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PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is to observe and analyse how British journalists interpreted and reported the events of the 2011 London Riots in the course of those events – to be more specific, between 6 and 10 August of that year, plus 11 August, which applies only to news articles that were published abroad – and, on the basis of this, how journalists in three other English-speaking countries, namely the USA, Australia and Canada, as well as two publications in Estonia interpreted, conveyed and/or translated the publicised information.

The primary sources for news articles are The Guardian (the UK), The New York Times (the US), The Sydney Morning Herald (Australia) and National Post (Canada), plus Eesti Päevaleht and Postimees (both in Estonian). The three other English-speaking countries are presented in the order in which those countries gained their nationhood. Michel Foucault’s “The Order of Discourse” and Teun A. van Dijk’s “Opinions and Ideologies in the Press” constitute the secondary sources of information – the theoretical framework on the basis of which the textual evidence is analysed.

The body of this thesis consists of the three main elements: descriptions of the information from the selected newspapers, their analyses in accordance with the above-mentioned discursive theories and concluding comparisons of the different countries in terms of the results of such analyses. These elements occur in this specific order in the three chapters devoted to distinct topics: “The shooting death of Mark Duggan”, “The rioters” and “Descriptions of specific events”.
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INTRODUCTION

There are many reasons for writing this thesis: firstly, the author happened to be in London at the time when the riots took place – this enabled the author to observe and follow through live broadcasting how the riots were reflected in the local media, although the first-hand account is limited in that it does not include information obtained directly at the scene of the events; secondly, these events are still comparatively fresh, which allows a more original approach in order to bring out more subtle details and to also compose a unique analysis. The events of the riots and related factors saw wide coverage throughout the world, including Estonia, and in most of the media channels, showing that these events dominated and were made to dominate the public attention at the time of their occurrence. In the course of this thesis, the author focuses on how the topics were covered in the specific newspapers and how the press aimed to influence the course of the ongoing events, which is why the observed period is made to correspond with the time frame of the riots.

As the paragraphs of the subsequent chapters will confirm, these events were ultimately triggered by the shooting incident in London on 4 August 2011 that resulted in the death of a man by the name of Mark Duggan. The incident was the consequence of the attempt by the Metropolitan Police to apprehend Duggan as part of Operation Trident, which reportedly investigates gun crime in black communities. The demonstrations on the days following the shooting eventually turned into full-fledged riots that began to spread across the country because the affected family and their supporters were unable to receive any satisfying answers from the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC). Evidently, the situation led to the emergence of a wider faction that believed him to be a victim of a brutal police operation and wanted to see the relatives compensated for this loss of life, and a faction of an unspecified size that was determined to investigate the circumstances in order to establish his guilt or lack thereof.
The approach of this study is predominantly qualitative, meaning that the author of this thesis does not focus on the frequency of the occurrences of any individual element or factor separate from its context, but select and/or highlight noteworthy instances, regardless of their statistical prominence; for example, the relevant speakers and the concepts that they expressed, the lexical items that they used, the distinctions that they made, etc. However, quantitative analysis is possible with the resultant data obtained from the frequency of the particular events that were reported within the above-mentioned time frame. The chronological order in which the news articles are examined in the subsequent chapters intends to recreate or approximate the initial acquisition of the pertinent information (e.g., the specifics of an incident) by the journalists and its release to the public. The chronological order is occasionally modified for reasons of relevance.

The body of this thesis consists of descriptive interpretations that are either quoted or paraphrased from the aforementioned theories and news sources, analyses on the basis of the latter variety of texts and comparisons, mainly of the vocabulary, that are derived from these analyses. The body of the thesis contains the following chapters: “The shooting death of Mark Duggan”, “The rioters” and “Descriptions of specific events”. Each of these chapters is divided into five sections: theory, empirical evidence for each of the three regions in the order of increasing linguistic distance (i.e., the UK, other English-speaking countries and Estonia) and cross-regional comparison. Of the total number of nine empirical sections, each has an analytical subsection (i.e., the corresponding analysis).

