emphasise the kind and level of knowledge listed: as indicated this is legitimate but there is also a clear sense in which the framework (s) is both more complex and quasi-scientific. 17

22. The re-production of a consensus can also be seen as a distinctive level and/or kind of re-production. Again, this issue will be elaborated on (see pp. 280-85). For the moment readers could refer back to analyses of consensus based re-productions and/or note the following: 1) the re-production of the knowledge that there are interests common to all members of

society, that dissent does not reflect conflicts of interest between groups/classes, that dissent must take certain limited forms and that if it ceases to so do it becomes something else, ie. crime; 2) the identification of a THEY whose actions/activities are defined as illegitimate because they- it is suggested- breach norms/values which are assumed to be and re-produced as the values of all reasonable people (ie. see the vast majority of the forms of (de) legitimisation); 3) the tendency to define trade unionism per se as being outside the realm of what everybody considers reasonable/worthwhile, eg. dissent must take legal, constitutional and legitimate forms. Put another way re-productions of a consensus involve levels of content (ie. everybody agrees with/believes arguments about fundamental issues like the rule of law and national interests; everyone agrees with/believes arguments about more specific issues- eg. trade unionism can only be understood as a problem), and the legitimisation of levels of knowledge via a reference to shared values or forms of (de) legitimisation; and thereby the re-production of forms of (de) legitimisation. Again, part of the value of this research is that these re-productions- like re-productions of inferential frameworks- take very particular and powerful forms. ¹⁸

MIRROR COMMENT: FAIRNESS

23. The analyses suggest that, with two limited exceptions, the Mirror does not explicitly re-produce knowledge. This feature and the nature of the community can be addressed by considering the notion of fairness. Usages of this notion are not the only characteristics of the community but they are central/crucial.

DESCRIPTIONS- a) The steelworkers deserve sympathy because they have been unfairly treated and affected; the pay offer was low and amounted to a cut in living standards; jobs have been lost and steel communities are threatened by further job losses and closures; other groups of workers have not been treated and have not suffered in the same ways. b) The British Steel Corporation/Sir Charles Villiers can be criticised because its/his actions and policies are unfair to the steelworkers (he and the management can also be criticised for other reasons, see pp. 263/65). c) The Government can be criticised because the unfair and inconsistent

application of pay and general economic/industrial policy was unfair to the steelworkers; despite a declared policy of non-intervention they intervened in this dispute and thereby, amongst other things, prevented a reasonable pay offer (see pp. 264-65 for further criticisms). PERSPECTIVE- The notion of fairness can and should be used to understand the actions/situations of the steelworkers and the actions/policies which effect them. POLICY- The application of pay and general economic/industrial policy should be fair and consistent; the steelworkers deserve fair treatment and a fair offer. ADJUDICATION OF DESCRIPTIONS, PERSPECTIVES AND POLICIES- a) YES those who suggest that there is an important relationship between wages and productivity are correct; higher wages without higher productivity results in higher inflation/taxation. YES there is a sense in which the steelworkers cannot be protected from reality- job losses may well be inevitable whatever happens. YES a fair offer will involve paying for wage increases with lost jobs and YES the unions must decide if a fair policy is worth the lost jobs. b) BUT why single out and pick on steelworkers. It is demonstrably the case that they have been unfairly treated and effected and that other occupational groups have not suffered in the same ways. c) The Government's pay and more general policy is unfair to the steelworkers and has been applied unfairly/inconsistently- the steelworkers deserve fair treatment and a fair offer.

FAIRNESS- THE RE-PRODUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE ?

24. In a sense the finding that the Mirror does not re-produce knowledge about fairness is simply counter intuitive. It might, for example, be argued that there is a clear implicit re-production of knowledge because the Mirror and notions like fairness are associated with labourist/social democratic traditions (eg. see Hall et al op cit). Put another way the finding is simply the result of a particular, limited approach to stocks of knowledge. However, there are features of the Mirror which suggest reasons why there is no explicit re-production and why re-production cannot be assumed.

A particularly revealing feature is that the YES-BUT defence of the notion of fairness rejects but does not deny the logic/importance of views about the relationship between wage, job and

productivity levels. This is an acceptance of the logic or internal validity and importance of the Express, the Mail's, the Sun's and the Government's preferred industrial/economic policy. True the Mirror treats wages, job losses and policy as moral issues; it insists that the most important and crucial issue is fairness to the steelworkers and steel communities. However, unlike the Express, the Mail and the Sun, it cannot completely reject the validity and importance of the threatening argument. Moreover, having accepted this argument- or at least central dimensions of it- it cannot propose an approach which ensures fairness but does not emphasise higher productivity and does not lead to lost jobs and higher inflation/taxation. In other words it recognises that the straightforward application of the notion of fairness is problematic. This is reflected in the way in which there is a sense in which the criticism of the Government's policy is not so much that it is unfair but rather that it has been applied inconsistently/unfairly. This suggests that it is possible that the Mirror does not explicitly re-produce knowledge because it cannot draw on a tradition which argues that policy based on fairness does not have adverse effects. The steel strike could be a specific and significant historical moment because the use of the notion of fairness has to be qualified. It might be argued that it is possible that the Mirror has always qualified the notion or that it does not really qualify it because it insists on its relevance and importance. However, given the clear acceptance of a threatening argument and the difficulty involved in formulating a fairness policy then it is at least arguable that the Mirror is inviting re-consideration of the notion. In the absence of clear evidence it might be argued that exactly how and in what ways the notion has been used is an empirical question. This is very much the point. It may be that the Mirror has always qualified the notion, ie. a wages/productivity argument is central but not specific to the then increasingly powerful and influential radical right (see Hall 1983, Hall et al op cit); has always qualified it but has argued that it was not directly associated with serious adverse effects; began to qualify it in the face of new events which could not be dealt with by positing no adverse effects; sees the new Government and its electoral popularity as a particularly problematic event or as a crystallisation

of challenges to the notion of fairness; argues and has always argued that an emphasis on fairness is a complete and adequate moral defence against alternatives; is for the time being qualifying the notion and recognising the importance of it and alternatives but is awaiting further developments, ie. the actions/fate of the new Government.¹⁹ These are some of the possibilities, only a detailed analysis of the Mirror's coverage of a series of events/issues could provide the basis for a clear determination of the longer term nature of the community. To assume that the steel strike specifics of the usage of fairness involve extensive implicit re-production ignores the possibility that the stock of knowledge is being significantly changed, extended, developed or modified. To assume there is no re-production ignores the sedimented status of fairness and the possibility of specific, detailed continuity. The explicit textual acknowledgement of the validity of a threatening argument made by a new Conservative Government and the other established popular newspapers is a good prima facie reason for according priority to further research.

This can be further illustrated by considering the descriptive basis of the Mirror's use of fairness. It explicitly invites readers to see what the steelworkers can see, ie. a poor, insulting offer, better offers to other loss making industries, the B.S.C. and the Government agreeing on policies which have catastrophic effects (ie. mass redundancies and devastated communities), the Government pursuing irrelevant trade union legislation without tackling unemployment and falling production. This is a powerful form of description not simply because it places an evaluative identification in a quasi-scientific process/form (ie. the reality of unfair treatment), but because it reinforces this process by inviting direct empathy with the steelworkers, ie. we can see that it is demonstrably the case that..., the steelworkers can see that it is demonstrably the case that..., we can see what the steelworkers can see and we sympathise. Again, this is arguably a powerful identification with and re-production of a version of labourist/social democratic tradition, in particular a concern with the fortunes, situation, rights and interests of the workforce. However, the point made above is illustrated by the policy derived from the description-perspective link, ie. the reality of unfairness/adverse effects-

therefore fairness is an appropriate perspective- the steelworkers deserve fair treatment and a fair offer, but applying this policy is problematical- the Government's policy could at least be fair in the sense that it could/should be applied consistently: why pick on/single out the steelworkers? Again, it is arguable that the Mirror's policy proposal is 'uncomfortable' because it cannot deal effectively with threatening events and interpretations. It may, of course, not be an uncomfortable description-perspective-policy link. However, it is at least arguable that the author is faced with the task of changing or rebuilding/reworking the stock of knowledge. Hence- arguably/hypothetically, while there is obvious reference to a stock of knowledge there is no explicit re-production and extensive re-production cannot be assumed because the Mirror is faced with the problem of reconciling fairness and economic realism. This kind of issue arises in respect of some of the other analyses, they are reviewed in 25-27, discussion follows.

25. A number of analyses emphasise and underline the Government's role in provoking, starting and prolonging a damaging dispute. Hence the author qualitatively describes and illustrates the reality of intervention despite the policy of non-intervention, and suggests that documents leaked to a television programme prove beyond reasonable doubt that the Government- specifically Sir Keith Joseph- provoked and started the strike: they 'took on' the steelworkers instead of the miners. More generally, readers are invited to make sustained and heavy criticism of the Government not just because of the unfair/inconsistent policy/ application of policy but, relatedly yet distinctly, also because they started, prevented a settlement of and failed to act to end a dispute/deadlocked dispute which has inflicted enormous damage to the steelworkers, particular industries, industry/the economy in general and the taxpayer. It is suggested that the problem for the Government is that it was elected partly because it promised not to surrender to trade unions: if it settles the strike it will be accused of surrendering but if it delays settlement a critical industrial/economic situation will get worse. For the Mirror struggles between Government and unions have occurred in the past but the important- crucial- issue is

that this Government should move to settle this strike: if it was not concerned with winning or saving face it could end a costly and damaging dispute- one which demonstrably effects all of us/everyone. One of the difficulties is that the strike has become entangled in a battle between the two halves of the cabinet about legislation to curb trade union power. However, for the Mirror, the Government and the cabinet should be concentrating on a practical solution to a costly and damaging dispute.

