‘Demonising Discourse’: the Traveller Community’s struggle against the Elite Voice of RTE

Abstract

As the Irish Government introduces a selection of changes to home defence law, through the Criminal Law (Defence and Dwelling) Act 2011, the Traveller Community, and the Ward/Nally case in particular, are regrettably reference points propelling public support for the use of force in home protection. The national broadcaster, RTE, has proved to be a central player in the constitution of difference; however, it is often an overlooked and under-researched arena. This paper focuses on the use of the elite televisual forum of current affairs programming on RTE television to unveil the complex and multiple ways in which discourses of belonging are mobilized with respect to the Irish - Traveller Community. It draws on one emotive event involving the Traveller and settled communities, the Ward/Nally case, and looks at the ways in which this forum interpellates the viewer, solidifying rituals of representation that remain within the viewers’ consciousness long after a programme has been broadcast.
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Introduction

On the 14th of October 2004 a member of the Traveller Community, John Ward, and his son Tom, drove into the yard of a smallholding belonging to a single man, Padraig Nally, on the West Coast of Ireland, in Co Mayo. John Ward, the car’s passenger, left the car on the pretext of looking for scrap metal, and proceeded towards Nally’s house. The exact details of what happened next are highly disputed, but what is known is that John Ward was shot twice by the farmer, Nally; once close to the door of the farmer’s house and the second time, the fatal shot, in the back on the main road, as John Ward fled from the property. Nally was later convicted of manslaughter using ‘excessive force’, but was freed upon appeal in 2006. Many in Irish society, who felt that Nally had reason to be fearful of the Travelling Community, celebrated this appeal verdict, but the judgement was also gravely
criticised by a minority, who strongly believed that it was a criminal act embedded in long felt prejudice and inequality towards the Traveller Community.

This series of events is viewed as one of the main precursors to the development of the Criminal Law (Defence and Dwelling) Act of 2011, an Act that Minister for Justice, Equality and Defence, Alan Shatter, contends, ‘recognises the rights of the householders to use reasonable force to defend themselves from intruders unlawfully in their home’ (Department of Justice and Equality 2012). The Ward/Nally case has been a pivotal reference point in the governmental and popular media discussions leading up to and following the enactment of this law, demonstrating a legacy of differential understanding and emotional rhetoric stemming from the events of 2004. In the debates surrounding the enactment of the law, the Nally case was considerably referenced. This paper will revisit the national broadcaster’s portrayal of the incident, focusing on the elite spaces of current affairs programming to examine the televsional discourses propelled from Ireland’s leading current affairs broadcasts of the period, focusing on both the representation and the audience reception of the Ward/Nally case, and the Traveller Community more broadly, in the aftermath of the Nally court case. It will draw on understandings of the power of elite spaces of knowledge-making to argue that powerful mediated spaces have a pivotal role to play in the constitution of identity and difference.

**The Irish Traveller Community**

The Traveller Community are an indigenous Irish nomadic population, which numbered 29,495 in the most recent Census of Population (2011). The Community regards itself as Ireland’s largest native ethnic minority group, although legally they have struggled to obtain such ethnic recognition and status in the Republic. Becoming more organised over the last twenty years, its members have formed a multi-group lobby association, The Irish Traveller Movement, which has aligned its plight with that of other international nomadic groups, a strategy that has aided their battle for improved resources and minority status. Although not recognised as such in Ireland, the Travelling Community meets the UK’s terms of reference for the constitution of an ethnic group, as outlined after the
Mandla v Dowell Lee case of 1983. Since 1997, Travellers have also been recognised as a distinct group in Northern Ireland, under the Race Relations (NI) Order, facilitated by the Good Friday Agreement. Their struggle for recognition within the Republic of Ireland illustrates to some extent both their lack of political representation, and indeed, popular acceptance as an ethnically separate group, within Irish society.

The fact that the Traveller Community remains as Irish citizens without separate ethnic status is a contentious issue and is exacerbated to some extent by the ostracised position the Community holds within Irish society more broadly (Bhreatnach 1998; Kabachnik 2009a; Tormey and Gleeson 2012). The Traveller Community are often differentiated by narratives that highlight their divergence from the cultural qualities of what is seen as ‘Irish’. Constant re-articulations of essentialised notions of difference serve to homogenise deviant connotations with respect to the Community. Mitchell’s (2006) insight into the ‘exception’ within society can provide a perspective of the ways in which the Irish nation has imagined the Traveller Community and excluded them from the national ideal. When thinking about the Traveller Community, their nomadic nature and attendant cultural practices, provides markers that can be used to conflate placelessness with deviant practice. Nomadism and trailer lifestyle are often used as examples to stress an out-dated and undependable existence (Richardson 2006b; Delanty, Wodak and Jones 2008; Mulcahy 2012; Schneeweis 2012; Goodman and Rowe 2014). The Community, although residing on Irish soil, are often excluded from the conception of the Irish nation (MacÉinri 2007). Belonging is a pivotal facet in the conceptualisation of any society and the Traveller Community’s place within Irish society is often challenged, because of their nomadic lifestyle, on the premise of not belonging.

Nomadism is a way of life for a majority of the Community, but not all; essentially it is believed that it is a state of mind, the importance of which is expressed in their material culture, such as the use of trailers and caravans (Sheehan 2000). The very nature of a nomadic lifestyle accedes to a theme of placelessness and is often viewed with suspicion and mistrust (Szalai 2003; Vanderbeck 2003;
Sigona (2005: 746) has discussed how nomadism is used in public discourse to reinforce the ways in which the Roma communities “do not belong”, further othering their place in society. The Traveller Community’s nomadic culture refocuses attention on Trudeau’s (2006) arguments about the innate spatiality of belonging. The exercise of free-floating nomadism is regularly criticized as an out-dated, hypothetically threatening and irresponsible custom, which has the potential to lead to deviant social practices (Szalai 2003; Kabachnik 2009a; Mulcahy 2012). Exclusion may be linked to suspicion of nomadic practices and the failure of the Community to call one concrete physical space home.

It is well established that the Irish Traveller Community have long been discriminated against on the grounds of health, housing, education and their ethnic status (Mac Laughlin 1998; Helleiner 2000; Parker-Jenkins and Hartas 2002; Richardson 2006a; McVeigh 2007; Kelleher et al. 2012). Various prejudice has extensively been noted with respect to the Community; a 1991 European Parliament Committee of Inquiry on Racism and Xenophobia reported; in Ireland ‘the single most discriminated against ethnic group is the Travelling people’. More recently, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance outlines challenges that the Traveller Community still face with respect to integration, housing, education and health care (Richardson 2006a; Delanty et al. 2008). It has been argued that the Traveller Community are increasingly ridiculed because of their lack of compliance with Ireland’s majority cultural values, lifestyle expectations and avarice desires (Mac Laughlin 1999; Crowley 2005). The Community are continually stereotyped as uneducated, unclean, unruly and uncivilised, and their way of life has been much ridiculed, especially within broader social discourses (Morris 2000; Parker-Jenkins and Hartas 2002; McVeigh 2007; Delanty et al. 2008; Kabachnik 2009a; Mulcahy 2012). The media is seen as a central player in this stereotyping. Richardson (2006b) discussed this in her study of media discourse and site provision for Travellers and Gypsies. She argues that ‘the ‘othering’ discourse surrounding Gypsies and Travellers serves to heighten their presence in society, which makes it easier to monitor them’ (Richardson 2006b: 85), perpetuating
the idea of surveillance through othering. Such an essentialised and normalising gaze facilitates ‘a visibility through which one differentiates and judges them’ (Foucault 1977: 25). It serves as a constant qualifier of distinction, differentiation and non-belonging. Although this gaze is not a physically controlling mechanism, it is a definer of representative norms in society.

**Mediating Difference**

Media platforms are key social construction facilitators that provide for an institutionally compounded identity where socially drawn boundaries are bolstered by notions of difference. Prioritised discourses are established, circulated and reiterated through media forums; they deliver social and cultural spaces that have become a fundamental conduit for discourse dispersal; providing persuasive public arenas to assert ideological power over the viewing public (d'Haenens and deLange 2001; Thetela 2001; Conway 2006; Falah, Flint and Mamadouh 2006). When discussing Roma and Gypsy reception into the UK, Schneeweis (2012: 685) argues that ‘one cannot conceive interethnic relations without including the media as key participant in the public conversation on integration and interethnic relations’. Televisual space offers a location for the constitution of the ‘categories’ of difference with respect to any group, facilitating emotionally imbued performances, demarcating identity, feeding into a wider politics of belonging (Richardson 2006a; Tormey and Gleeson 2012). Stenbacka (2011: 236) has argued that ‘consumption [of media] is an important social activity and at the same time a powerful instrument in affecting how we learn about ‘reality’ and how we are expected to react to this reality’. Television viewing incorporates a knowledge making process through the provision of a space for the negotiation of identity politics. Such televised representations serve as ubiquitous forums to construct, embody, and sustain both belonging and diversity with respect to the Travelling Community, and their perceived position and role within Irish society.