The first of these chapters, which incorporates Foucault’s theory, examines how different groups defined the character of Duggan; whether as a victim of police misconduct, or an armed crook whose actions had determined the outcome. The different classifications of speakers include the following: journalists of different countries, members of Duggan’s family, authorities, etc. The second chapter, which relies on van Dijk’s theory of ideologies, analyses how the identity of the participants was revealed through their actions, as recognised by such groups as the journalists, authorities, eyewitnesses and participants themselves; for instance, the distinction between the mental models of the initial demonstrators/protesters and that of the emerging rioters as well as looters. The third chapter in question utilises van Dijk’s theory of opinions in investigating specific events of the riots, distinguishing factual information and evaluative (i.e., opinions, such as approximations, estimations, etc.) beliefs and identifying their respective sources in the form of speakers.
1 THE SHOOTING DEATH OF MARK DUGGAN AS THE MAIN CAUSE

1.1 Foucault’s power of discourse theory

In Michel Foucault’s (1981: 52) “The Order of Discourse”, which was originally published in 1971 and translated by Ian McLeod and published in Robert Young’s Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader, it is stated that “in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organised and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality”. In order to achieve this, every society will invariably utilise “the three great [external and an equal number of internal] systems of exclusion which forge discourse” (ibid. 55).

The external ones are as follows: a) “the forbidden speech” (ibid.) – in order to avoid saying taboos, and to observe that ritualistic expressions are uttered by those who have a special privilege to do so under the right circumstances, the society has three interacting and complementing ‘types of prohibition’ that form a dynamic grid; b) “the [division and] opposition between reason and madness” (ibid. 53) – the madman’s “word may be considered null and void, having neither truth nor importance, worthless as evidence in law, inadmissible in the authentication of deeds or contracts” (ibid.); c) “the will to truth” (ibid. 55) –

[This /…/, like the other systems of exclusion, rests on an institutional support: it is both reinforced and renewed by whole strata of practices, such as pedagogy, of course; and the system of books, publishing, libraries; learned societies in the past and laboratories now (ibid.).]

The internal systems of exclusion are as follows: a) commentary, for there tends to be a division of discourses along a gradational line, on one extreme end of which are those conversations and verbal exchanges that are transient, meaning that they disappear as soon as they have been expressed, and on the opposite side that constitute the foundation for new and subsequent speech-acts, meaning that they are recorded and modified accordingly prior to
being repeated or relayed; b) the author, because “[i]n the order of scientific discourse, it was indispensable /…/ that a text should be attributed to an author, since this was an index of truthfulness” (ibid. 58); c) disciplines, for “[t]he discipline fixes limits for discourse by the action of an identity which takes the form of a permanent re-actuation of the rules” (ibid. 61).

“[A] rarefaction, this time, of the speaking subjects” (ibid.) prevents those who are unqualified from entering the order of discourse. There have always been “‘societies of discourse’, which function to preserve or produce discourses, but in order to make them circulate in a closed space, distributing them only according to strict rules, and without the holders being dispossessed by this distribution” (ibid 62–63). Despite the fact that the organisation of modern, progressive societies facilitates access to discourses in all areas of expertise and professional terminologies, this may still be an illusion for personal and professional social distances still determine whether people with standard education would be able to master different discourses on the same level. Official education in various fields distributes distinct knowledge and the resulting power to different individuals within the same society, maintaining the separation of powers.

All of this is relevant in the context of this thesis because I intend to observe who has conveyed information about the incident involving Mark Duggan and his character in terms of what are the speaker’s qualifications and methods. In the analysis part of this chapter, I will assess how the journalists have articulated the above-mentioned observations.