26. A number of analyses relate various phenomena to fundamental issues like fairness, the role of the Government and the BSC, and the need to settle a costly/damaging dispute between 'two sides.'

a) The damaging intentions of men and management (ie. threats to withdraw safety cover and withhold taxes) are seen as wrong but as indications of- reactions to- a desparate situation- ie. a deadlocked strike started by an obstinate Government and an incompetent management who have brought about disaster, in particular- bearing in mind the role of the Government- they have not responded sensibly and effectively to a fair claim and reasonable moves by the men and their representatives. b) The result of the BSC ballot is formulated as indecisive, as an indication of the fact that if both sides conceded some ground a damaging dispute could be resolved by further negotiations. c) It is suggested that if both sides cannot agree an inquiry or informal mediation by someone able to see both sides of the issue are desirable options. More generally, ^{the Government} who obstinately refused to act- but actually intervened and persistently hindered a smooth and quick outcome- should after the eventual pay inquiry is over initiate a more general inquiry into the state and future of a ruined industry- one which is further indication of and adds to our decline as an industrial nation. d) Steel strike secondary picketing is neither approved of nor disapproved of; it is seen as a legal and legitimate tactic, a strategic response to a deadlocked strike which aims to pursue a good cause and hasten an end to a strike which damages, amongst other groups/ things, the steelworkers. e) The threat to expel private steelworkers who refuse to strike is seen as wrong. It is suggested that they are in a difficult position (ie. betray colleagues or support the strike and threaten their own

livelihoods), but that an attempt to coerce/discipline them is wrong and will not be received favourably by the public. The majority recognise that the steelworkers have a good case and that the strike was started by an obstinate Government and incompetent management, but many groups of steelworkers are refusing to strike and the coercion of any or all of these groups is both wrong and will lessen public support.

27. The analysis of Mr. Scargill's argument is similar but not identical to the Express' and the Mail's. It is suggested that people like Mr. Scargill are professional provocators whose arguments have no rational basis or legitimacy. More specifically, Mr. Scargill seeks out opportunities to make arguments which have no rational base, ignore the merits of particular cases and invite illegitimate support for trade union actions/activities, ie. anarchistic support. This is illegitimate because: disrespect for the law replaces democracy with anarchy- disagreement is acceptable and we disagree with the recent ruling- but nobody is above the law, people are free to disagree but to incite or involve themselves in disobedience and anarchy; Mr. Scargill seeks out strikes and uses them as occasions to spread his unreasoned opinions and play the role of trade union hero/martyr- he is only interested in personal publicity. The contrast between critical disagreement and disobedience reinforces the Mirror's de-legitimation of certain kinds of support for trade unionism: it clearly establishes a distinction and contrast between legitimate/law-abiding/reasonable dissent and illegitimate/anarchistic/extreme/radical/unreasonable criticism and support. This contrast is part of the following YES-BUT logic: YES criticism of the law and support for trade union actions/activities is possible and legitimate- secondary picketing is legal and legitimate- BUT radical criticism and support of the kind proposed by Mr. Scargill and people like him is illegitimate because it invites anarchy and is associated with a minority who pursue self-interest and extreme views and whose arguments have no rational basis. The law must be respected and dissent must take legal and legitimate/socially acceptable forms.

TRADE UNIONISM: THE EXPRESS, THE MAIL, THE MIRROR AND THE SUN

28. As in the case of the other three established newspapers some of the Mirror's analyses are, at least in part, relatively

brief and undetailed. In some cases there is a hard core of descriptions and clear, derived description-perspective-policy links, ie. the demonstrable reality of unfairness, damage to the economy and the role/actions/policies of the Government/BSC-fairness, criticism of the Government/BSC and an emphasis on a negotiated solution to a dispute which damages everyone are appropriate and interrelated perspectives- fairness and resolving the dispute quickly and efficiently are appropriate policies, in particular an inquiry or informal mediation would not restore lost jobs and the health of steel communities and might not adequately recognise the merits of the steelworkers case, but it could at least produce a fair compromise and prevent further damage. However, in other cases the author tends to refer in less detail to phenomena like secondary picketing and the refusal of groups of steelworkers to strike, and relates them to 'other' issues and emphasises, ie. fairness, the role of the Government in a deadlocked and damaging dispute, incompetent management. Moreover, more detailed references to phenomena like damaging intentions and the BSC ballot and most of the brief references to more general phenomena (ie. struggles between Governments and trade unions, cabinet disputes, the state of the steel industry past, present and future) are also related to the overriding emphases.

It might be argued that the above involves an obvious and straightforward re-production of community. Whereas the other newspapers- albeit in different ways and to different extents- latch onto and analyse in detail issues like secondary picketing, and proceed by inflecting a version of the analysis of- to use a general category- the multi-faceted trade union problem; the Mirror pulls these issues away from this stock of knowledge and towards its own, ie. two different unequivocal interpretations of the ballot and the refusal of men to strike. Similarly, it is arguable that the fact that the Mirror does not address secondary picketing in detail and sees it primarily in terms of and as an indication of something else is not really a reflection of a failure to address it, but rather is a particular analysis of it: the Mirror does not relate it to other issues but to its own particular stock of knowledge. More generally it is arguable that the brevity of some of the analyses are simply a reflection of the fact that in all four cases some analyses are briefer than

others. Moreover, it is arguable that the Mirror's analyses and the evaluative identifications involved in them are clear but implicit re-productions of a well established stock of knowledge: ie. at one level the Mirror is re-producing central dimensions of a labourist/social democratic stock of knowledge, eg. there are no fundamental conflicts of interest and value- the alliance between the two sides of industry is designed to pursue the national economic interest and is regulated by the state which provides an institutional framework for bargaining/negotiation, consequently legitimate dissent can only take certain forms (eg. Hall et al op cit, Morley 1976); more specifically, the emphasis on fairness, job losses and devastated/threatened communities, the contrast between fairness and economic realism which recognises the limits of fairness and the centrality of the efforts of the workforce to the economy, the emphasis on damage to the economy/taxpayer and the need to settle a damaging dispute through negotiation, the emphasis on criticism of Government and management (ie. 'the bosses')- perhaps particularly a Conservative Government- who have broken or have not followed the rules of 'fair play,' the recommendation of an inquiry/mediation, references to the rule of law, the majority and the contrast between legitimate, legal, democratic, normal, reasonable, reasoned, majority dissent and illegitimate, illegal, undemocratic/anarchistic, abnormal, unreasonable, unreasoned minority dissent- can all be seen as specific employments, inflections and re-productions of a more general value consensus or stock of social democratic knowledge. (but see 29). The above can also be seen as the basis of the Mirror's inferential framework, one which is different from but also similar to the Express', the Mail's and the Sun's: similar but different (de) legitimising references to damaging strikes, adverse effects, positive effects, the national economic and civil interest, the taxpayer, the majority, the rule of law, a democracy/anarchy contrast; a contrast between legitimate and illegitimate dissent (see above & 29); the assumption that there are no fundamental or serious conflicts of interest and value; the suggestion that the actions/efforts of the workforce are a crucial determinant of viability/unviability; the suggestion that there is a causal link between productivity, wage and job levels, and that serious problems result if wages are not related to productivity; distinctions between descriptions, perspectives and policies, description-perspective-policy links,

YES-BUT logics, the placement of (de) legitimisations in quasi-scientific forms, including specific forms of objectivity (ie. qualitative and quantitative evidence, the universalisation of perceptions, leaked documents, direct sympathy invoking references to the views, situation and experience of the steelworkers, quoted or direct references to- as opposed to authorial or indirect claims about- the views of management, Government and people like Mr. Scargill, analyses of a series of specific examples/incidents), but excluding explicit, detailed re-demonstration; differences- sustained and heavy criticism of the Government and the BSC, no denial of the legitimacy and rights of trade unionism (but see 29), an emphasis on and defence of fairness, an emphasis on and (de) legitimising references to fairness, lost jobs, devastated/threatened communities and the role of the Government/BSC in a damaging and deadlocked dispute between two sides which should be settled by forms of fair negotiation which aim to produce a fair outcome.