The data presented here will examine the representative structure of programming and the practices of transference and crystallisation of discourse towards the Travelling Community in the
aftermath of the killing of John Ward by Padraig Nally, and focus on how this discourse was reused and re-inscribed in debates on the new Criminal Law Act. This incident bears some resemblance to the Tony Martin/Fred Baras case in the UK. Vanderbeck (2003) has discussed this case and the discourses surrounding it, focusing mostly on media and political rhetoric. He argues that the dominant discourses re-inscribe Traveller and Gypsy communities as a deviant underclass, which is constantly stereotyped as not belonging. There is an emotional attachment and a closeness manifest in the practice of belonging. This paper will illustrate how one emotive incident led to a chain reaction of events that further ostracised the Community as an out-group in Irish society. Additionally, it will be argued that the filmed re-construction of the events of that day created a visual representation and interpretation that left an indelible memory on the viewer. This visualisation was seen to solidify condemnation of John Ward, a disapprobation that was propelled long after the filmed representation; a demonization that is still reiterated as the new law for the protection of the home comes into place. It also seeks to illuminate the ways in which commonality of perspective within televisual space forges a collective sense of community understanding, with the televised performance acting as a strong boundary drawing social mechanism.

Ethnic discrimination is a learned practice, and it has been shown to manifest itself in a multitude of ways. Mellor (2003) has identified four broad areas of practice that impact on social exclusion and isolation. His categories include 1) verbal racism, 2) behavioural racism, 3) discrimination and 4) macro level racism, which incorporates selective histories, a general lack of concern, and cultural dominance. As discriminatory views and practices are continually reiterated they become standardised in a society; through normalisation, discrimination becomes a customary practice. The creation and retention of discriminatory categories are linked to discursive practices and the constant assertion of prejudices and stereotypes (Delanty et al. 2008). Drawing on the work of Quasthoff (1978), Wodak and Reisigl (1999) have discussed the important role that stereotypes play in the articulation of prejudice. They state that the stereotype “takes the logical form of a judgement that attributes or denies, in an oversimplified and generalizing manner and with an emotionally
slanted tendency, particular qualities or behavioural patterns to a certain class of persons” (Wodak and Reisigl 1999: 182). This has been well studied with respect to nomadic, Roma and Gypsy, communities. Much work has been completed on the Roma Community and their mediated representation and reception in Russia and mainland Europe (Erjavec 2001; Szalai 2003; Gross 2006; Popescu 2008; Vitale and E 2010; Hutchings 2013; Messing and Bernath 2013; Picker and Roccheggiani 2013), and Gypsy representation in the UK (Clark and Campbell 2000; Vanderbeck 2003; Richardson 2006b; Kabachnik 2009b; Schneeweis 2012), more recently with events such as the ‘Stamp the Camps’ newspaper campaign (Richardson and Ryder 2012) and analysis of *My Big Fat Gypsy Wedding* television show (Richardson and Ryder 2012; Jensen and Ringrose 2013; Tremlett 2014). Stewart (2012), and the various contributors to his edited volume, links xenophobic action towards Roma communities directly to alarmist and stereotyped media reporting and highlights the powerful influence media discourse has in the strengthening of stereotypes. Stewart specifically stresses how certain events or individual incidents can be used to shift public opinion and even acceptance levels towards certain communities. One such media event was the murder and rape of two little girls in Bulgaria, where elite knowledge provided by a psychologist and professor was used to accuse minority groups of this heinous act, without any proof. This accusation remained dominant as the media replicated and reinforced its logic. Efremova (2012: 63) warns that public narratives have "lasting impacts - they frequently survive their original designers. Or as a popular Bulgarian saying goes, every spoken word is at thrown stone". Similarly in this volume, Picker (2012) notes the media’s role in the exacerbation of xenophobic discourses towards the Roma in the Florentine context.

Discrimination is habitually created and reiterated through the discursive productions of multiple institutions often working in tandem, articulating different narratives which combine to form overarching discursive structures. Evaluating the construction of the self and objects through interaction with others, symbolic interactionism is “founded on the basic tenet that human beings
construct and transmit culture through complex symbols” (Spencer 2006: 96). Language and semiotics are seen as essential precursors to discriminatory practice, as ideals and opinions are upheld in everyday interactions and communications. Potter and Wetherell (2001: 209) contend that “if a researcher wishes to get to grips with racism then a vital part of their activity must be the investigation of how description and explanation are meshed together and how different kinds of explanations assume different kinds of objects or supply the social world with varying objects”. Hall (1974) has long noted the importance of institutions to discursive transmission, claiming that institutions involved in broadcasting and mediation are the predominant players in the crystallisation of identity. He has argued that what are ‘produced’ by the media with specific regard to ‘race’, are “representations of the social world, images, descriptions, explanations and frames for understanding how the world is and why it works as it is said and shown to work” (2003: 90). Wodak et al (2009) have consistently noted the role that media, and particularly elite voices represented and vocalised from media platforms, have on the creation of senses of identity, stressing that these act as everyday practices in identity creation. Discourses transmitted by these institutions are often then enacted and re-enacted through everyday practices. In the image conscious twenty-first century, visual representations are seen to significantly determine reality. As Atkinson (1999: 102) has concluded, ‘the reach and influence of the media in the modern world is so pervasive that it shapes, unconsciously, the way we think about foreign cultures with which we have little other contact’. Prioritised discourses are established, circulated and reiterated through this medium, with the media proving to be a channel for cultural transmission. It is a cultural space which has become an invaluable conduit for discourse dispersal; providing discourses with a public forum, asserting ideological power over the viewing public (d’Haenens and deLange 2001; Thetela 2001; Conway 2006; Falah et al. 2006; Christophers 2009).

How issues are transmitted, presented, branded and packaged determines how they are received. Although the media professes to be a neutral environment, the misleading nature of such
assumptions has been extensively studied (Fiske and Hartley 1978; Van Dijk 1991; Fairclough 1995; Cottle 2000). The reality that is presented by media discourse is indeed, “not reality itself, but reality generated by a general sign-system in relation to social structure” (Erjavec 2001: 702). Media discourses are encoded, throughout the production and transmission process, to produce an ideological sense of reality. McQuail (1987) explains that the media’s most significant influence is its “referent power”. Knowledge that is prioritised in the media narrative consequently identifies the issues of significance in a given society, and constantly contributes to the development, and reiteration, of the dominant ideological discourse. The social knowledge that viewers acquire, conditions the way that they think about themselves and about those around them. The media taps into and exploits peoples’ fears of ‘the other’ (van Dijk 2005; Crewe and Fernando 2006; Schneeweis 2012). Chilton (2004) stresses the necessity to examine the political interactions that take place in mediated conversations and debates; he sees that the importance of these interactions lies in the power of speech acts. He notes the need to focus closely on small nuances within talk such as the use of “we”, “us” and “them” within mediated discussion, and also the necessity to question and contextualise any interactional deflections.

By reproducing and reiterating notions of deviance and dangerousness, the media is constructing a ‘threatening other’. Analysis of the level of misrepresentation and under-representation in media texts of ethnic minorities is seen as a transparent marker of the levels of discrimination in mediated representations (Mahtani 2001; Messing and Bernath 2013). Misrepresentation and under-representation identified on the screen leads to “symbolic annihilation”, a phenomena discussed by Tuchman (1978) with relation to media representations of women. Vermeersch (2003), who has studied Roma identity formation and Roma activists in the Czech Republic and Slovakia, has noted the power of mediated, political, and public discourses in the creation of ethnic identity. He has argued that powerful ethnic categorizations had to be overcome in the struggle for Roma rights, providing evidence for the fact that media institutions and discursive dimensions of politics have
strong impacts on the process of Roma identity formation (Vermeersch 2003: 880). Messing and Bernath (2013: 22) stressed this under-representation with relation to Roma, arguing that ‘political self-organization and civil movements of Roma, operating independently have almost disappeared from the media coverage’. This feeds into notions of powerlessness and denunciation of the minority by the institutions of the state (Ross and Byerly 2004). McGarry (2012) has argued that Roma Communities ‘do not have an effective voice at the local, national or transnational level’, impacting not only their legal rights, but also their levels of annihilation, discrimination and exclusion. Similarly, Sigona (2005) argues that Gypsy’s weak political representation reinforces their isolation within Italian society also noted this. The negative framing of ethnic minorities creates stereotypes causing social subordination and cultural exclusion (Kama 2003). Our perception is constantly being framed within the boundaries laid out by multiple narratives, all contributing to an overarching discourse.