1.2 Articles from the British newspaper

The following paragraphs on newspaper articles exclusively from *The Guardian* will illustrate how information about the identity and actions of Mark Duggan was obtained by the journalists and revealed to the readership in the course of the riots to which the death of the person in question was frequently said to have led. The articles in the aforementioned newspaper are expected to contain a more sizeable volume of information and to present more detailed accounts pertaining to Duggan’s background, locations described, past events such as the Broadwater Farm riot of 1985, social conditions as contributing factors and participating individuals relevant to the target audience in the United Kingdom, in comparison to the international reader.

The British newspaper *The Guardian* reported in its article “Tottenham in flames as protesters riot” on 6 August that people were going out to the streets in the “community where a young man was shot dead /…/ to demand ‘justice’” (Press Association 2011a: para. 2–3),
and state the reason to be that “29-year-old, named locally as father-of-four Mark Duggan” had died. The circumstances of his death included the fact that “[o]fficers had been attempting to carry out an arrest under the Trident operational command unit, which deals with gun crime in the black community” (ibid. para. 13). In the process, “shots were fired” (ibid. para. 15), and Mark Duggan, who was driving in a minicab, died. An editorial titled “Tottenham riots: A suburb in flames” said on the following day that whether “Mr Duggan fired first, or even at all, is widely disbelieved in the area” (The Guardian 2011: para. 1).

On 7 August, the “Tottenham riots: relatives of dead man say they didn’t want violence” article, written by Sandra Laville (2011b: para. 1), recalled that “Mark Duggan had just turned four when the Broadwater Farm riots erupted on the streets of Tottenham 26 years ago”. Duggan’s fiancée, Semone Wilson, had admitted that “Duggan was known to the police”, but said that “he had never been sent down for anything” (ibid. para. 11): “He has been on remand. I can’t remember what for but that was about nine years ago. I believe if he had a firearm and he saw the police he would run rather than shoot. When he was remanded last time he said he hated jail and never wanted to go back there.” (ibid.) During the police operation, Duggan was driving in a minicab, talking to his fiancée to say he was coming home and asking her to cook dinner. Before the killing, Duggan “texted her to say he was being followed by the ‘Feds’. What happened next is the subject of the IPCC investigation.” (ibid. para. 13) The article on 7 August “Tottenham riot: ‘very volatile’ situation contained, for now” by Sandra Laville (2011a: para. 4) adds a remark that Duggan “was well known in the local area”.

The 7 August article “Tottenham riots: the warnings to police that went unheeded”, by Vikram Dodd, said that it was still not certain if Duggan had fired at the police. People seemed to believe that he did not. In the article titled “We warned Tottenham situation could get out of control – community leaders”, by Paul Lewis, Sandra Laville and Caroline Davies (para. 7) on 7 August, Duggan’s fiancée, Semone Wilson, explained their “family had not wanted trouble, only answers”, and Wilson was not happy about the situation that followed.

The article “Mark Duggan: profile of Tottenham police shooting victim”, by Patrick Barkham and Jon Henley (para. 1–2) on 8 August, investigated the nature and character of Mark Duggan by posing the following question: “Hardened north London gangster and drug dealer, or loving family man who would never seek confrontation?”. Duggan’s fiancée, Wilson, said Duggan “was known to the police” (ibid. para. 3), but she “denied he was ever imprisoned” (ibid.). Research into his background revealed that “Duggan was born on [15 September] 1981 and attended St David’s and St Katherine’s, now Greig City Academy, in
Hornsey” (ibid. para. 9). Duggan was said to have been a good father for his children. Together, he and Wilson had three children, as their fourth child was stillborn. Wilson had expressed her disbelief in the accusation that her fiancée was a ‘gangster’, and said that the media had thus far been unfairly portraying him as such, conjecturing Duggan’s possible actions as follows: “If he did have a gun – which I don’t know – Mark would run. Mark is a runner. He would run rather than firing and that’s coming from the bottom of my heart.” (ibid. para. 4) In the 8 August “There is a context to London’s riots that can’t be ignored” article, by Nina Power (para. 2), it was revealed that “only police bullets were fired” during the “fatal shooting of Mark Duggan”.