29. However, as suggested, there is another interpretation of the Mirror and its relationship with the other three newspapers. The relevant features are particularly evident in the analysis of Mr. Scargill's argument. As suggested this can be seen as a re-production of elements of a general value consensus or social democratic stock of knowledge (ie. the law must be respected and dissent must take legal and legitimate forms, THEY threaten OUR interests); an exclusion of views/arguments which defines them as illegitimate, as not part of normal/legal/legitimate dissent and thereby as challenges to existing and highly regarded social structures (eg. Hall et al op cit). More specifically, the Mirror, unlike the other three newspapers, does not want to exclude forms of dissent like secondary picketing per se and is thereby arguably defending a more specific stock of knowledge (ie. secondary picketing is a legitimate tactic but certain forms of action and support for trade unionism are illegitimate). A possible reason why the YES-BUT logic is not explicitly informed by and does not explicitly re-affirm this more specific stock is that the Mirror cannot emphasise and highlight the legitimacy of secondary picketing because it then becomes difficult - but by no means impossible- to recognise and reject radical/extreme/illegitimate/unreasoned actions and views, ie. if secondary picketing is analysed in

detail and re-formulated as a worthy and legitimate activity then what is wrong with strong and unwavering support for it, if this kind of support is legitimate then what is wrong with one-off violations of controversial laws, if that is legitimate then what is wrong with strong and unconditional support for secondary picketing, if...?)²⁰ Put another way if the author positively approved of and supported secondary picketing as opposed to merely acknowledging its legitimacy- in particular the legitimacy of steel strike secondary picketing- then a continuum of views would replace a clear, oppositional contrast. Conversely, he/she cannot relate rejections of radical actions/views to more general rejections because this would raise the question of the general illegitimacy of secondary picketing. In other words it may be that the Mirror knows that if it highlights the the issue it has to confront either the argument that secondary picketing is completely legitimate/positive or the argument that it is completely illegitimate/negative. It, so the argument could run, does not want to make either argument and therefore simply notes the legitimacy of secondary picketing and insists that certain kinds of action are completely unacceptable. This may involve a defence of a long standing specific stock of knowledge or it may be that the Mirror is on the defensive in the sense that it has become embarrassed by the issue of secondary picketing and thereby wants to suppress it. The latter is possible because given the new Government's, the Express!, the Mail's and the Sun's tendency to define trade unionism per se as illegitimate- in particular the exclusion of secondary picketing from definitions of what is legitimate and the limitation of dissent to peaceful picketing of the strikers own place of work- and given that these discourses and the Mirror share a dislike for certain kinds of action/trade unionism, then the Mirror may not be able, so to speak, to turn left or right. It is only on safe ground when it can unequivocally recognise an extreme/radical/illegitimate/unreasoned instance: if it turns left for preferences it meets people like Mr. Scargill, if it turns right it meets a radical critique of trade unionism. Put another way it is arguable that these other discourses are more powerful in that they reflect and are part of an increasingly successful redefinition of the consensus (Hall et al, esp. chapters 8 & 9). Specifically, for

example, for the Government, the Express, the Mail and the Sun strikes are not- are no longer- disputes between two sides who employ legitimate tactics and who are governed by various senses of the notion of fairness (ie. fair wages, fair conditions and circumstances, fair negotiations, fair outcomes, fair tactics), but rather involve a fight against the enemy- modern trade unionism- and an insistence on economic realism. Hence the Mirror cannot provide a re-demonstrated, detailed and more positive account of trade unionism, cannot successfully recommend the implementation of fair wages policy and elaborate on issues like the state of the nation and struggles between Governments and trade unions, and cannot mount a generalised and re-demonstrated critique of Government and management because its (de) legitimisations are no longer part of the consensus; even such traditional and powerful ones like fairness are under attack.²¹ Again, it must be stressed that there are clear indications of the maintenance, development, legitimisation and defence of a stock of knowledge, that the Mirror may not be 'uncomfortable/embarassed', that it has always- for example- negotiated and reconciled the contrast between fairness and economic realism and between legitimate/legitimate and positively approved of secondary picketing, that these and other analyses may have been well established in the period upto 1979, that there is a clear sense in which it defends the legitimacy and rights of trade unionism. However, in the absence of clear evidence the longer term nature of the community is an empirical question, one which could only be answered by research which examined in detail the Mirror in the 1970s-1980s. Simply to argue that it is a mainstream, social democratic newspaper and is associated with identification with the experience, situation and circumstances of the workforce, or to assume extensive re-production ignores the possibility that the steel strike is a crucial stage in the reworking, rebuilding and reconsideration of a stock of knowledge which can no longer easily and comfortably accommodate threatening events and interpretations.²² Again, only further research could cast definite and detailed light on this issue, but given the nature and arguable ascendancy of the threatening communities (crystallised and reflected in the election victory), the sense in which the Mirror's handling of fairness is uncomfortable and embarrassed, its failure to address certain

issues in detail, its recognition of central dimensions of the threatening communities (community) and the sense in which it 'smothers' certain issues by relating them to other issues then there are good prima facie reasons for suggesting that the absence of explicit and detailed re-production is not the result of a particular, limited definition of stocks of knowledge but rather a reflection of troubled times for the Mirror. Again - to underline- there are clear indications of continuity (ie. fairness) and the apparently specific details of these analyses (ie. the limits of fairness, the importance of 'economic realism') may also be continuities, but only further research could specify whether or not this was the case and how and in what ways the notion has been used, developed and modified.

STAR COMMENT

30. The Star's knowledge is distinctive in that there is a clear sense in which it is very vague and brief. True it does offer a clear understanding of aspects of the strike. However, compared to the other papers, there is a quantitative lack of comment and a high proportion of humorous comment- a quantitative and qualitative lack of comment on issues which preoccupy the other newspapers. This suggests that it is unable and/or unwilling to provide knowledge of similar quantity and quality. One possible reason why it may be unwilling is that it does not expect readers to see the strike as a particularly important event. On the other hand if the author wanted to invite membership of a community which denied the importance of events like the steel strike then the obvious strategy would be to ignore it altogether or understand it in a totally unserious manner. However, in the light of the knowledge provided by the other papers both of these options would be dangerous. Readers of popular newspapers expect, amongst other things, serious and detailed understandings of events like the steel strike. As a relatively very new newspaper the Star would be unlikely to run the risk of attempting to produce and subsequently re-produce a community which totally rejected the norms of popular newspaper discourse. This, together with the fact that the Star does stress certain issues, suggests that it is not so much unwilling but rather unable to provide the kind of detailed understanding found in the other newspapers.

This inability could well stem from the fact that the Star, being relatively very new, does not have an established community of readers. Given this then the knowledge is either a first tentative step towards the re-production of community or a temporary compromise. In the first case the aim would be to produce and subsequently re-produce a community concerned with issues like the role of Governments and the effects of costly and unresolved strikes. In the second case knowledge about these issues provides an understanding of sorts but also one which avoids deeper, long term commitments. In both cases, in order to locate knowledge in the norms of popular newspaper discourse, it draws on aspects of the knowledge of other communities, especially the Mirror's, ie. the strike can be understood in terms of the Government's stance towards a deadlocked and damaging strike; they started the strike and could and should take steps to end it; damage to industries/the economy and the damaging intentions of men and management (ie. threatening to stop maintenance and withhold taxes) can be understood as indications of a deadlocked and worsening dispute and in terms of the Government's stance/actions; strikes damage everyone but as ever the real loser is the British economy; meetings between Governments and trade union leaders of the kind associated with the Labour Party are sometimes an appropriate way to end strikes, this Government is rightly considering a version of this option, the subsequent inquiry produced a settlement fair and acceptable to both sides. Clearly, the Star draws on knowledge used by the other communities (ie. damaging strikes), in particular the Mirror (ie. the role of the Government, both sides, damage as an indication of something else and as a consequence of a deadlocked strike started by the Government rather than as the effect of trade union actions/activities). It may be that at the time in question it was aiming to establish a community similar to the Mirror's, or that it was avoiding long term commitments by emphasising more general and neutral themes, ie. the economy suffers, this particular instance of non-intervention is causing problems, intervention is sometimes appropriate and is particularly so in the case of the steel strike. However, the lack of an established community and the quantitative/qualitative nature of the coverage make it very much a special case. Hence no firm conclusions can be drawn.

QUASI-SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY: A COMPLEMENTARY PERSPECTIVE

31. In chapter one it was suggested that the research was not grinding any particular theoretical axe but rather adopting certain strategies and perspectives in order to cast fresh light on the nature of media language. Relatedly it was suggested that the findings could support and/or develop a variety of existing emphases. It will not be possible to relate the findings to all existing emphases or to provide a comprehensive account of the relationship between the findings and any particular emphasis; such an enormous and complex task could only be achieved via a separate theoretical study. However, the significance of the research can be highlighted via an indication of the ways in which the findings develop and/or support a variety of existing emphases. ²³

THE OBJECTIVITY OF MEDIA LANGUAGE

32. At various points in the review and discussion of the analyses it was suggested that readers are positioned not so much as direct perceivers of a seemingly external and objective reality but rather as objective analysts of it. More specifically, it was suggested that while direct perception was a central feature of the communities there were clear senses in which they were more analytical: readers can distinguish descriptions, perspectives and policies, derive description-perspective-policy links, demonstrate and/or re-demonstrate the unequivocal validity of knowledge, refer to and provide various kinds of objective evidence, analyse empirical instances in a way which provides further reasoned and objective evidence for the validity of a well established stock of knowledge and a form of reasoned adjudication between competing theories. Hence the findings support the finding that forms of objectivity or realism are central features of media language (eg. Brunson & Morley op cit, Connell op cit, Hall 1972, 1973a), and develop it by suggesting that some media language and thereby some dimensions of sections of public opinion have a significant quasi-scientific, reflexive or reasoned dimension.