By framing events in a particular way, regularly, and from multiple arenas, discursive control is exerted, as these discourses mediate our reality (Goffman 1974; Entman 1993). By selecting various topics and bounding them with specific discursive formats, television reports are choosing and constructing reality. Cottle and Rai’s (2006: 164) analysis of television states that ‘communicative frames… routinely organize how news events and issues are publicly communicated and contested’. They go on to outline how these discursive frames are present in society outside of the televisual, but that the televisual medium, especially on news broadcasts, offers these frames credibility and a visual, (and elitist), privileged forum from which to broadcast, achieving consensus. Vermeersch (2003) uses Goffman’s (1974) work on frame analysis to discuss Roma activism and struggle over dominant identity categorizations. He stresses that the processes of framing can be mobilized for differentiation along social and political lines. He uses interview text and documents produced by Roma activists to discuss the predominance of three types of frames of identity, arguing that frames can be intentionally produced for a desired end, but also can be designated and turned on their
heads to be used for a counter-purpose. In his discussion of top-down formulations of Roma identity he stresses that reports of antisocial behaviour and discussions of Roma's material living conditions and circumstances have very strong definitional elements in how people understand Roma communities and their identity as a separate ethnic group. Repetition of various themes validates an argument in the audience’s mind; the social boundary between groups is bolstered and maintained even if no physical interaction takes place (Van Dijk 2000; 2005). The constant reiteration of certain specific frames allows for the prioritisation of a particular knowledge at the expense of others (Schneeweis 2012). The coded principles conveyed by the media contribute in the naturalisation of social discordance and inequality, permitting them to be accepted as justifiable and accurate.

**Methodology**

This paper stems from a broader multi-method tri-partite (production, representation and reception) study, focused on the ways in which elite current affairs television forums mobilise certain markers of identity with respect to ethnic minority groups in Ireland and propel dissent beyond the screen. The information discussed here draws on qualitative data gleaned from content and critical discourse analysis, organisational surveys, and public on-line discussion group responses. This study focused on current affairs programming specifically, looking at a 2 year corpus from the shows *Prime Time*, *The Late Late Show* and *Questions & Answers*, taking in the coverage of the Ward/Nally case, and examining the topics that were associated with the Traveller Community in the year after the final appeal case and retrial verdict were given. *Prime Time* broadcasts both filmed investigative reports and in-studio discussion/debates twice weekly after 9:30 p.m. It is seen as RTÉ’s flagship current affairs programme. *Questions & Answers* consisted of a 5 member chaired debating panel, based on a series of questions, centred around major news stories and political issues of the week. It was wound up in 2009. *The Late Late Show* is a two-hour live chat show broadcast once a week. It provides a forum for both contemporary debates on relevant social issues and an interview space for politicians, leading experts, journalists and celebrities.
Patrona (2006) illustrates that current affairs programmes are the greatest site for ‘radical cultural change’, providing a space to articulate arguments between the public and the private sphere, where viewers are led to believe that they have direct access to, and have the ability to participate in, social debates. She claims that these shows are ‘ultimately, the mediated construction of the public sphere in contemporary western societies’ (2006: 5). The formats of the three programmes under study allowed for the investigation of what are viewed as powerful, elite spaces of communication. The broadcast corpus included a total of 339 programmes, thirty one were deemed to be relevant to the study of ethnic minority representation and 6 were focused on the Traveller Community. Each broadcast was transcribed, and evaluated to unveil its discursive structure, and to further illuminate the ways in which the Traveller Community were constructed and how diversity was highlighted and articulated. It was determined that the Traveller Community were differentiated by multiple framing strategies, many of which were mobilised by the Ward/Nally case; these frameworks are illuminated by the ensuing analysis.

Content analysis is the most popular method used to analyse media texts. This involved a sequence of steps: content analysis methods were initially applied to outline and identify the main broadcasts for study; they were then further employed in categorising the principal topics which were broadcast, and in the selection of specific programmes for more intense critical discourse analysis. Content analysis was then re-applied to the identified programme corpus to classify a range of specific discourses within each broadcast. Content analysis involved the extraction and examination of significant meanings and themes from specific textual records and the illustration of this data in quantitative terms. It measured the frequency, direction and intensity of communication content, permitting the categorisation of data to condense the overall programme matter. This allowed for the identification of primary markers of the narrative’s composition and precise facets of the programme production, which were then outlined for more in-depth critical discourse analysis. Categories for this study were decided on through a process of inductive open coding. A system of axial coding was subsequently used on these relevant broadcasts (Berg 2006). This was completed
for each individual broadcast, to identify, and consequently tally, all coding variables. This grouping of programmes, under a common thematic umbrella, prepared the data for critical discourse analysis, and the elucidation of frames later in the study.

There are a multitude of signs to be analysed in any given broadcast. The questions asked in the discourse analysis of each broadcast for this study allowed for identification of the various multiple sign systems available for investigation. The sign systems employed in television broadcasting shape and imitate the dominant discourses in society, and therefore, contribute to the production of an over-riding ideology through which the audience can comprehend reality. When we look at what people say about ethnic minorities, we are essentially examining the semantic macrostructures of discourse, that is, the “global meanings that organize the local meaning of words and sentences at higher levels of paragraphs and whole discourses” (Van Dijk 1995). The analytic paradigm of critical discourse analysis is extremely pertinent to this research. It concerned both the sociological and linguistic aspects of discourse, providing a methodology that sought to uncover the power relations that lie behind naturalised and assumed knowledges, espoused through dominant discourses in society. For this research, analysis was carried out at both a macro and a micro level; at both the level of the individual text, and the wider social structure in which it appears. This analysis has recognised the embedded nature of text, its reliance on social interaction, and societal context, entrenched within one another. Critical discourse analysis is therefore an inter-discursive investigation.

Critical discourse analysis, as argued by Wodak (2002: 6), has its roots in “in classical Rhetoric, Textlinguistics and Sociolinguistics, as well as in Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics”. The role of language is central to critical discourse analysis, as Thetela (2001: 351) contends “in discourse, the content, participants and semantic roles are largely constructed through language”. Wodak et al. (2009: 8) argue that “through discourses, social actors constitute objects of knowledge, situations and social roles as well as identities and interpersonal relations between different social groups and
those who interact with them”. Language plays a vital role in the re-production of ideology and the naturalisation of group values. Van Dijk (1998: 6) has argued that “if we want to know what ideologies actually look like, how they work, and how they are created, changed and reproduced, we need to look closely at their discursive manifestations”. On initial viewing language can appear as common sense articulations, but it must be understood that dominant values are often being maintained through ‘taken-for-granted’ language. Language, “rather being seen to referentially and benignly ‘map-the-world-out-there’ is instead implicated in constructing the possibilities and material practices of that world” (Worrell 1999: 55). Wodak (2007) has argued, in her study of Anti-Semitism, that various factors are important of an adequate discourse analysis. She stresses that these should include an appreciation of historical context and expressions, collective memory making, politics, the function of the speech acts being made, as well as the setting, and the context of such interactions. Conversational analysis is a central facet of this type of research, allowing for comprehensive scrutiny, and a “thick description” of “the ‘emergent’ discursive themes of various kinds” (Worrell 1999: 58). For this research, a concentrated examination of the text was completed with rigorous transcription of the conversation, which was then thoroughly analysed.

Lexical choices are important as they “mark off socially and ideologically distinct areas of experience” (Fowler 1991: 84). The questions that Fairclough asked of a text were based on Halliday’s views concerning the functionality of language, and the choices, both conscious and unconscious, which language users make. Halliday (Halliday and Hasan 1985; Halliday and Martin 1993) believes that specific facets of a particular context delineate the meanings articulated and the language used to communicate these meanings. The semantic potential of an explicit discourse is therefore limited by the context in which that discourse is articulated. Language has three principal meta-functions; Ideation, which is concerned with how language is used to understand the world around us: Interpersonal, the exchange structure of language, pronoun use, and the way language is mobilised to enhance and control social relations: and, textual meaning, the use of language to organise actual texts through the examination of vocabulary use and text structure.
The conversational aspect of each programme was analysed to better understand, i) the theme of each programme, ii) the social relations as presented on the screen, and, iii) the investigation of how the specific roles of each participant were played out. It also assessed the messages transmitted with regard to the rhetorical mode used and the symbolic organisation of each programme. This process uncovers the ways in which televisual texts are socially constructed and presented on the screen. The structure of the discussions and the arguments that take place on these programmes can be connected to society’s wider social and cultural practices. This procedure is essential to understand the complex processes that take place to create a current affairs text. This text has in turn, the ability to impact upon a viewing audience, as both the lexical and the visual aspects of these discursive events consist of multiple sign systems that are informed by, and enlighten, the audiences’ cultural reference systems.

Secondly, online discussion groups were carried out immediately after broadcasts took place, and online discussions concerning Traveller issues were monitored for two years afterwards to examine the extent to which the televised debates, data and opinions were transferred to other discussions, to support or detract from additional conversation and argument beyond the screened debates. These forums afforded a space for the collation and analysis of anonymous opinion generated through a process of group interaction and the articulation of personal opinion in an unrestricted manner. Online discussions uncovered the way in which people identify with certain programmes, as well as providing an immediate understanding of how mediated texts are viewed and consumed, and how certain knowledges may be conveyed from one person to another. Jensen and Ringrose (2013: 17) used a similar technique when analysing My Big Fat Gypsy Wedding, arguing that ‘the online life of engagement with Gypsy Wedding amply demonstrates the continuing social acceptability of revulsion, racism, and discrimination towards Gypsies and Travellers’. The extent to which these programmes influence and impact on people’s opinions can be gauged by assessing participants’ reactions after they watched a programme. Essentially, for this research project, this method provided evidence of how the issues that were raised in the programme and how the
narrative that was relayed, influenced discussions, both immediately after the programme aired and in later conversations. The points that were made provided excellent indicators of how the televisual discourses informed and influenced the viewer.