Stafford Scott (para. 8) claimed in his 8 August article “If the rioting was a surprise, people weren’t looking” that the reactions of local youth had been explosive, and “[t]he trigger may well have been the killing of Mark Duggan and the insensitive treatment of his family”. In the 8 August article “Mark Duggan handgun tests show conversion into lethal weapon”, crime correspondent Sandra Laville (2011c: para. 1) conveyed the understanding that Mark Duggan’s weapon was “a converted handgun capable of firing real ammunition”. ‘Forensic tests were said to be in progress to “establish finally whether Duggan fired his weapon at all during the attempted arrest [on 4 August]” (ibid. para. 6).

Since “[t]he Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) has launched an inquiry into the shooting” (Laville, Lewis, Dodd, Davies 2011: para. 4), the cause of the death in question was no longer believed to have been “an exchange of fire” (ibid. para. 1), as previously held: “Initial reports from the IPCC were that during an apparent exchange of fire police officers from C019 fired two shots and Duggan died at the scene” (ibid. para. 5). Such an ‘assumption’ is said to have resulted from the discovery of a “bullet /…/ lodged in a police radio worn by an officer at the scene” (ibid.), which even the “initial ballistics tests” (ibid. para. 2) revealed to be ‘police issue’, as opposed to the alternative. In addition, “a non-police issue handgun was also recovered at the scene where Duggan was shot dead in Ferry Road” (ibid. para. 5), but, “as one community organiser suggested” (ibid. para. 6), that particular weapon “was found in a sock and [was] therefore not ready for use” (ibid.).

Articles “Mark Duggan did not shoot at police, says IPCC”, on 9 August by Jeevan Vasagar, and the Press Association’s “London riots: Mark Duggan died of gunshot wound to chest, inquest told” both state that Duggan was ‘killed’ by the police. According to an inquest, he had died of “a single gunshot wound to the chest [inflicted] by armed officers” (Press Association 2011d: para. 1–3), whereas the former of the two articles mentioned in this paragraph said in its title that according to IPCC, “Mark Duggan did not shoot at police” and
adds that he “received a second gunshot wound to his right bicep” (Vasagar 2011: para. 8). Gavin Knight (para. 1) said in “London riots are not the work of organised gangs” that “Mark Duggan was a member of the Star gang”, consisting of under 10 people altogether – “it had a notorious reputation for being armed, dealing Class A drugs and intent on making money”.

1.2.1 Analysis of the information from The Guardian regarding the identity of Mark Duggan

In an early article that was the first one analysed in this thesis, “Tottenham in flames as protesters riot”, the Press Association (2011a: para. 2–3) wrote about Duggan with neutral vocabulary, such as the phrase ‘a young man’ and exemplified by the following sentence: “29-year-old /…/ father-of-four”, with the information given about him that he was associated with “crime in the black community” (ibid. para. 13) – again, rather neutral but adequately defining nonetheless. In another article, “Tottenham riots: A suburb in flames”, an editor of the newspaper expressed that local people tended not to believe that Duggan had shot at the police.

By the beginning of the second day of rioting, 7 August 2011, the British newspaper in question still referred to Duggan with the most basic, laconic choice of words and descriptions; for instance, Laville employed neutral vocabulary, just using his name and such descriptions as ‘dead man’. Sandra Laville (2011b: para. 11) conveyed the words of Duggan’s fiancée, who is in this thesis the second type of source providing information about Duggan, as follows: he had been “known to the police” because he had been on remand for an unspecified reason almost a decade ago, but never actually convicted. His fiancée had said that she did not believe that his husband would have opened fire at the police at all, because such behaviour had not been in his nature. According to her, the remand had had such an effect on Duggan that he would have avoided prison time at all cost by co-operating with the police. Laville (2011a) described Duggan as having been ‘well known’ locally, which has negative implications that the shooting was the culmination of his activities for which he had been known.