COMMON SENSE, EVALUATIVE IMAGERY AND QUASI-EXPLANATION

33. A number of studies emphasise the notion of common sense

(eg. Brunşdon & Morley op cit, Hall 1977, Hall et al op cit). More generally, numerous studies emphasise- amongst other things- the evaluative nature and power of the arguments, explanations, ideas, images and themes found in media language, and suggest- sometimes only by implication- that it is not in any strong sense logical or reasoned but rather involves a commonsensical and evaluative stock of taken for granted and unreflexive cultural knowledge (eg. Chibnall op cit, Cohen op cit, Glasgow University Media Group op cit, Golding & Middleton op cit, Hall et al op cit, Halloran et al op cit, Hartmann & Husband op cit, Morley 1976). Some of these studies also emphasise the notion of ideology but for the moment this can be left on one side. Hall et al's arguments are an interesting case because they emphasise the links between common sense, evaluative imagery and quasi-explanation. Reduced to essentials some of the relevant arguments are as follows: a) Media explanations of crime are not "...fully coherent and adequately theorised... (They) are not in any normal sense 'logical.' They are ^{not} internally consistent and coherent. They do not obey a strict logical protocol" (pp. 165-66); b) Media explanations unreflexively draw on arguments, explanations, ideas and images which are sedimented in evaluative, common sense stocks of knowledge. c) Media explanations are not just b) but also derive power from b). Specifically: what is sedimented seems to correspond with 'the way things are' and appeals to evaluative/emotive ideas and images which reflect and evaluate our lived personal/common sense experience and understanding of reality.

The various emphases reflected in a-c raise a number of complex issues which are beyond the terms of this research. However, in more general terms the research supports, develops and casts doubt on some of these emphases. It suggests that in the case in question (ie. popular editorial coverage of the steel strike) there is a sense in which the language involves a set of logical and reasoned theories, findings and analyses. It might be argued that this is a very simple and misleading conclusion. Hence, for example, it might be argued that an emphasis on intimidation and mono-causal explanations of the economy are not "fully coherent and adequately theorised explanations" or in any strong sense logical or reasoned. More generally, so the argument might run, an analyst who applied a theory which focused

on the scientific status and/or truth value of the editorials would be able to make a strong case for the argument that they are not logical/reasoned. However, from the perspective of this research this is neither here nor there. The point is that there are clear senses in which the editorial language appears as and claims to be quasi-scientific knowledge. True it provides common sense or ordinary language arguments, definitions, ideas and images which evaluate phenomena in terms of their positive or negative relation to the concerns and interests of readers. Moreover, there are clear senses in which some forms of (de) legitimisation refer directly to and are firmly grounded in personal/commonsensical experience, ie. fair wages, the unreality of not earning a living. It would be over general and simplistic to simply equate forms of (de) legitimisation and the ideas and images referred to in b) and c) but there is clearly some similarity between them. However, the problem with the Hall et al type argument is that it tends to emphasise that media language is completely experientially based and unreflexive, and that it is powerful because it is a sedimented, evaluative and lived reflection of 'the way things are.' This is not to say that it does not consider the production or re-production of knowledge as a process or an achievement, only that it does not give due weight to the possible rational and reflexive dimension of the process/achievement. The suggestion that the editorials only draw on sedimented, evaluative ideas/images would be as equally misleading as the suggestion that they are a set of objective, non-evaluative and completely reflexive theories and findings. This research suggests that different forms, contents and sources of power interact; specifically, that powerful and evaluative forms of (de) legitimisation appear in quasi-scientific argumentative processes/forms.

Obviously different media outlets (eg. television, radio, newspapers) and different parts of particular outlets (eg. news stories, features, editorials) may understand different issues (eg. strikes, crime) in different ways. Nevertheless, at least in the case in question an emphasis on the unreflexive use of common sense and evaluative ideas/images would not be a sufficient account. It might be argued that the essential point of the Hall et al type argument is that even if some media language

is in some sense logical and reasoned it is still a common sense and highly evaluative/emotive logic/reason which fails to reflect seriously on first principles or the status of stocks of knowledge, and obscures or disguises real social relations and the real nature and determinations of events. However, the point of the findings is that in their own terms the editorials appear as and claim to be quasi-scientific accounts. Whether or not they disguise real social relations is not the issue: the significance of the research- or at least part of its significance- is that given this theory then the authors provide very powerful and effective disguises. Not only can readers demonstrate and re-demonstrate the validity of knowledge they can also make reasoned adjudications between alternatives and thereby demonstrate/re-demonstrate the superiority of preferences. The knowledge is in clear senses commonsensical and evaluative but it is an extremely powerful form of common sense and evaluation. The literature in question and the literature in general by no means underestimates the power of media language, but it does tend to ignore the possibility that the appearance of knowledge in quasi-scientific forms makes it extremely powerful and highly resistant to falsification.

IDEOLOGY, COMMON SENSE & POPULIST LANGUAGE

34. Much of the above applies to the notion of ideology: arguments about the ideologies found in media language and sections of public opinion and the relationships between these and more general ideologies/ideological processes could be developed via the recognition of the possibility that different forms, contents and sources of power coexist and interact, and the possibility that forms of logic and reason are an integral part of ideologies/ideological processes. However, it is possible to be more specific and to elaborate on the significance of the findings. Hall has argued that

"Neither Keynesianism nor monetarism... win votes as such in the electoral marketplace. But, in the discourse of 'social market values', Thatcherism discovered a powerful means of translating economic doctrine into the language of experience, moral imperative and common sense... This translation of a theoretical IDEOLOGY into a populist IDIOM was a major political achievement: and the conversion of hard-faced economics into the language of compulsive MORALISM was, in many ways, the centrepiece of this

transformation. 'Being British' became once again identified with the restoration of competition and profitability: with tight money and sound finance ('You can't pay yourself more than you earn..')- the national economy debated on the model of the household budget. The essence of the British people was identified with self-reliance and personal responsibility, as against the image of the over-taxed individual, enervated by welfare state 'coddling', his or her moral fibre irrevocably sapped by 'state handouts'. This assault, not just on welfare over-spending, but on the very principle and essence of collective social welfare- the centrepiece of consensus politics from the Butskell^(ie) period onwards- was mounted... through the emotive image of the 'scrounger': the new folk-devil. The colonization of the popular press was a critical victory in this struggle to define the common sense of the times. Here was undertaken the critical ideological work of constructing around 'Thatcherism' a populist common sense." (1983 pp. 28-29, original emphases)

This argument suggests that the findings could be utilised by and could develop analyses of a particular and significant ideology/ideological process; that is, the research could be seen as a case study of the popular press' role in attempts to significantly change the terms of social, economic and political debate. It is not the task of this research to specify all that could be involved in such a utilisation/development. However, there are a number of obviously relevant points. Firstly, the Express, the Mail and the Sun were clearly and explicitly re-producing, legitimating and defending the then new Government's policies and philosophy (ie. economic/industrial/public spending policy and policies designed to effect trade union reform); in particular they stressed that the steel strike was an opportunity to translate theory into practice and thereby to change the fortunes of individuals, industries, the economy and the nation. In the cases of the Mail and the Sun there was clear evidence that the validity of non-interventionist/non-public money policy was a well established preference. Further research could, amongst other things, chart the development of this stock of knowledge in the relevant decades and, more specifically, determine and specify in detail long-as opposed to longer-term continuities/discontinuities. Secondly, the Mirror accepted crucial aspects of 'Thatcherism' and none of the newspapers provided a persistent, generalised and strong defence of trade unionism. True the Mirror was significantly different but clearly no where in the popular press was there a sustained and generalised

critique of Thatcherism (see also next section). Thirdly, the accounts of 'economic' policy provide, legitimate and draw on social and moral arguments of the kind Hall refers to- the general Thatcherist philosophy/ethic. Fourthly, and relatedly, much of the knowledge offered is part of, contributes to and reinforces a more general ideology. Four obvious cases where it is possible to posit a relationship between 'knowledge about industrial disputes' and knowledge about other issues are law and order, dissent, the welfare state and the general relationship between the individual and the state. Readers are in a position to elaborate on, defend and legitimise their knowledge of Thatcherism in general and specific dimensions of it via a reference to, for example, analyses of the waste and misuse of taxpayers money, analyses which stress the importance of individual and unsubsidised effort and the adverse consequences of subsidised existence, ones which specify how, why and in what ways certain forms of dissent are illegitimate because they involve threats to public order, ones which define- at least in general terms- industrial disputes in terms of crime and the rule of law and thereby illustrate and instance, for example, the need for clear and firm law and order policy and the need to limit dissent to certain forms (see Hall et al op cit for a general account of the emergence of these and other links in the 1960s-1970s). Again, the Mirror was significantly different from the other three established papers, but did not deny the importance of central aspects of Thatcherism or provide a detailed and explicit defence of activities like secondary picketing. Though, of course, it did not deny legitimacy to trade unionism per se. Fifthly, the newspapers did not provide lectures on Keynesianism or monetarism but nor did they just convert theoretical/intellectual arguments into "the language of complusive moralism", or draw on "the language of experience, moral imperative and common sense." True the contrast between the reality of earning a living and the unreality/unprofitability of subsidised livings locates knowledge in the language of experience, involves the moralism referred to and draws on common sense imagery/models. However, readers can do several of the following re-demonstrate the validity of knowledge, point to a series of confirming instances, provide reasons for preferences and reasons for rejecting alternatives, provide various kinds of objective evidence and other (de)