The third data source involved a short survey, which was sent to all Traveller Community organisations in Ireland, to assess their opinions about RTE current affairs programming and the influence they felt that these broadcasts held with respect to Community representation. These anonymous surveys were distributed by the Survey Monkey system. Surveys consisted of 20 questions; three questions eliciting ‘yes’ or ‘no’ responses, seven multiple choice questions, and a further ten open ended questions. The questions were tied to the representation of Traveller issues on the programmes under study, and the majority of responses, in some manner, referred to one event, the Ward/Nally case, with references made to the Prime Time reconstruction.

**Propelling Difference**

Belonging involves a complex set of affiliations, ostensibly entailing familiarity, incorporation and a feeling of ownership of and association with concurrent civil, social and political inclusiveness. It is a contested concept, one which is under-theorized and often ambiguously conceived of in human geography literature (Antonsich 2010). However, it is a central pivot in any understanding of place, ethnicity and identity relations. The notion of ‘Irish - Traveller’ implies a degree of belonging and an attendant citizenship entitlement, an association that is often only experienced at a nominal level. With this in focus, it has become clear that the Irish - Traveller Community are struggling to maintain any modicum of such incorporation. I argue that the events of the Ward/Nally case have been a fundamental event in maintaining this sense of detachment and alienation.

An examination of the politics of belonging and the constitution of difference and dissent must include an analysis of the socio-spatial facets of inclusion and exclusion, and the structures in place to influence such associations. De Cillia, Reisigl and Wodak (1999) argue that common media use
and practices contribute greatly to senses of common belonging and the maintenance of imagined communities. The television media, as represented by RTE, is pivotal in the communication and consequent actualisation of belonging. Television offers a daily space for the (re)production of knowledge; an arena where discursive systems are practised, performed and renegotiated. A nuanced understanding of the privileged role of such spaces in the constitution and facilitation of Irish - Traveller belonging, in the period following the killing of John Ward, is necessary to better comprehend its profound affect.

Current affairs television is a fundamental location in the establishment of notions of belonging, allowing for the creation and maintenance of essentialised understandings, regularised through a set of normalising techniques. The Ward/Nally case and the current affairs televised account of the event have been instrumental in the contemporary articulation of Traveller identity, raising questions about the power of elite televised representations to articulate, justify and solidify notions of difference and belonging. The power of this case to impact upon the national psyche was evidenced in the debates surrounding the new changes to the legal rights and responsibilities concerning home defence, which became law in 2012.

Debates focused on the Criminal Law Bill occurred from October to December 2010, in both the Upper (Dail Eireann) and the Lower (Seanad Eireann) Houses. Eight Deputies highlighted the Nally case in their debates in the Upper House, while four Senators discussed the case in the Lower house. Predominately the Ward/Nally case and the public interest in the precepts of the event were discussed as critical issues propelling the enactment of the Criminal Law (Defence & Dwelling) Act. The bill was underlined as coming ‘in the context of the public controversy following the Padraig Nally case’ (Deputy Martin Ferris, 20/10/10). Its enactment was stressed as ‘the final part of the reaction” to the “high profile’ Nally case (Deputy Jimmy Deenihan, 21/10/10), while Senator Ivana Bacik argued that the change in the law was required as the ‘Nally case... [gave] rise to a great deal

\[1\] Taken from Dail Debates held on the dates cited.
of public concern’ (08/12/10). The only government representative in these debates to challenge the essentialising of the Traveller Community as pivotal to a need for these legal changes was Senator David Norris, who emphasised that the Ward/Nally case was being ‘used for very unpleasant attacks on the entire Traveller Community, which was wrong’ (08/12/12). Narratives that impact upon the politics of belonging are value-laden in nature and are tied up in emotive rhetoric and performative routines, what Yuval – Davis has coined as the ‘multiple axes of difference’ (2012: 200). They represent the culmination of an array of power networks, all working to maintain associations between those who are constituted as ‘fitting in’, and those who are deemed ‘different’ and ‘unworthy’.

Television programmes are not simply representational documents; they are contributing elements of power networks in society. The everyday nature of the televisual text permits a constant trickle and re-articulation of discourse, allowing its narratives to assume a hegemonic position, maintaining normalisation in an indirect, yet penetrating manner. As Vanderbeck (2003: 376) argued in relation to the Tony Martin case, the associated trial and the mediated texts surrounding this event; ‘these representations, it is felt, serve to further label and stigmatise Travellers as undesirables, increasing the high levels of scrutiny, surveillance, and suspicion to which they are already subject’. This study illustrates that the prioritised narratives in these texts informed later debate, with language and associated discussions being replicated in wider society, propelling dissent beyond the space of the screen.

When viewed as texts to be read and deconstructed, television programmes provide an extensive representative record (Leudar and Nekvapil 2000; Horrocks 2004; Adams 2009). Television has been seen to be a pervasive space from which to impart knowledge, influence knowledge production, and create and maintain certain ideological standpoints (Fairclough 1995; Hall 1997; Van Dijk 2000; Wasko 2010). More recently, Tremlett (2014) has studied the power of televised discourses of Travellers on My Big Fat Gypsy Wedding, examining the intimate nuances of the televised
representation and performances, arguing that televised representations of Traveller as spectacle reinforces difference and otherness. She examines the ideological power that such programming has, not only to represent Gypsy communities, but also, more generally, to propel understandings of gender roles, race and class. This was similarly argued by Jensen and Ringrose (2013: 13) who saw the programme as ‘sexposé TV programming that has occasioned prolonged affective debates around issues of raced, classed, and national (mis)identifications and (mis)representations’. For Althusser (1970) and his proponents, ideological power has a more pervasive and productive influence on society than material power. Utilising Marxist theory and the work of Gramsci, Althusser argued that control could be maintained through institutions that subtly foster and buttress the status quo in a society, maintaining consent shrouded in a cloak of free thinking and openness (Althusser and Brewster 1971). These institutions consequently ‘interpellate’ individuals as subjects, through the circulation of a common ideology.

RTE, the Irish state broadcaster, can be viewed as an ‘ideological state apparatus’ in an Althusserian sense, conveying its power in an often restrained and discreet manner. The televised narrative acts as a discursive building block in the discursive recruitment of the viewing subject. This medium holds significant social power as it is led by well-respected and influential voices. Van Dijk (2005: 4) tells us that ‘the public discourses of the symbolic elites are the primary source of shared ethnic prejudices and ideologies’. The language used and the narratives prioritised in an elite forum, echo for the audience the dominant notion of what is ‘true’ in a given society. Stewart (2012) discusses three main issues with respect to Gypsy and Roma communities, a) that ethnic attacks, hate crime and protests against Roma communities are on the rise, b) that this has been exacerbated by new laws and policies with respect to the targeting of Roma communities and other ethnic minority groups and c) that this has been further fueled and aggravated by a deterioration in language used in the public discourse with respect to these communities. He goes on to discuss how powerful elites such as political party members and policy makers are reframing old tropes and discriminatory language with respect to Roma communities into new nationalist popular discourse. Stewart stresses that this
is part of a broader shift in European policy and that this type of elite discourse is proving to be extremely persuasive in society. Foucault (1987) contended that knowledge is discursively created, connecting institutional structures and technologies to the naturalisation of knowledge and practice, through the creation and transmission of discourse. Explicitly, discourse is coordinated in terms of objects (what can be spoken of), ritual (where and how one may speak), and the privileged, or exclusive, right with authority to speak of certain subjects (who may speak). This paper will look in more detail at these three aspects with respect to Traveller representation in the wake of the Ward/Nally case on Irish televised current affairs programmes, within the specific context of Ireland’s national broadcaster, RTE.

Re-presenting and Re-constructing Difference

The crucial televisual text for this study was a *Prime Time Investigates* programme examining the Ward/Nally case that was broadcast on 15th of November 2005. This programme provided a filmed ‘reconstruction’ of the events on the day of John Ward’s death, portraying what happened after Ward left the car in Nally’s yard, to the moment of his demise. It included exclusive interviews with Padraig Nally, Tom Ward and members of the extended Ward family. The portrayal was devised on the basis of evidence and interviews given by Nally about the events of that day, and focused in detail on his fears of living alone in an area of rural Ireland that was poorly policed. The filmed reconstruction showed John Ward and his son driving onto Nally’s property, and continued, to demonstrate John Ward proceeding from the car to enter the doorway of Nally’s house. This was a pivotal event that has been disputed and unsubstantiated by crime scene evidence, as no finger prints or forensic evidence were found to support the argument that Ward went farther than the front of the house. This reconstruction, which intimates an attempt to enter uninvited into the home of another, is a key representative marker and reference point to suggest unlawful entry and efforts to commit robbery.
This *Prime Time* programme was viewed by 48% of Ireland’s television viewers that night, and the filmed reconstruction was reused in a number of programmes, including the national broadcaster’s news programming. This allowed for further legitimisation and solidification in the mind of the viewer. The reconstruction served to visualise a highly contested event and give a voice and visualisation to the details of the event, beyond the courtroom narrative. In the broadcast itself, Mary Wilson, the programme presenter, continually interrogated the victim’s son and family during the interviews, constructing the deceased Traveller, John Ward, as a criminal schizophrenic, as seen in the following transcripts.

