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Identity in an age of uncertainty

Questioning national identity is a sign of our times. Throughout Europe, nation states are grappling with the challenges of subnational autonomy, globalisation, European integration and multiculturalism. Hardly anywhere, however, are these questions more prevalent than in Britain, where openness to international trade and migration has often been accompanied by caution and restraint when it comes to displays of national unity. British patriotism was confirmed by the Second World War, so it is said: hardly a sufficient platform for a national unity fit for the twenty-first century.

Arriving in England, wrote George Orwell in “The Lion and the Unicorn”, “you have immediately the sensation of breathing a different air... The beer is bitterer, the coins are heavier, the grass is greener, the advertisements are more blatant. The crowds in the big towns, with their mild knobby faces, their bad teeth and gentle manners, are different from a European crowd.” While Britons may still be a particular breed, they are also asserting separate national identities to the extent that the future of the United Kingdom is in question, as discussed in the spring issue of British Politics Review. This is also the challenge for Gordon Brown, a Scot yet a British prime minister, whose advocacy of Britishness and a shared national credo has expanded over the last few years. Brown’s version of Britishness defends a historical set of values, summarised in his British Council annual lecture of 2004 as “a passion for liberty anchored in a sense of duty and an intrinsic commitment to tolerance and fair play”. The Prime Minister’s efforts to create a united British football team for the 2012 London Olympics reflect a wish to popularise this perception of unity.

The Prime Minister has an arduous task in defining Britishness across geographical and political divides. His Conservative predecessor, John Major, met with criticism for championing the white middle classes of southern England, his reference to “the country of long shadows on cricket grounds, warm beer, invincible green suburbs” finding little resonance in other parts of the population. A shared vision of Britishness today carries even greater difficulties. The recent announcement on the planned introduction of ID cards for British citizens illustrated the problem, seeing the Union Jack removed from the card to the benefit of a floral pattern of shamrock, daffodil, thistle and rose, signifying the four nations of the UK.

The present issue of British Politics Review discusses Britishness in light of the multiple identities of Britain today. Our fine team of guest contributors include Paul Ward, Arthur Aughey, Christopher Bryant, Vron Ware, Espen Kallevik and Dana Arnold. Together, they show the many dimensions of the debate today as well as its historical antecedents. Resolving identity in a multi-national and multicultural “nation of nations” will be vital for the future of the British state. Can Britishness provide the answer?

Olavind Bratberg and Kristin M. Haugevik, Editors
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The end of Britishness? A historical perspective

By Paul Ward

Revival of a debate. Discussion of Britishness now seems endless. Googling “Britishness” returns hundreds of thousands results for the last month alone. Almost any event relating to sport, politics and culture seems to provoke commentators to raise the spectre of the crisis of Britishness. There have been newspaper and magazine articles, radio and TV programmes, and a stream of blogs discussing what it means to “be British”. Without a doubt, Britishness is being discussed at unprecedented levels.

It is too often the case, though, that this discussion is taken to mean that Britishness is at its end. It has been widely assumed that the discussion of national identities in the UK is relatively recent, beginning with Tom Nairn’s The Break-Up of Britain in 1977. Nairn suggested that it was only a matter of time until Britain and Britishness was no more. The articulation of arguments about Britishness have therefore been taken to imply its demise. It is necessary, however, to take a historical perspective on current discussions of national identity in the UK – viewing them in their historical context rather than as containing some essential truth about the future of Britain.

Debates about Britishness have occurred frequently in the past – hence the volume of historical discussion in the last 20 years or so. Much of this, like that of Nairn, focuses on the contemporary UK, and the recent past, but it is possible to cite books and articles that push discussion back and back through history. There is a substantial number of works on Britishness in the twentieth century, including my own Britishness since 1870 (2004) and Richard Weight’s Patriots (2002), which argue very different positions. For the nineteenth century, Keith Robbins’ work should be mentioned, and Linda Colley’s Britons (1992) is probably the most cited book on Britishness. Colley argues that Britishness emerged out of Protestantism in the eighteenth century, while Britain was engaged in a series of wars against the French Catholic “other”.

The early modern period is now also well covered by historians such Steven Ellis, Sarah Barber and John Morrill. Historians such as J.G.A. Pocock and Hugh Kearney have therefore been taken to imply its demise.

Poblacht na hÉireann. The Provisional Government of the Irish Republic to the People of Ireland.

In Irish and English. In the name of God and of the most solemn of our forefathers from whom we received our old tradition of nationalism, Ireland, through us, assures her children in this generation that it is the duty of every Irish person to strive for the establishment of a Republic at this time. We are the people who are called upon to see that the Irish nation, as an independent nation, will live as long as the earth endures, and we pledge our lives, our souls and our fortunes in the service of its freedom, of its wealth, and of its achievements during the nation.

The Irish Republic is entitled to and earnestly claims the allegiance of every Irishman and Irishwoman. The female citizenship of Ireland and every citizen equally entitled to all the rights and equal opportunities of all citizens, and declares its resolve to preserve the happiness and prosperity of the whole nation and of all parts, combining all the children of the nation, equality and liberty of the citizens of the world, and we assure the world that the Irish Republic will in its traditions, and we pledge our lives, souls and fortunes to the Nation’s freedom and the progress of the Irish nation, as an independent nation, will live as long as the earth endures.

Proclamation of the Irish Republic, Dublin 1916. Unity within the UK and the British Empire has been challenged on a number of occasions before, under different and harsher circumstances.