legitimisations, provide empirical assessments of Government policy, adjudicate between arguments in a reasoned manner and derive perspectives and policies from descriptions. Again, ideas and images which reflect and evaluate our lived/personal experience and understanding of reality are one kind of form, content and source of power, but they are part of stocks of knowledge which are in clear senses logical and reasoned. Again, at least in the case in question, an account which emphasised one kind of form, content and source or ignored the relationships between different forms, contents and sources ~~would~~ be insufficient. Again, different media outlets and different parts of different outlets may understand different events/issues in significantly different ways; further detailed empirical inquiry which highlighted the possible coexistence of different forms, contents and sources, and the possibility that a form of logic and reason are a central ^{feature} of populist idioms could determine these differences. Again, to stress and underline, the findings do not suggest a sharp contrast between ideological/common sense/evaluative/emotive/moralistic/experiential knowledge and quasi-scientific knowledge. However, they do, in the precise senses described, suggest that some sections of public opinion have a reasoned dimension and are thereby highly resistant to falsification. Again, given the theory- ie. the translation of elite, official and dominant ideology (ies) into populist language, the limited nature of the differences between mainstream newspapers, the legitimisation of various kinds of inequality (eg. Hall 1973a, 1977, 1982, 1983, Hall et al op cit)- then the simple but crucial relevance of the research is that these processes took particular and very powerful forms. More generally, researchers who do not find the emphasis on quasi-scientific knowledge particularly useful could detach it and formulate the findings in other ways, ie. as straightforward descriptions of levels, similarities and differences of content, or they could focus on the identified forms of (de) legitimisation.

CONSENSUS

35. Usages of the notion of consensus are closely related to usages of the notion of ideology but are analytically distinct. The findings are relevant to several distinct but related usages of consensus. Firstly, the argument that whatever the differences

between different newspapers there is a basic and underlying similarity; they draw on and re-produce the knowledge that all members of society understand it in the same way and have shared values/interests (eg. Chibnall op cit, Hall 1973a, Hall et al op cit). Part of Hall et al's specification of the consensus is as follows: the denial of "...any major structural discrepancies between different groups, or between the very different maps of meaning in society...", the "...assumption that we... have roughly the same INTERESTS in society, and that we all have an equal share of power...", the representation of "...society as if there are no major cultural or economic breaks, no major conflicts of interests between classes and groups. Whatever disagreements exist, it is said, there are legitimate and institutionalised means for expressing and reconciling them...", the suggestion that "...disagreement or conflict of interest can be reconciled by discussion, without recourse to confrontation or violence." (pp. 55-56). This form of consensus can be called a general value consensus in the sense that it refers to, invokes and re-produces widespread agreement about fundamental issues (ie. the basic nature of society and perceptions of it), and is said to be common to different newspapers and the media in general. Clearly, the findings provide some empirical support for this notion. There are differences between the Express, the Mail and the Sun and between these newspapers and the Mirror but clearly- at one level- they all, for example, invoke and posit a national economic and civil interest, do not recognise any fundamental conflicts of interest/interpretation or divisions in society, and contrast legitimate and illegitimate behaviour/dissent in a way which suggests that it can and should only take certain forms and that disagreement can and should only be resolved in certain ways. More specifically, the analyses of the handling of Mr. Scargill's argument can be seen as a case study of consensus based re-production. In essence the Express, the Mail and the Mirror contrast legitimate, legal, democratic, normal, reasonable, reasoning, majority dissent/behaviour/views and illegitimate, illegal, undemocratic, anarchistic, abnormal, unreasonable, unreasoning, minority dissent/behaviour/views; and thereby define certain phenomena as illegitimate via a reference to the ways in which they manifestly

threaten common interests, ie. the argument that 'radical' criticism/support/action designed to further the legitimate interests of trade unionists is legitimate/acceptable is delegitimised and the argument that actions/dissent/behaviour must take certain, limited forms is legitimised via an evaluative contrast between the views and actions of a WE and a THEY. The Sun did not analyse Mr. Scargill's argument but as suggested the above contrast is not inconsistent with its forms and contents and is reflected in some forms/contents, ie. the analyses of picketing/secondary picketing. Whereas the Mirror did not define trade unionism per se as being beyond the realm of what is reasonable and widely perceived to be reasonable. (see 36)

The significance of the findings is not limited to empirical confirmation. The point is the now familiar one. Readers are in a position to, for example, provide a form of reasoned adjudication between competing arguments, recognise the legitimacy of criticism of the law but reject certain forms of criticism, provide reasons why the crucial issue is respect for the law, demonstrate and re-demonstrate how and in what ways strikes damage the economic and civil national interest; and, with the exception of Mirror readers, they can point to various analyses which unequivocally re-demonstrate that it is the case that X threatens Y, provide reasons why trade unionism can only be understood as a problem, specify via the provision of reasoned and objective evidence how, why and in what ways X is Y and can only be understood and responded to in terms of Z, provide reasons why the crucial issue is enforcing and/or changing the law, and so on (see 36 for second usage of consensus). The consensus and alternative views/actions are defined and (de) legitimised in the ways suggested by the literature, but this defining and (de) legitimisation takes particular, reasoned and very powerful forms. It might, of course, be argued that the re-productions of consensus are only reasoned in a very limited sense, ie. to describe damage to the national economic interest is not to reflexively analyse the issues but rather to focus, in a limited and simplistic manner, on adverse effects and to associate these effects with damage to a national interest via an invocation and reiteration of sedimented evaluations; to invoke employ and re-produce a democracy-anarchy contrast is to do

just that- to invoke a sedimented, highly evaluative and 'unthought' resource, to identify a THEY or a "folk-devil" who threaten OUR interests. ^(eg. Cohen op cit, Hall et al op cit) However, as in the case of all arguments of this type- ie. if media language is in some sense reasoned it is a simplistic/misleading/ideological/common sense/highly emotive, evaluative/experiential/personal, lived or 'phenomenal' logic/reason- the point is simply but crucially that evaluative and quasi-scientific forms interact: the end result is extremely powerful knowledge which is powerful partly because it takes forms and appears in processes under emphasised by the existing literature. Readers faced with new, threatening events or threatening interpretations will not just define, label, evaluate, condemn and stigmatise or refer to brute reality, but rather place these phenomena in reasoned forms/processes which in a clear and to a significant extent reflect on the issues and position readers as objective evaluators.

36. Elements of the above suggest a second usage of the notion of consensus. Namely, that at a more specific level of knowledge the consensus changes. Hence, for example, Hall refers to Thatcherism as "...a new kind of taken-for-grantedness... (which) began to be spoken in the mid 1970s- and, in its turn, to 'speak'- to define- the crisis; what it was and how to get out of it." (1983 p. 30). Relatedly, Hall et al (op cit) chart the development of changing stocks of knowledge in the post-war period and the seeds and emergence of recent ones in the 1960s-1980s; in particular, for example, they point to the way in which the media, from approximately the early 1970s onwards, tended to define trade unionism per se as being outside the consensus. In both cases the suggestion seems to be that while the new consensus is not omnipotent or unchallenged it tended to successfully define and change the terms of mainstream social, economic and political debate. Clearly, the findings support aspects of these emphases by, for example, providing a detailed account of the way the Express, the Mail and the Sun re-produced the "new taken-for-grantedness" (see also pp. 277-280). They also develop these emphases by indicating that- in essence- this process took particular, reasoned and very powerful forms. Re-production is the right word: continuity and discontinuity interacted, ie. the steel strike as an opportunity to translate

theory into practice, the strike develops our knowledge of the trade union problem, in particular the need for firm, fast and effective action. Though further research could develop the issue of the maintenance and development of stocks of knowledge by examining a series of issues and/or particular issues which have a crucial bearing on the continuity-discontinuity issue (ie. the Heath-Thatcher transition, the emergence of the concern with the trade unionism per se problem, see Hall et al op cit, chapters 8 & 9 for an overview of the relevant decades). At the time of the steel strike the "critical ideological work" (Hall 1983 p. 29) was arguably not so much to introduce and establish "the new taken-for-grantedness" (ibid p. 30) but rather to re-produce, defend and legitimise it; and to develop it by showing how it could be applied to a relevant and threatening empirical instance.