(PT 15/11/05)²

MW: On the 2 o’clock news he heard that a trailer had been stolen in the area, and, and was just after the headlines that he was alerted by a car revving outside, he was determined to get the number plate. John Ward and his son Tom had arrived at Nally’s farm, their car was revving loudly it was backed into Padraig Nally’s van. He was instantly suspicious.

PN: So he had the entrance to my yard blocked and I couldn’t leave in the car to phone guards or nothing.

MW: Were you and your father intent on robbing Padraig Nally?

TW: No, no we had no intents of doing that. We, intents, if we had intents of robbing him would, would we ask him about the car?

MW: Were you the getaway driver?

TW: That’s lies it’s all lies

She vigorously questioned the dead man’s son and wife, Tom and Marie Ward (Transcript 2). John Ward’s character, health, and past deeds were outlined for the viewers, depicting the victim as a troubled, mentally unstable career criminal.

(PT 15/11/05)³

MW: John Ward had spent most of the month before his killing in psychiatric care; the jury heard that he was a high risk patient and violent. He told his doctors he was self-harming and wanted to kill his wife. MW: What was wrong with him or what had been going on with the doctors?

---

² MW = Mary Wilson (presenter), PN = Padraig Nally, TW = Tom Ward
³ M Ward = Marie Ward
Marie Ward: He, he wasn’t great with his nerves; he was hearing voices and stuff like that in his mind. He never says what they’re saying but he’d tell us he was hearing voices. He was telling us he was hearing things and he says telling him what to do and what not to do.

MW: Did he hurt himself was this part of his illness, did he hurt himself?

M WARD: The scars on his hands, ya, he done them himself. He was in and out of the hospital the last while back say, he was on medication for a number of years, you know what I mean. He’d never do anything bad out of the way or anything, just get his medication, he’d use it, if he really got bad he’d say to me will you bring me back into the hospital and I’d bring him back in.

MW: And had that been going on for a long time

M Ward: A few years like a number of years

MW: Did it make him violent?

M WARD: No, not with me and my kids no

MW: But it emerged in court that John Ward did have violent tendencies there were voices in his head commanding him to kill. He’d been injured in sword fights and was feuding and he wanted to kill a man who’d attacked him with a Stanley knife.

MW: Did you ever see him being violent Marie?

M Ward: Not really

MW: Would he hit you or anything like that?

M WARD: Well, it’s, it would be more outta fun then anything else, not really, but it happens. If he was, maybe if we had a few drinks or something on, but me growing up with him and I know him, he was never violent, he never harmed no one. I never heard of him harming anyone anyway

MW: It was also suggested during the trial that John Ward was a bare knuckle boxer

MW: Was you father into fighting

TW: No he wasn’t a fighting man

MW: How did this story get around that he was a bare knuckle fighter?

TW: That, nobody knows that my father was never a bare knuckle fighter

MW: But the defence appealed to the deep-rooted fears and vulnerability of isolated country people. John Ward’s violence and unpredictability were used to bolster Padraig Nally’s defence to the jury

Yet, in contrast, she treated the farmer, Padraig Nally, as a victim (Transcript 3). Furthermore, she reinforced this narrative and stressed the pitiful nature of Nally’s position by describing a visit by Nally’s sister, with the comment that ‘he cried when she left’, allowing for sympathy to develop in support of the farmer’s position. Richardson et al. (2013) in their examination of the mediation and performance of political and social issues, argue that the presenter has a pivotal political role to play
in the transmission of knowledge. They focus on the emotional nature of mediated interactions stating that the typical interviewer/interviewee interaction with political/social actors is seen as one of the central ways in which the viewing audience formulates an opinion on a specific political personality and, by extension, their opinions and arguments. They illustrate that the entertainment rationale means that even current-affairs and strongly political debates have a tendency towards sensationalism and overstated negativity to attract more viewers. This type of interviewing technique associates itself with this set of logics.

The filmed piece showed shots of Nally’s farmyard and lands, while also obtaining access to the inside of his home, shedding a light on a lonely existence of a man who has little more than a radio for company. The reconstruction was used again in a later programme reassessing the issue, here Wilson provided additional commentary, and she associated Nally with the image of a man protecting his property from attack. Such a comment invokes links with a frontier type lifestyle, whereby one had to fight to survive and maintain their home, possessions and independence. The programme precipitated much debate across the national newspapers and radio programmes and among the discussion groups researched for this study, illustrating a broadly felt sympathy for Nally, underscoring the power that this respected programme possesses to woo an audience.

(PT 14/12/06)

MW: Padraig Nally is now 62, he was in his 50s, in his late 50s when that happened. He’s a bachelor farmer, he spent his life living in this rural area in Cross in Mayo... ah... looked after his parents as they aged and then he found himself, I think left alone in his mid-50s and he did become increasingly frightened and believed that he was under attack and he believed that he was under attack from Travellers. He had started keeping all numbers of cars that passed the road, now in fact I remember the first time I went down to call to see Padraig Nally, he took the number of my car and asked me if I had been in different places and this was, I mean this was after the, ...the, the, Ah... John Ward had been shot and killed and he became increasingly isolated...even though he lived on this road with a number of other houses, a lot of people living in that area now go out to work every day, so he was essentially alone in this environment all day every day, a lot of times to think, a lot of time to become paranoid. He believed there had been break ins at his house, he said things had been disturbed, he believed that ah... the Wards had been at his house before, spinning around the area, and that they’d called in before, and he believed he was a target sitting, as he said himself ,in that piece am... in the shed for hours and hours on end keeping his loaded shot gun down in a barrel beside him, ready to go to battle to save himself and to save his property.
As Yuval – Davis (2006: 203) has argued ‘specific repetitive practices, relating to specific social and cultural spaces, which link individual and collective behaviour are crucial for the construction and reproduction of identity narratives and constructions of attachment’. The collated online discussion group responses illustrated a progression of understanding with respect to difference, beyond the space of the screen, to everyday conversation. This transference highlighted a direct influence over the viewers’ interpretation, and focused attention on new processes in the creation and maintenance of rituals of truth. All in the on-line discussion group, which was carried out after the broadcasted show, praised the Prime Time programme, dedicated to the investigation of the Ward/Nally case. It was predominately commended for the outlining of the victim’s previous convictions, with one participant stressing that ‘Prime Time were able to show that when Ward was in prison, crime dropped to virtually zero in the area’ (Ger). It was declared that Ward ‘had it coming’ (Lisa), and that due to the filmed reconstruction of the event it was plainly seen that ‘Ward picked the fight in the first place, Nally was defending himself from the repercussions’ (Marian), even though, pivotally, no evidence was found by the medical and forensic teams to support this. A final response from one participant stated that ‘Nally did not shoot the census enumerator or the milkman or one of the neighbours. He knew exactly who he was dealing with and took appropriate action. Whether from previous experience, or intuition, Nally recognised a nasty piece of work when he saw one’ (Trevor). Viewers recounted issues from the same Prime Time filmed reconstruction in later debates, illustrating how the various diverse narratives remained in the viewers’ mind. When recalling the Late Late Show programme in the context of the Ward/Nally appeal one participant stated that ‘Travellers should be forced to settle so as to provide the next generation with a stable upbringing’ (Laura). Later, again recollecting the formerly discussed Prime Time Investigates programme from the previous year, a participant referred to the past criminal record of the murdered man, arguing that ‘I think we are entitled to draw inferences from Ward’s past misdeeds...and the Traveller community need to get their act together and assimilate into the settled-community’ (Brenda). Such discussion, especially as it was provided long after the initial
broadcast, clearly underlines a direct use of programme data to both inform, and act upon, a viewer’s way of understanding the issue.

The reconstructed depictions also cultivated discussion and critique beyond this programme itself and moved into issues outside of the Ward/Nally case, to conversations about the Traveller Community’s lifestyle more generally, and Traveller identity and status within Irish society itself. References to this programme were reused, and referred to, in later televised discussions, with debate drifting from the initial individual case, to incorporate appraisal of Traveller living standards and the Community’s involvement in criminal activity. Critical discourse analysis identified common themes and sentiments throughout the current affairs debates preceding this enactment.