Dodd (2011) stated on the same day as mentioned in the previous paragraph that the ongoing investigation into the shooting was attempting to establish whether Duggan had shot at the police as the deciding factor of his guilt or innocence, taking into account that the majority of the local residents were still committed to the belief that he had not. Lewis, Laville and Davies’ (2011) article basically said that his fiancée, who found the riots to be
detrimental to her cause, was determined to find the answer that Duggan had not shot either first or at all in order to restore his integrity.

On 8 August, Barkham and Henley (2011) explored the background of Duggan as follows: they were not certain whether Duggan had been a ‘hardened gangster and drug dealer’ or a ‘loving family man’, even though the title of the article itself referred to him as a ‘police shooting victim’. This was among the first articles to feature a more in-depth study into Duggan’s past activities, relevant achievements and character, in the course of which it was said that he had been a good father, as opposed to the alleged opposite view of him being a ‘gangster’ – the unfair portrayal that his supporters had observed that the media to have been giving on occasions. Power’s (2011) article continued the line of investigation that had focused on Duggan’s – who was mentioned only by his full name, without any evaluative comments – participation in the shooting, confirming that all bullets found were of the police issue.

Scott’s (2011) article demonstrated the bias shifting in favour of Duggan, whom the authorities had ‘killed’, and his family, who had been treated ‘insensitively’ by the same. Laville (2011c), on the other hand, continued to report on official investigations into the details of the original incident and the specifics of the firearm found in possession of Duggan at the scene of his death, as if there was still no way to confirm either way whether his nature and intentions were inherently good or bad.

Laville, Lewis, Dodd and Davies (2011) reached the conclusion that there had been no exchange of fire, since both the initial and the subsequent investigations had failed to associate any bullets with the firearm belonging to Duggan, so the assumption that there could have been such a connection was unfairly discussed in the media. Furthermore, another source, a community organiser, commented that, although the weapon in question had been concealed, it had been concealed in the way that it was not ready for use.

On 9 August, Vasagar’s (2011) and the Press Association’s (2011d) articles continued to reveal increasingly more detailed information about the original incident, with both of the sources referring to it as ‘killing’, with the former article announcing even in its title that Duggan had been cleared of allegations of shooting, as if that had been the central question that the investigations had been trying to answer for all this time. On the other hand, subsequent articles, the authors of which may have been aware of the aforementioned revelations, such as that of Knight’s (2011: para. 1), began to focus instead on Duggan’s membership in ‘the Star gang’, which had “a notorious reputation for being armed” that
traffics the most dangerous drugs, the possession of which can result in the harshest punishments, for reasons of making a profit for their dealing.

1.3 Articles from newspapers in other English-speaking countries

*The New York Times* articles “London Sees Twin Perils Converging to Fuel Riot”, written by Ravi Somaiya (para. 6) on 7 August, and “London Riots Put Spotlight on Troubled, Unemployed Youths in Britain”, written by Landon Thomas, Jr. and Ravi Somaiya on 9 August, state the cause of the riots to have been “the killing of a local man, Mark Duggan”. On both occasions, the newspaper gives a superficial description of the beginning of the events, their influence and the situation in the society in general. The 10 August article “Cameron’s Broken Windows”, by Richard Sennett and Saskia Sassen (para. 5), in the same newspaper specified that Mark Duggan was “a young black man”.

On 8 August, the Australian newspaper chosen for this study, *The Sydney Morning Herald*, provided in its article “London police arrest 100 in riots” only the name and age of the man whose death was the cause of subsequent events: “The fresh violence came after a peaceful protest in Tottenham, north London, on Saturday, which followed the fatal shooting of Mark Duggan, 29, on Thursday” (Press Association 2011b: para. 15). The same paper added on 9 August, in an article written by Luke MacGregor (para. 1–3) and titled “Bullet casts doubt over firefight”, that Mark Duggan was “a father of four” who had been ‘killed’, with details that the “[i]nitial ballistics tests on a bullet, found lodged in a police radio worn by an officer during Thursday’s incident, suggested it was police issue – and therefore had not been fired by Mr Duggan”.