As suggested the case of the Mirror is interesting because there were clear indications that it shared or was influenced by the 'new' consensus. Not only did it accept a central feature of the economic/industrial policy and thereby ^{a feature} of the general philosophy, it also was arguably embarrassed by the issue of secondary picketing and did not provide a clear and detailed critique of the concern with the trade unionism per se problem. Again, these and other similar features may not ^{be} indications of embarrassment/discomfort or specific reactions to the perceived power of an alternative discourse; they could reflect normal features of the Mirror and/or significant continuities. Moreover, there are differences between the Mirror and the other three established newspapers and it is arguable that it successfully defends a different stock of knowledge. Clearly, some of the forms and contents provide the basis for a sustained, generalised and critical engagement with the new consensus. Again, further research could clarify some of these issues and would, from the point of view of consensus/ideology theory, be particularly useful because it would specify how the only- to use a general category- non-Conservative/non-Thatcherite established popular newspaper handled and negotiated the new consensus. Simply to assume extensive re-production or that the Mirror will take certain forms because it is a mainstream social democratic newspaper ignores the specificity of the Mirror's response and the indications that a powerful alternative discourse (s)

has put partly irresistible pressure on its preferences. Again, the more general point is that researchers could use this research to support and/or develop their knowledge of the forms, contents and power of re-productions of consensus.

37. The third usage of consensus is the argument that it is, to use the terms of this research, a form of (de) legitimisation. This may now seem a self-evident point. However, it is important to stress that the research confirms that- again to use the specific but not distinctive terms of this research- an important part of media language and the employment of evaluations is the allocation of legitimacy/illegitimacy and approval/disapproval via an evaluation of phenomena in terms of their positive or negative relation to worthwhile social, economic, political and normative structures; and thereby an identification of phenomena with the lives, interests and concerns of readers-^{in particular} the identification of a WE who have certain interests/values in common and a THEY who threaten these interests/values (eg. Chibnall op cit, Hall 1973a, Hall et al, Lasswell op cit). Hence consensus theory can be seen as an important- indeed central- approach to levels of content, the relationships between different media outlets, evaluation, identificatory evaluation and sources of power. Re-productions of knowledge which assume and attempt to re-produce widespread agreement about general and more specific issues (eg. the rule of law, economic realism), and re-productions of forms of (de) legitimisation which powerfully and specifically invoke and re-produce widespread agreement via identifications with the reader: the re-production of powerfully evaluative (de) legitimisations and the re-production of legitimisations of certain actions/views and the de-legitimisation of others. Again, the major contribution of this research is that these processes took- and could in other cases take- particular and reasoned forms and are for underestimated reasons very powerful.

INFERENTIAL FRAMEWORKS

38. The notion of an inferential framework (s) or interpretive framework/structure is not necessarily connected with the other notions discussed, but it raises similar as well as additional issues. Hence a consideration of it provides an opportunity to both elaborate on and review/highlight the significance of the

research. Some of the essential features of usages of the notion are as follows: a crucial feature of media language is that it provides a framework which structures, organises, informs and limits knowledge/debates in particular ways; the framework not only defines issues, terms, assumptions and questions it also sets the terms for all subsequent argument/debate; consequently it is difficult to challenge because it establishes and sediments a definition of what the issues, terms, assumptions and questions are; knowledge and debate must accept or start from the framework, if it does not it will be defined as irrelevant, illegitimate, misleading, a failure to address the relevant issues and questions; the framework is also powerful because while at a certain level public opinion may consist of various and specific arguments, opinions and attitudes it will tend to be structured, organised and limited by the framework-specific attitudes about specific issues will be informed by the framework and take it as a point of departure; the framework is at certain significant levels common to different media languages; it is not biased in any simplistic sense but it is biased in the sense that it prefers particular and limited explanations and ignores other explanations and/or evidence which contradicts the preferred explanation (eg. Glasgow University Media Group op cit, Hall et al op cit, Halloran et al op cit, Hartmann & Husband op cit).

In the discussion of the findings it was argued that it is possible and legitimate to identify a general level of argument which structures the communities and popular newspaper discourse as a whole (see, eg, pp. 252-53 & 268-69). This level of knowledge tends to be emphasised in discussions of inferential frameworks. Hence, for example, Halloran et al (op cit) showed that a demonstration was understood in terms of the pre-existing issue of violence and that coverage ignored evidence which contradicted this framework; Hartmann and Husband (op cit) showed that coverage of immigration and race related issues emphasised numbers and conflict, and ignored issues like integration and housing; Hall (1973a) showed how debate about an Industrial Relations Bill excluded the issue of whether or not there should be a law. True these and other studies also consider more specific levels of knowledge/knowledge process

but they do tend to emphasise a more general level of structuring, organising and limiting premise. Part of the significance of this research is that it suggests that inferential frameworks may be both quasi-scientific and more specific/complex. True there is a clear sense in which readers cannot conceive of the issues in terms other than those dictated by, for example, the arguments that: picketing is intimidatory, dissent must take certain legal and legitimate forms, there is an economic and civil national interest, strikes do not reflect serious or fundamental conflicts of interest and can be understood in terms of adverse effects, there is a causal relation between wage, job and productivity levels and serious problems result if wages are not tied to productivity. However, there is a clear sense in which these arguments consist of and involve a number of interrelated evaluations, descriptions, perspectives, policies and adjudications. Hence, for example, the Express, the Mail and the Sun can only conceive of trade unionism as a fundamental problem but they can also re-demonstrate the validity of this knowledge, point to various manifestations of the problem and solutions to it, provide various kinds of objective evidence which supports their various but interrelated descriptions, perspectives and policies, and provide a reasoned re-demonstration of the validity of preferences and invalidity of alternatives. It is difficult to see how any of these phenomena could be described as transient- as employments or manifestations of the framework as opposed to central parts of it; and there is a clear sense in which readers are not just invited to ignore evidence which contradicts the framework and/or alternative frameworks. True it might be argued- quite rightly- that this is the effect of the analyses. For example, there is a clear sense in which all four established newspapers define 'radical' trade union actions/activities and 'radical' support for them as illegitimate, rhetorical, extreme and self-interested; and thereby-via a reference to a consensus/inferential framework- legitimise certain arguments/views/issues/questions/assumptions and de-legitimise/reject others. More generally, it might be argued that the relevant newspapers do not in any real sense consider arguments like, for example, intimidation is not a particularly prevalent, important or distinguishing feature of

industrial disputes, an adjudicative contrast between fairness and economic realism defined in Thatcherite terms is a simplistic and misleading contrast between two limited theories and, like all populist arguments, it is ideological, common-sensical, phenomenal, emotive and involves unreflexive categorisation and contextualisation via a reference to a sedimented stock of definitions, ideas and images. However, there is a clear sense in which readers can provide forms of objective evidence, distinguish descriptions, perspectives and policies, derive description-perspective-policy links and place inherently and explicitly evaluative arguments in YES-BUT logics which in turn place various, interrelated descriptions, perspectives, policies and forms of evidence in a reasoned adjudicative chain which demonstrates and/or re-demonstrates the validity of preferences and invalidity of alternatives. Moreover, it is arguable that it is these phenomena which constitute the inferential framework (s). In other words it is arguable that the vast majority of the knowledge reviewed and discussed in this chapter is part of the framework (s): very little of it is transient. Even given the unlikely possibility that the Mirror is not re-producing knowledge in any shape or form it still provides a set of interrelated descriptions, perspectives, policies, objectivities and adjudications which organise, structure and limit the understanding of the steel strike. Though, of course, for the reasons noted the longer and long term nature of the Mirror's community is best seen as an empirical question. This is not to say that a more general level of knowledge has no independent existence. Clearly, there are significant general structuring and organising premises but equally clearly more complex/specific and quasi-scientific arguments are part of and re-affirm the more general structure, ie. trade unionism can only be conceived of as a problem and is not legitimate or widely perceived as legitimate; there are various senses in which and reasons why this is the case, the alternative argument is... BUT... , it is demonstrably and re-demonstrably the case that X is ABC and can only be understood in terms of DEF as opposed to GHI.

Again, the significance of this research is not so much that an existing emphasis is inappropriate, ^{or} has failed to consider

the power of media language and the possibility that it appears in specific argumentative forms/processes, but rather that it can be supported and developed. It would be clearly legitimate to approach the editorials with a theory which stressed inferential frameworks. Indeed while it would be over simple to equate the re-production of community and inferential frameworks there is some similarity between the two notions. However, this research suggests both that there is a sense in which the framework (s) is more complex/specific than is usually suggested and that the maintenance and legitimisation of preferences and rejection of alternatives takes particular, reasoned, very powerful forms.

CONCLUDING COMMENT.

39. The basic starting point of the research was that a concern with the re-production (ie. maintenance, legitimisation, defence, development) of communal knowledge could be developed via an emphasis on the possibility that this crucial social process was explicitly quasi-scientific. At the methodological level it was argued that an explicit definition and a detailed, public examination of whole texts would provide clear and rigorous evidence for the readings provided. It was accepted that the specific focus of the research was limited- a particular approach to the sociology of the mass media and a particular approach to media language- but it was argued that significant benefits could be gained from the adoption of a certain perspective certain strategies. The basis of these claims and the refinements to and qualifications of the operationalised hypothesis/approach should now be clear. In short: our knowledge of the social processes involved in media language has been confirmed and significantly advanced via the identification of quasi-scientific forms of knowledge and re-production and, more generally, various forms, contents, processes and sources of power; it is clear how, why and in what ways the analyses were arrived at; and readers have an opportunity to check the analyses and to propose alternatives/modifications which challenge and/or relate the analyses to emphases other than those covered by the hypothesis- including broader emphases. Researchers who do not find the emphases involved in the perspective useful could simply use this chapter as a mine of information about forms, contents,

sources of power, similarities and differences; and develop their own concerns by adopting and/or reinterpreting this or that finding.