Schneeweis (2012: 685) stated in her study of UK newspapers’ depiction of Roma that ‘the complexity of discourses lies, after all, in their interconnection’. Unpacking this complexity provides the real challenge for those who employ critical discourse analysis techniques. Common thematic patterns or frameworks were identified throughout the following year’s programming, four such framed strategies were identified; these incorporated 1) Influx, 2) Social threat, 3) Criminality, and 4) a Denial of Ethnic Status for the Travelling Community as a whole. This process of framed debate recalls the work of Foucault (1987) and van Dijk (1988), who both outlined the bounded and interconnected nature of discourse. Frames fundamentally encase an issue; using particular narratives, and overarching discourses, topics are moulded within demarcated imaginative boundaries. There was evidence of various and regular overlapping of these frameworks in many of the broadcasts. Tremlett (2014) looks at this in relation to *My Big Fat Gypsy Wedding*, examining how repetition and narration work towards framing understandings of race, class and gender. These framing strategies facilitated renewed discussions on the nature of Traveller belonging and called for integration and assimilation with ‘settled’ ideals. The continued referencing and re – presentation of explicit ideas and discursive markers crystallises a specific set of narratives about the Traveller Community.
Issues of acceptance played a pivotal role in these panel discussions, and ran as an undercurrent throughout the various frameworks. Essentially those chosen to speak on these programmes and represent the variety of opinions and socio-political perspectives held privileged positions as arbiters of discourse. The way, in which they spoke, in essence the ritual of speaking, is extremely important to understand the constitution of belonging throughout the identified framework strategies. The sorting and classificatory power of linguistic choice comes to the fore in detailed textual analysis. It was insinuated throughout the identified discursive frameworks that Travellers are failing the state, and not playing by the precepts of national responsibility, solidifying notions of deviance and difference. In a similar vein Efremova (2012) notes that nationalist sentiment is mobilized with respect to the exclusion of the Roma community in Bulgaria. Efremova (2012: 46) argues that the Roma “are presented both as cause and manifestation of state weakness and are in turn placed at the centre of national/cultural decline and the need for salvation”. In the context of this research it was clearly noted in the opinions of the Managing Director of Irish International News agency, Diarmuid McDermott, in a conversation with Questions & Answers presenter, John Bowman.

(Q & A 21/11/05)⁴

JB: Good evening panel, how can we improve the relationship between the travelling and the settled communities? Right Diarmuid Mac Dermott

DMcD: Well as I think we’ve seen from the debate so far John eh there’s a great deal of unease eh about travellers in, in the overall community, ah I think it’s probably one of the last great taboos in Irish society and on the one hand there, there’s a sense that we have to thread very carefully and we have to be very politically correct about what we say I mean there is, there is genuine eh fear amongst the settled community about travellers eh and, and I certainly I was glad to hear Martin Collins say that he respects An Garda Síochána because the experience of many Gardaí wouldn’t be that they get too much respect from a lot of the travelling community and I think that, that we’ve got to move away from a lot of the travelling community and I think that, that we’ve got to move away from seeing travellers as victims and as somehow they’re the most victimised, most oppressed people in Ireland because they’re not, because eh they’re going to stand up and take responsibility for their own actions. If there is criminality amongst travellers, which there is, the same way that there is criminality amongst the settled community then they must face that and they must face the consequences of that because...

JB: Hasn’t Martin Collins accepted that already?

⁴ JB = John Bowman (Presenter), DMcD = Diarmuid McDermott
DMcD: Martin Collins certainly has, but amongst the greater travelling community that certainly wouldn’t be the perception in the outside community that travellers have accepted their responsibilities as Irish citizens, which is what they are, they’re equal under the law the same as everyone else in this country so they’ve got to accept that and they can’t claim special privileges or special rights or special anything else simply because they’re travellers they, they can expect equal treatment that is their right to expect equal treatment but the settled community also needs to be assured that, that when they see travellers not going to be scared and afraid as Padraig Nally was in his situation.

This strategy of claiming to speak on behalf of a populace fits directly into Foucault’s (1987) discussions on the co-ordination and constitution of discourse, illuminating the influence that the speaker holds to turn individuals into collective subjects. Chilton (2004: 72-73) asserts the power-laden nature and influential role of such discourse, as politicians are “aware of social structures beyond the local context and the current interaction”. He (Chilton 2004: 73) stresses that “they have knowledge of those structures, of customs of discourse associated with, or constituting those structures, and of the past utterances of other speakers associated with those customs and structures”. Here, McDermott implicated an entire group, while also choosing to speak as the majority voice offering opinion over the minority. A further example of this comes from the then Justice Minister, Michael McDowell, a man in a well-respected and powerful political and social position. He discussed a hypothetical situation, which bore no resemblance to the real facts of the Ward/Nally case.

(Q&A 18/12/06) 5

JB...That was discussed earlier; Minister what was your response when you heard the verdict

MMcD: Well I mean I don’t want to talk about the Ah... individual decision because Ah... it’s wrong for Minister for Justice to start commenting on individual cases because he’s going to end up Ah..., that’s a slippery slope, but I can say this Ah... I do think that am Catherine’s analysis is probably right, it was the fear issue and the subjective Ah... the subjective feelings of Padraig Nally, which were probably at the heart of the decision, and am I would, I would like people to ask themselves this, if in a slightly different scenario Ah a traveller family were being, which happened in the past, were being am targeted by local farmers or whatever and if Ah the father of a traveller family came out around his caravan and found them there with petrol or something, you know, what he would do in those circumstances, ah you know, would have to be viewed in the same way as Padraig Nally doing what he did, and you know I just don’t think that we, we’d be right to say that this was an anti-traveller verdict, I think it was much more concerned with the subjective fear of the individual

5 MMcD = Michael McDowell
This moralising rhetoric demonstrates the distorted nature of the debate, where a man at the very heart of the governing and legal processes of the state can articulate such a flawed scenario, equating a man walking towards the door of a house with the petrol bombing of an inhabited caravan. McDowell, frequently used the pronoun ‘we’ as a differentiator when offering his own opinion about the Traveller Community. This collective pronoun use is a clear identifier of the ‘us/them’ binary; by repeatedly associating certain topics with evident collective generalisations, speakers are mobilising and strengthening social division and discord.

Language, detailing aggression and hostility, provides an argumentative strategy that stresses dissonance, and instils trepidation in the viewing public. This manifested itself through the use of the word ‘invasion’, insinuating an attack, which appeared in six instances throughout the broadcasts. The employment of invasion metaphors was associated predominantly with the frame of criminality. This was a similar finding to Messing and Bernath (2013), whose study of Roma representation in Hungarian media, over an extended period, identified that the Roma were increasingly branded with markers of criminality. They argue that ‘the political elite has displaced the discourse on discrimination, and frames phenomena related to the social exclusion of Roma/Gypsies increasingly in terms of blaming the victims: Gypsies being unwilling to work, to keep norms, to adapt, to integrate’ (Messing and Bernath 2013: 27). This was used both overtly and implicitly, with the Traveller Community linked to negligible and more substantial illegal activity. Over six programmes the word ‘criminal’ was used 43 times, along with reference to violence (9) and terror (3). The prioritised current affairs narratives allow similar themes to cut across several sites of discussion, and the use of similar frames creates a type of mental closure serving to enfold debate (Bourdieu 1998). As a particular narrative is prioritised, viewers become subjects to the discourse and regularly overlook other marginalised knowledges. These programmes consequently have the capacity to ‘interpellate’ individuals as subjects, through the distribution and exchange of normalised ideology, moulding and shaping a person’s belief system. This interpellation is a process
of internalisation. The use of this stratagem with respect to Traveller and Gypsy groups has been noted in other cases by Acton (1997) and Sidoti (2011). This style of debate is not a reasoned one, but rather a dialogue of distress and consternation aimed towards those who are marked as different (Bleasdale 2008). These words act as semantic scaffolds for the constitution of emotive discourses of fear.

One year after the initial Ward/Nally *Prime Time* programme was broadcast; the event was still holding precedence in debates about the Traveller Community and their position in Irish society. While promoting his new book on levels of criminality within the Traveller Community, Eamonn Dillon stressed that Travellers were affluent and successful, linking wealth to criminal practices.

---

(LLS 17/11/06)

PK: Eamonn, you’re very welcome, what kind of criminality did you find in the course of your research?

ED: Well, in my book *The Outsiders*, it covers, from everything, from the most minor petty crimes right up to the most serious level of criminality, which involves, what can only be described or characterised as organised criminal activity, and you’re talking about drug dealing, gun running, am... you’re talking about a high level, a high degree of, of sophistication in terms of executing those crimes, but you’re, it’s not just, the book isn’t entirely about criminality, it also goes into the area of sort of am..., the sharp business practice like Ah... one of the things that I ah, kind of discovered, when I started writing about Travellers 4 or 5 years ago there’s a huge am..., it’s a, the Travelling Community is a disparate, complex community and there are those without any doubt suffering from the problems enforced... you know of, of poverty and a lack of education and opportunities, but there are those who are multi-millionaires, who are extremely sophisticated business people, who have shown incredible acumen, there’s one of the people in the book we describe, how he went to China and bought wrought iron furniture and brought back several shipments and was selling those in, all over Europe and, and...

PK: But what’s wrong with that?