It should perhaps be stressed that some existing emphases have been considered in a relatively brief and general way and that they raise complex and highly debated/debatable issues (ie. ideology, the truth value of media language). It should also be stressed that the finding that the communities are quasi-scientific is intended in a particular way and that there are differences between the various analyses made by the various newspapers; and various forms, kinds^{and} levels of knowledge process (see discussion of analyses for details). However, that said, there is clearly a strong case for arguing that the sections of public opinion re-produced by the editorials- and thereby possibly public opinion and social consciousness in general- have a reasoned or quasi-scientific dimension. Moreover, this- in particular as a source of power and legitimisation- is underestimated in the existing literature and some and the central specific and more general emphases of this literature can be developed via the recognition of this dimension/possible dimension and, more generally, supported and/or developed by consideration of the various forms, contents, processes and sources of power identified. It is, of course, arguable that "Bingo/Jingo" (Harris 1983, chapter 3) rather than quasi-science is a more appropriate description of modern popular newspapers. However, at least in the case in question, they re-produced and analysed crucial social, political, economic and normative allegiances in reasoned and extremely powerful ways.

The weaknesses of the specific focus have been considerably lessened both by the ^t contribution of the research and the indication of the ways in which it develops and/or supports a variety of existing emphases- including more general ones. The major weaknesses can be briefly reviewed in the context of an inevitably brief and general consideration of the possibility of further research which extends and supplements the focus. Obviously there is no account of the nature and relationships between editorial comments on different issues and no account of the nature and relationships between editorial analyses and analyses found in other parts of the newspapers. Equally

obviously the research is only concerned with one part of one particular mass communication medium. It might, of course, be argued that the findings are generalisable and that the stocks of knowledge are icons/summaries of the whole- or at least major parts of it- newspaper, and are not just stocks of knowledge about strikes but rather about more general social, economic, political, normative allegiances. Clearly, there is something to be said for these arguments but they fail to treat the issues as detailed empirical issues. Hence a priority for further research could be to apply hypotheses about the relationship between- to use general terms- evaluative and quasi-scientific knowledge in studies of different mediums, coverage of different issues, different kinds of coverage of different issues and the relationships between different mediums, issues, kinds of coverage and different parts of particular and different mediums. More generally, such hypotheses could be applied to non-media languages, the relationships between these languages and media language and media coverage of these languages.

It may also be the case that different classes, groups or subgroups employ different forms of knowledge in different ways and to different extents. Detailed decoding studies would be an obvious way to approach the determination of this kind of issue. Further research could also place the findings and similar kinds of hypothesis in various social, economic, political and linguistic contexts. Possibilities include: the distribution, frequency and roles of different forms of knowledge, including implicit knowledge; the extent to which particular forms/contents are specific to particular historical periods; the long term continuities and discontinuities in stocks of knowledge; the origins of popular/media language and the relationships between it and social, economic and political elites; the relationships between it and more general social, economic, political and ideological processes; the 'actual intentions' of editors and their conceptions of the role and effects of media language. For the reasons noted the Mirror and its context (s) would be a particularly worthy object of investigation.

The possibilities are almost infinite. However, the point is not just that the findings can be placed in various contexts and related to other aspects of the mass communication process,

but also that in many cases these exercises could be developed by the findings. Some of these possibilities were dealt with in the consideration of the existing literature and, more generally, the research casts fresh light on and reveals significant information about crucial social processes. Moreover, it is relevant to theorising/research about a variety of issues and to various kinds of theorising/research.

FOOTNOTES

1. The review and discussion of the analyses will refer to some of the concepts and formulations in the existing literature. The next section (see pp. 274-92) draws out these references and indicates the ways in which the findings/theory develop and/or support existing usages.
2. This is not to make a distinction between evaluative and non-evaluative processes. It will be argued that while all the processes identified are inherently and/or explicitly evaluative the majority of them- in different ways and to different extents- are quasi-scientific and do not just involve placement and contextualisation.
3. As will become increasingly apparent objective is used and intended in a particular way. More specifically, it will be argued that evaluative arguments, definitions, ideas or images which are powerful because they are evaluative and evaluatively relate the issues to and identify them with the interests, concerns and lives of readers (ie. the use of OUR money related to a household budget), appear in quasi-scientific argumentative forms/processes; that is, arguments which- in various ways- claim to be analyses of an seemingly objective and external reality. This account of the interaction between objective or realist reader/subject positions and evaluative identifications is based on and- as will become apparent- develops Brunsdon & Morley op cit, Connell op cit, Hall 1972.
4. As will become apparent the Mail and the Sun also emphasise the steel strike as an opportunity to apply in practice non-interventionist/monetarist policy (see pp. 238-39). However, in these cases there is clear and detailed evidence for the re-production of knowledge about interventionist/non-interventionist policy. Hence there is no necessary connection between the production of knowledge and the new Governments policy. In the absence of clear evidence to assume extensive continuity in the Express ignores the possibility of discontinuity and to assume extensive discontinuity ignores the possibility of continuity.
5. These phenomena are evaluative identifications in the sense that they define actions, activities, effects and groups in terms of their positive or negative relation to worthwhile social, economic, political, normative and moral structures, and thereby relate them to and identify them with the interests, concerns and lives of readers. In the immediate cases in question the emphasis is on negative relation. This approach to evaluation draws on Brunsdon & Morley op cit, Chibnall op cit, Hall, eg, 1973a, Hall et al 1978, Lasswell 1971; see also, eg, Cohen op cit, Golding & Middleton op cit, Morley 1976.
6. A more general account of this process is provided on pp. 234-36. It might be argued that there is a sense in which all arguments, definitions, ideas or images are quasi-scientific, realist or objective, ie. intimidation

is always intimidation of someone by someone. As should now be apparent the claim here is that there are clear senses in which the knowledge is objective/quasi-scientific.

7. See Hall et al (op cit) for a contrast between editorials which claim to speak for the public/the majority and those which express the views of the newspaper/community. As they point out the former is a powerful legitimisation of knowledge. This kind of process was identified on pp. 225-26, for an elaboration and reiteration see pp. 242-43. All four established popular newspapers (the Star is a special case) employ, usually in combination, both forms of address, but the Express is distinctive in that it has a very strong sense of its own campaigning voice.
8. The evaluative forms in the Express, the Mail and the Sun are very similar. A list is provided on pp. 254-55, though readers could refer to pp. 220-21 & 224-25. The term forms of (de) legitimisation is used simply to highlight the way in which evaluative phenomena are not simply evaluative or evaluative in some general sense, but rather allocate legitimacy/illegitimacy via a reference to what is deemed and assumed to be positive/worthwhile- negative/unworthwhile. Though, of course, they are contents as well as sources of power/legitimation/de-legitimation.
9. Clearly, for example, there is no necessary connection between re-production and description. However, the argument is simply that re-production/re-demonstration is a particular and powerful form of knowledge because it involves the provision of further evidence for a well confirmed stock of knowledge; readers can point to a series of confirming instances and analyse a particular instance in a way which provides further evidence for the general theory. More generally, forms of quasi-scientific knowledge and forms of (de) legitimisation can be called forms of re-production in the sense that they are part of what is re-produced and/or central dimensions of the forms, contents and power of the re-productive process (ie. the re-production of evaluative and quasi-scientific knowledge and the evaluative and quasi-scientific re-production of knowledge).
10. It might be argued that to posit discontinuity is simply counter intuitive: the Express clearly prefers established non-interventionist policy- or at least non-interventionist theory. However, the argument is not that there is significant discontinuity or no continuity but simply that there is no clear evidence about the longer term nature of the community; that is, detailed evidence about the detail of the Express' handling of the interventionist/non-interventionist issue.
11. There are also similarities between the three newspapers and the Mirror. The Mirror and the special case of the Star are discussed on pp. 260-72 & 272-73.
12. Hall et al (op cit) discuss the issue of significantly and essentially similar stocks of knowledge in terms of

- the translation of dominant and consensual definitions into populist idioms. As will become apparent there are some similarities between all four established popular newspapers and, as some of the discussion to date suggests, the research confirms usages of the notion of consensus and suggests that the translation of 'Thatcherism' into populist idioms took particular, very powerful forms, see, eg, pp. 277-80 for an elaboration.
- 13'. As this suggests the findings support Hall et al's (ibid) suggestion that there has been an increasing tendency in the media to define trade unionsim per se as a problem. As will become apparent there is a sense in which the Mirror does not and cannot resist this 'new consensus', see, eg, pp. 269-72.
14. Clearly, the senses in which the three newspapers are 'independent' of the Government are limited. It is manifestly the case that they re-produce support for the Government in general and for specific policies. However, as noted, there is a sense in which the provision of empirical, objective assessments of Government policy is an additional source of objectivity. Similarly, criticism of it bestows a sense of independence and independent thought. When this form occurs with, as is usual, references to the views of the public/majority it is particularly powerful and can be seen as an attempt to put pressure on the Government via a reference to (socially constructed) public opinion (see Hall et al ibid, pp. 62-63); pressure which reflects a critical, independent voice but also the inflection and objectification of Government policy.
15. In a sense the communities could be restated in various more general ways, ie. what exactly counts as part of the basic inferential frameworks and the framework common to all three newspapers? The point here is to highlight and stress a more general level of structuring, organising and limiting knowledge found in each newspaper and the three newspapers. See also discussion of the similarities between the three newspapers and the Mirror (eg. pp. 268-69), and for usages of the concept of inferential framework see, eg, Hall et al ibid, Halloran et al op cit, Hartmann & Husband op cit .
16. This list and the basic inferential frameworks can also be seen as a summary of some of the major contents and evaluations of the 'new consensus,' see, eg, pp. 269-72, 283-84.
17. For an elaboration see pp. 285-89.
18. See, eg, Chibnall op cit, Hall 1973a, Hall et al op cit for various usages of the notion of consensus. The contrast between fairness and economic realism is one important form of (de) legitimisation which in a sense cannot claim the allegiance of all reasonable people, though of course it invokes such allegiance. In this respect, as will become apparent, the relationship

between the Mirror and the other three established newspapers is particularly important.

19. In the light of footnote 18 it is possible that the Mirror is faced with the problem that fairness is no longer a successful de-legitimisation because a contrast between it and economic realism is being offered as a value of all reasonable people. Though, of course, there is a sense in which the Mirror defends it. As will be stressed only further detailed research could clarify this and related issues.
20. It might be argued that this is a traditional dilemma for the kind of Labourism associated with the Mirror. However, while this may be the case it ignores the possibility specificity of the community and the possibility that it is experiencing partly irresistible pressure from alternative discourses; that is, the specific pressure of Thatcherism.
21. Put another way the Express, the Mail, the Sun and the Government know that they can safely assume that references to intimidation, crime, the majority, unrepresentativeness and so on, are universal—at least to all intents and purposes—(de) legitimisations, and are trying to get a contrast between fairness and economic realism included in the list of universal (de) legitimisations. The Mirror is, perhaps, losing the struggle.
22. Again— to emphasise— there is a sense in which the Mirror successfully re-produces its own community and it may be that the limits of fairness and trade unionism are normal and traditional features. However, its acknowledgement of the validity of a specific alternative, threatening discourse and its failure to address in detail certain issues are good reasons for according priority to further research.
23. This will inevitably, at least to a certain extent, involve generalising the review and discussion. It should be stressed that there are differences between the different analyses of particular newspapers and the analyses of different newspapers. In particular nothing can be said about the Star and, for reasons noted, there are senses in which the Mirror's community is unclear. However, it does re-produce some knowledge and the knowledge in general takes quasi-scientific forms. Hence in more general terms the rest of the discussion can be based around the identification of quasi-scientific knowledge, quasi-scientific re-production and various kinds and levels of content.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography only lists works referred to.

- Anderson D.C. & Sharrock W.W. Biassing The News: Technical Issues in 'Media Studies.' Sociology, 13, 1979, pp. 367-85.
- Aristotle Rhetoric. In, McKeon R (Ed), The Basic Works of Aristotle, New York, Random House, 1941.
- Atkinson J.M. & Drew P. Order in Court. London, Macmillian, 1979.
- Beardsworth A. Analysing Press Content: Some Technical & Methodological Issues. In, Christian H (Ed), The Sociology of Journalism and the Press, Sociological Review Monograph, 29, 1980.
- Berger P.L. & Luckmann T. The Social Construction of Reality. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1967.
- Blumler J.G. & Gurevitch M. The Political Effects of Mass Communication. In, Gurevitch M. et al (Eds), Culture, Society and the Media, London, Methuen, 1982.
- Brunsdon C. & Morley D. Everyday Television: Nationwide. BFI Television Monograph 10, 1978.
- Chibnall S. Law-and-Order News. London, Tavistock, 1977.
- Cohen S. Folk Devils and Moral Panics. Herts, Paladin, 1973.
- Connell I. Television News and the Social Contract. In, Hall S et al (Eds), Culture, Media, Language, London, Hutchinson, 1980.
- Fowler R. Linguistics and the Novel. London, Methuen, 1977.
- Fowler R et al. Language and Control. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Garfinkel H. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1967.
- Glasgow University Media Group. Bad News Vol. 1. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.
- More Bad News (Vol. 2). London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.

- Golding P. & Elliott P. Making the News. London, Longmans, 1979.
- Golding P. & Middleton S. Images of Welfare. Oxford, Martin Robertson, 1982.
- Hall S. The Determination of News Photographs. In, Working Papers in Cultural Studies 3, 1972, pp. 53-87.
- The 'Structured Communication' of Events. Birmingham, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Media Series: SP No. 5, 1973a.
- Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse. Ibid, SP No. 7, 1973b.
- Introduction to Smith A.C.H. et al, Paper Voices, London, Chatto & Windus, 1975.
- Culture, the Media and the Ideological Effects. In, Mass Communication and Society, Curran J. et al (Eds), London, Arnold, 1977.
- The Rediscovery of 'Ideology': Return of the Repressed in Media Studies. In, Gurevitch M et al (Eds), op cit.
- The Great Moving Right Show. In, Hall S & Jaques M (Eds), The Politics of Thatcherism, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1983.
- Hall S et al. The 'Unity' of Current Affairs Television. In, Working Papers in Cultural Studies 9, 1976, pp. 51-93.
- Policing the Crisis. London, Macmillan, 1978.
- Halloran J.D. et al. Demonstrations and Communications. Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1970.
- Harris R. The Media, the Government and the Falklands Crisis. London, Faber & Faber, 1983.
- Hartmann P. Industrial Relations in the News Media. Industrial Relations Journal, 6, 1975/76, pp. 4-18.
- Hartmann P. & Husband C. The Mass Media and Racial Conflict. In, McQuail D (Ed), The Sociology of Mass Communications, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1972.

- Racism and the Mass Media. London, Davis-Poynter, 1973.
- Hodge R. Linguistics & Popular Culture. In, Bigsby C.W.E. (Ed), Approaches to Popular Culture, London, Edward Arnold, 1976.
- Newspapers and Communities. In, Fowler R et al, op cit.
- Hodge R. & Kress G. Transformations, Models and Processes: Towards a More Usable Linguistics. Journal of Literary Semantics, 3, 1974, pp. 5-21.
- Kress G. & Hodge R. Language As Ideology. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Kress G. & Trew T. Ideological Transformations of Discourse: or, How the Sunday Times Got Its Message Across. Sociological Review, 26, 1978, pp. 755-76.
- Lasswell H.D. Propaganda Technique in World War 1. Massachusetts, M.I.T. Press, 1971 (1927).
- McQuail D. Review of Sociological Writing on the Press. Royal Commission on the Press, Working Paper 2, London, HMSO, 1976.
- Analysis of Newspaper Content. Royal Commission on the Press, Research Series No. 4, London, HMSO, 1977.
- Morley D. Industrial Conflict and the Mass Media. Sociological Review, 24, 1976, pp. 245-68.
- The Nationwide Audience: Structure and Decoding. BFI Television Monograph 11, 1980. a
- Texts, Readers, Subjects. In, Hall S et al (Eds), op cit (1980b).
- Reconceptualising the Media Audience: Towards an Ethnography of Audiences. Birmingham, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, Media Series: SP No. 9.
- Murdock G. Mass Communication and the Construction of Meaning. In, Armistead N (Ed), Rethinking Social Psychology, Harmondsworth, Penguin, 1974.

- Misrepresenting Media Sociology:
A Reply to Anderson & Sharrock.
Sociology, 14, 1980, pp. 457-68.
- Murdock G. &
Golding P. For a Political Economy of Mass
Communications. In, Miliband R. &
Saville J. (Eds), Socialist Register
1973, London, Merlin Press, 1974.
- Perelman C. &
Olbrechts-Tyteca L. The New Rhetoric- A Treatise on
Argumentation. Notre Dame,
University of Notre Dame Press, 1969
(1958).
- Schlesinger P. Putting 'Reality' Together. London,
Constable, 1978.
- Schutz A. Reflections on the Problem of Relevance.
London, Yale University Press, 1970.
- Smith A.C.H. et al. Paper Voices. London, Chatto & Windus,
1975.
- Trew T. 'What the Papers Say': Linguistic
Variation and Ideological Difference.
In, Fowler R et al, op cit (1979a).
Theory and Ideology at Work. Ibid,
1979b.
- Turner R. Words, Utterances and Activities. In,
Turner R (Ed), Ethnomethodology-
Selected Readings, Harmondsworth,
Penguin, 1962.
- Williams R. Communications. Harmondsworth,
Penguin, 1962.