ED: Absolutely nothing, except he didn’t pay for the last consignment, this particular chap and the Chinese factory owner contacted, as it happened, an Irish journalist who was based in China that I had contact with and I realised, I figured out, I had a good idea, which particular character it was and it turned out then it was, it was, it was the man that we feature in the book

PK: Alright so you talk about fraud, you talk about con artists you talk about criminality, serious criminality, what was the most shocking thing though that you found

---

PK = Pat Kenny (Presenter), ED = Eamonn Dillon
This type of narrative was presented as ‘fact’; Leudar and Nekvapil (2000: 507) have understood this as ‘epistemic marking’, arguing that stereotyping and categorisation in this manner ‘resist inconsistent personal experience and factual arguments to the contrary’. The use of ‘you know’ when speaking to the audience serves to pull the audience together as one group who share the same ‘rational’ opinion as the author. It permits Dillon to draw the audience into his way of thinking; a tactic that is often carried out in a way that is unwitting to the viewer, allowing for a furthering of the othering process. As scholars of pragmatics argue (Wodak 2007), there is meaning imbued in interaction. It is necessary to understand how language is embedded and used in the context of specific knowledges and particular spaces of meaning. The idea of subtlety, as imbued by Althusser, is especially important when considering such tactics, as a detailed, systematic and nuanced examination through critical discourse analysis is required to unveil the intricate nature of narratives. Such discussions of criminality draw associations between Traveller culture and unlawful behaviour. This is further noted later in The Late Late Show programme, in the discussion between Martin Collins (a Traveller representative) and Eamonn Dillon (the author).

(LLS 17/11/06)⁷

ED: Ya ... Ya fair enough I still think it’s important not to understate the level of the problem, again I’d like the, the fact of the matter is that Travellers... are that there’s about 10 times as many Travellers in jail than there are in the actual population, the jail population from my own sources would suggest

MC: What does that, what does that say about the judicial system?

ED: No I would

MC: Is there a, is there an inherent voice in the judiciary towards Travellers

ED: I, I, I, the, can I clarify the, the facts from the, the study by the central mental hospital 10% of the prison population are Travellers, Travellers represent less than 1% of the overall so it would seem that they are 10 times more representative in the prison population than they should be

PK: Yes, yes

MC: That

ED: I would actually suggest that the problem is in modern Traveller culture, and when I use the word culture I don’t mean high art and, and literature or song and dance, I’m talking about the

⁷ MC = Martin Collins (Traveller Representative)
learned behaviour, in the actual everyday practice of how people go about doing their business. That criminality has become, has become, part and parcel of the, of a not the majority obviously, but certainly a large minority, and that a lot of young men, their role models are guys who are, who are, in at the very, very least extremely sharp business practice

These comments foster images that lead to widespread concerns about the burden Travellers may be seen to be placing on the security of people and their homes. Vanderbeck (2003) has discussed this framing of criminality in his work on the Martin case. He argues that ‘the re-inscription of discourses of Traveller deviance potentially contributes to pressure to evict “undesirable” Travellers and reinforces the already strong presumption that Travellers will be criminal or aggressive, with potentially devastating consequences for Traveller families on unauthorised encampments’ (Vanderbeck 2003: 378). Similarly Sigona (2005) discusses how the so-called “Gypsy problem” is created within Italy by examining how politicians and public policy makers stereotype and label Gypsy communities. His paper argues that the ways in which politicians, NGOs, and society more broadly interacts with Gypsy communities is framed within the popular remit of the dominant discourse of “Gypsy as problem”. By associating the Traveller Community with feelings of fear and unease these elite voices are adding trepidation to notions of diversity (Goodman and Rowe 2014).

Narrative conveyance can be seen in the analysis of the ways in which the frame of criminality was upheld with reference to Travellers in the discussions held after programmes were aired. Respondents emphasised that these televised discussions and the Ward/Nally representation were further proof that the Traveller Community were involved in criminal acts. For instance, after The Late Late Show debate (LLS 17/11/06), one respondent stressed that they did ‘believe that there is a higher level of criminality in the Traveller Community, some of this is attributed to their way of life, and culture and some is due to their treatment in Irish society’ (Eddie). Indeed this programme was referred to in other debates about the Traveller Community and their association with levels of violence and criminality. This transference to later discussions, on further topics relevant to the Community, was seen in an online conversation a month afterwards, when it was argued that ‘we know what elements of the Traveller community engage in. They were talking about criminality
therein on the *Late Late* recently on RTE. The criminality in the Traveller community is rampant and 10% of those in Irish prisons are Travellers’ (Paul). Such referencing and direct use of statements made on the broadcast, provides confirmation of the authority that is given to the evidence provided on this programming and the longevity of its contents in viewers’ minds.

Evidence of the Ward/Nally case and the framework of criminality were again replicated in other debates, while incorporating other perspectives such as ethnic group refutation. A nine person debate, took place after the broadcasting of Questions & Answers (13/03/06), which incorporated themes pertaining to criminality and the denial of Travellers’ ethnic status. The programme was initially criticised by the discussion group, with some participants feeling that it was unnecessary to broadcast a programme totally devoted to the Travelling Community. One discussant stated that Fine Gael Minister, Jim Higgins’s quote about all Travellers driving new cars ‘was dreadful’ (Liam), yet this was ridiculed by the others in the conversation who argued that ‘there’s merit to the comment’ (Sean), and that ‘there’s a difference between being pc for the sake of it and being honest’ (Tracey). These comments illustrate how prejudicial attitudes towards Travellers are easily articulated in response to a harmful comment made by a privileged voice. To some extent, such elitist commentary justifies, and allows, viewers to be equally prejudicial. As Hall (1974) has argued, such narratives can be crystallised as a type of ‘tacit agreement’ is made between the panellist and the viewer, which allows discrimination to prevail. The group debate continued along the same lines as the televised discussion, with conversation centring on the eligibility of Travellers to claim separate ethnicity. Here discussion group members’ critiqued Travellers’ claims, using the same language and points employed in the Questions & Answers programme. They argued that ‘they’re as Irish as any of us’ (James), that ‘it is a little absurd to class Travellers as a separate ethnic group’ (Terence), with one respondent asking ‘am I missing some mysterious cultural traditions and practices?’ (Bobby). These comments ‘emanate as a result of specific social practices’ (Vannini and Taggart 2013: 203) and overtly illustrate the politics of belonging. This has been discussed in detail by Goodman and Rowe (2014: 43) who also analyse online discussion forums to argue strongly that ‘there is a
hierarchy of prejudices where only racism is deemed too extreme to acknowledge, while prejudice towards Gypsies is not denied but rather is presented as an inevitable outcome given ‘the actions of Gypsies themselves’.

The theme of belonging was used as a tool to give credence to these arguments, both to support and detract from the presented issues. Even though on the one hand the Traveller Community were represented as criminal and constructed as groups to be feared, these markers were turned on their head with respect to ethnicity, as ‘belonging’ was mobilised as a tool to dispel discriminatory practices. The issue of ethnic discrimination, provides an excellent example, as programme panellists imply that the Traveller Community are ‘as Irish as any of us’, and therefore are not in need of a separate ethnic group association. This denial of inimitable ethnicity only serves to exacerbate the vexation felt by Traveller representatives. Government Minister Noel Dempsey provided evidence of this on the Questions & Answers broadcast.

(Q & A 21/11/05)  
JB: Minister
ND: I’ve, I’ve no difficulty am, ah... with the concept of recognising the fact that the Travelling community are different, that they, that they want to be different, that they want a different style of life, that they have a particular culture and so on, where I have the difficulty is where they start saying that they’re a different ethnic group, they’re not a different ethnic group
MC: Well, we are, we are anthropological sociological debate and writing on it will actually indicate that
ND: ...no...no...No, no
MC...and in the north of Ireland Travellers are actually recognised as an ethnic group, through the racial relations order of 1997, like it was in England...
ND: But that doesn’t
MC: ...The practical fact is, of the equality legislation is to identify membership of a Traveller, the Traveller community as a brand of which discrimination is
ND: Ya, ya
MC: ...prohibited I mean the argument
ND: That doesn’t make them an ethnic group
MC: But
ND: ...it just makes them a discriminated minority

---

8 JB = John Bowman (Presenter), MC = Martin Collins, ND = Noel Dempsey
This blatantly serves to create further divisions between the two communities, legitimising dissonance, yet denying diversity. The lifestyle and traditions of the Traveller Community were repeatedly problematised, with panellists calling for Travellers to conform to the ‘Irish’ way of life.

The journalist Ian O’Doherty argued similarly on The Late Late Show.

(LLS 17/11/06)

PK: What, what do you think is the future for Travellers

IO’D: I don’t think there is one to be honest, with you, in this sort of nomadic lifestyle, either you adapt or you die. The country is changed to such a degree and they don’t have the right to go in and basically park in other people’s land. I mean there was one case there a couple of years ago where one group moved into the grounds of the Russian embassy for God sake, and there was this assumption that anybody who says, actually hang on, you play by the same rules that we play by, and then we can actually have some sort of a dialogue, and yet anybody who says that is immediately accused of being a bigot or being prejudiced or being racist or whatever, and it’s actually no, because it’s the biggest respect you can give to anybody is to hold them to the same standards that you hold yourself to

This talk has been linked to fear mongering, with panellists, who refute that discrimination can exist, and who are dismissive of ethnic status, speaking about the dread of saying the ‘truth’ in case one is labelled as racist. Panellists were seen to deny discriminatory practices in these types of debates, before going on to employ prejudicial viewpoints. This tactic distances oneself from biased practice, it asserts ones’ political correctness, and is used to defer attention from, and absolve oneself of, any unfair and prejudicial comments.

O’Doherty went on to link one private bad encounter with the Traveller Community to personal experience, and a justification that changing times meant that there was no longer acceptance of Traveller lifestyles. In doing this, he provides another example of a strategy that can be easily applied to forge a connection with the spectators. With this approach O’ Doherty claimed to speak for a mass audience of viewers.

(LLS 17/11/06)

9 PK = Pat Kenny (Presenter), IO’D = Ian O’Doherty
10 MC = Martin Collins
MC: Well Ian, Ian going back to the 60s when there was a commission on itinerancy, which says basically that the Travelling community are a problem, get rid of the Traveller community, force Travellers to settle and that would be the end of the problem, now, the... also... what Ian has said is..., I think was interesting is that he talks about his own experiences as a young fella growing up, now as a mature adult writing for a paper and I assume reading the other papers, Ian should know that the problem, the problems that are occurring, and the flashpoints, are majorly because of a government failure to provide accommodation and sufficient accommodation for Travellers

PK: Ian

MC: Now you know, you can’t just go back and pretend, still Ian that you are a 12 year old playing football or whatever you know from, from what is there in terms of... out in the media that there is a shortfall of sites in...

PK: Alright so

IOD: Ok, now that the, I was just talking about the personal experience that is shared by tens and tens of thousands of people who grew up in Dublin and different cities around, right, and that is a simple fact of the matter, but this notion that somehow the government needs to come in or whatever is, again this inability of the Travelling Community to actually accept responsibility for their own destiny. They’re always looking for sort of help from the Government, or they’re looking for this cultural victimhood and they’re basically putting up barriers between themselves and the settled community. Now when they said about the... I started talking about the end of the Travellers, I wasn’t talking about putting them into cattle trains or something, this isn’t, this hugely emotive language that we have in this debate all the time where Eamonn was making..., made the point that someone, Traveller, compared themselves to the Jews of Europe in the 40s I mean..., I mean... this is just asinine stupid things. What I want to see and what every and all the good Travellers that I’ve spoken to and the ones that have settled and broken away, what the Travelling community really needs to do is to basically review their education process, stop taking their kids out of school so early get, there are three words in this education, education, education and then basically they can move on, but their way of life those days, and not just for Travellers, but for, as you said the small farmers for...

PK: Alright

IOD: The coopers

PK: Alright

IOD: Those people, those days are gone...

Moreover, he attained audience support for this viewpoint, indirectly stating that only those who had adopted a settled way of life were worthy of admiration. Vermeersch (2003: 898) has strongly argued that “the identification between social behaviour and ethnic identity can easily be maximized in public discourse and can be utilised to support a ‘discourse of otherness’”. These quotes evoke thoughts of colonising ‘civilising missions’ and the need for social enlightenment and conformation.
Such approaches are not often immediately explicit, but are consistent, subtle narrative mechanisms employed to tell a certain story, leading to the ascription of characteristics of one person, or one individual’s actions, being mapped onto an entire group, maintaining and substantiating a policy of negative othering (Vanderbeck 2003). Such examples emphasise the precedence given to these television debates by the viewing audience. They also continue to underline the rituals of practice and levels of transference that are apparent between current affairs programming and more informal day-to-day discussions; highlighting the prominent position held by these programmes as sources and reference points in debates concerning Travellers and their position within the country.

**A Call for Change**

Bhabha (1990: 295) has argued that ‘the question of social visibility’ is central to the naturalisation of minority groups within the national arena. The public must see minorities on the screen for them to be recognised as accepted affiliates of the Irish nation. Such visualisation and participation is an intrinsic marker of belonging. Only three spokespeople represented the Traveller Community in the six programmes over the two year period of study; Martin Collins (Assistant Director of the Traveller Group, Pavee Point), Derek Hanaway (Director of An Munia Tober, the Traveller support organisation for Belfast) and Anne Costello (a community worker with Galway Traveller Movement). The lack of ethnic minority speakers does not facilitate an equal and impartial discussion, it is apparent that the selection of panellists and participants is thwarting the possibility for an unbiased and equal debating setting.

The debates surrounding the Defence and the Dwelling Bill stressed the important role that the media had played in propelling feeling around the need for home protection. In one of the Upper house debates, Deputies Jimmy Devins and Beverley Flynn discussed the media’s role in propelling public opinion in the Ward/Nally case. Deputy Devins, when directly discussing the Nally case, stressed that ‘the intense public interest and wide support for Mr Nally was evidence of the huge interest in this issue. This huge interest is driven to a certain extent by the media, who regularly
highlight injustices, perceived or otherwise, that occur in the course of defending one’s home’ (20/10/2012). This explicitly illustrated the pivotal role that this case played in the changing of the Criminal Law. The Travelling Community argues that they need to be included in the ‘us’ of Irish media. Voluntary groups stressed that little efforts were made to make them more included, arguing that ‘the programmes never seem to highlight positive aspects of certain cultures - for example Traveller Focus Week is held every year in December and it never receives any coverage from these shows - this would be an ideal time to cover something positive’ (Org A)\textsuperscript{11}. These groups contended that they were neglected and the ‘forgotten’ in Irish society and that this feeling of abandonment and rejection was having adverse effects on Traveller’s reception and acceptance within the national space. They felt that the Travelling Community are gravely under-represented and that the majority voice is constantly speaking for their minority. They were also cognisant of the fact that the common theme of discussion with respect to the Traveller Community was criminality, with one organisation stating that often ‘reactionary racist’ speakers were offered a platform on these programmes in the ‘interest of balance’ (Org B).

All representatives from the Traveller organisations who responded to this study were of the opinion that RTÉ current affairs programmes were instrumental as precursors to prejudice and discriminatory practice. It was declared that these programmes have the propensity to ‘give leadership and address issues rather than what seems to happen is that debates are stirred to the max – without much concern about raising and discussing issues’ (Org C). One group highlighted that ‘RTÉ should be reaching out to members of the new communities and Travellers to ensure that we have an opportunity to learn about more lives’ (Org D). These organisations stressed for the need for further education and instruction for presenters and production staff; arguing that more ethnic minorities needed to be consulted by the national broadcaster. Moreover, they stated that there was a great weight of responsibility on the shoulders of RTÉ and that they needed to be held accountable for the discourses they called attention to.

\textsuperscript{11} From Traveller Organization surveys carried out by the author
Conclusions

This investigation unearthed many subtle and unassuming devices, which when seen as a whole, illuminated a covert body of evidence, revealing many rituals of discriminatory and demonising practice. Overt exclusionary practices may be visible when one encounters isolation and segregation, but the more covert procedures of marginalisation, ostracism and differentiation may have greater far reaching and longer lasting effects as processes in the delineation of belonging. An examination of the Ward/Nally case and *Prime Time’s* filmed reconstruction illuminated the repetitious and recurrent nature of common narratives and the transference of ‘categories of signification’ into later discussions. Continual reiteration led to a small dense classification process. It became clear that there was an apparent failure to engage with the multifaceted nature of the issues discussed, the flawed reconstruction of the contentious Ward/Nally case led to the replication of simplistic descriptions and understandings, trivialising a complex issue and establishing a set of criteria to directly influence understanding of the issue.

A fair and impartial space for discussion and debate was consequently never given an opportunity to prevail. Instead, RTÉ current affairs programming played a significant role in the discrimination process; propagating discourses of prejudice and in turn distorting beliefs about Traveller issues. The Ward/Nally case itself played a pivotal role in debates surrounding the Home Defence Bill. The case, mentioned on 12 separate occasions, served to further align the need for the new legal change with fear aimed towards the Traveller Community. The media and its powerful influence was also mentioned on two occasions as having a crucial role to play in inciting public support for a specific perspective and set of ‘logics’. Television is a regularly taken for granted medium, yet televisual narratives provide powerful cultural signifiers for the classification of difference. This filmed reconstruction, and the frequent re-appearance of familiar frameworks, provided indicators of the degree of transference of discourse from television to common parlance, and demonstrated a key influence over the viewers’ opinion formulation. The utilisation of ideas and lexical choices from
television narratives underlines the critical role that elite televisual discourse plays in the dissemination of information. This transference gave credibility to the organisations who argued that such televised elite narratives were principal players in the propagation and transmission of myths and fabrications with respect to the Traveller Community. These organisations underlined the need for further consultation if any sense of inclusiveness, fair representation and belonging is to be achieved.
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