Canadian newspaper *National Post* portrayed the deceased man in question through neutral vocabulary, referring to him simply as ‘man’; for instance, in “London neighbourhood erupts in violence after police shooting” by Michael Holden, 7 August 2011. But an article in the same paper from 9 August, “‘No evidence’ Duggan shot at police in riot-igniting exchange: commission” by Agence France-Presse (2011a: para. 1), indicated that there was “no evidence that Mark Duggan, whose death at the hands of police last week was the catalyst for unprecedented riots in London, had fired a gun at officers”. The article brought out Duggan’s age at the time of death to have been 29, and explained in a more detailed way the shooting of Duggan and its reasons. The text did not fail to add that it was a protest against his death that turned into the riots.
1.3.1 Analysis of the information from *The New York Times*, *The Sydney Morning Herald* and *National Post* regarding the identity of Mark Duggan

Somaiya’s (2011) as well as Somaiya and Landon Thomas, Jr.’s (2011) texts, which appeared on 7 and 9 August respectively, phrased the incident as ‘killing’, without providing more information about Duggan than the facts that he was male and a local, but they recognised that he was essentially the trigger for the subsequent events. Sennett and Sassen (2011) added on 10 August that Duggan was a ‘young black man’, which is not just a neutral choice of words, but the kind of political correctness that one would expect from this particular newspaper when making polite generalisations concerning age and ethnicity.

The situation in the Australian newspaper is comparable to that in the American one, which was discussed in the previous paragraph, in that the Press Association’s (2011b) article of 8 August mentioned the name and age of the deceased man. MacGregor (2011) added on the following day, again in a neutral fashion, that Duggan had had four children, saying that there was no evidence that he had not shot at the police. What is more, by stating that he had been ‘killed’, the text conveyed a sense that his death was unjustified.

Holden’s (2011) and Agence France-Presse’s (2011) articles referred to Duggan neutrally with such words as ‘man’, and specified by providing only his name and age at the time of death. The latter source stated that there was no evidence that Duggan had fired his weapon, and that his “death at the hands of police” (ibid. para. 1) had been the cause for the riots.

1.4 Articles from Estonian newspapers

Estonian national newspaper *Eesti Päevaleht* emphasised in “Briti politsei kavandab laamendajate vastu plastikkuulide kasutamist [British police plan on using plastic bullets against rioters]”, 9 August 2011, that the events had started when the police killed the alleged drug dealer. Interestingly, an article bearing the same date, “Politsei tappis päti, Tottenham põleb [Police killed a crook, Tottenham burns]” by Heiki Suurkask, said that Mark Duggan was 29 and had three children. The Estonian newspaper was very specific in describing Duggan’s past and criminal activities, giving details of his membership in the notorious Star Gang because of which he was in the possession of an illegal weapon. It was said that he was carrying the aforementioned weapon since a cousin of his had been killed in gang-related violence in front of a local night club a year ago. The author described the Star Gang as to be directly related to Jamaican Yardies, who are active in the underworld, robbing and taking
hostages without political reasons. *Eesti Päevaleht* has a solely negative attitude towards Duggan, as one of the titles says that Duggan had been a *pütt* ‘crook’.

Another Estonian newspaper chosen for this paper, *Postimees*, said in its articles “Londonis puhkesid rahutused [Riots erupted in London]” by Hendrik Vosman and “Galerii: rahutused Londonis [Photos: Riots in London]“ by Hanneli Rudi on 7 August 2011 that the riots had grown out of a protest in which 300 people gathered at a local police department to demand answers. This had been caused by the incident on Thursday night where the police shot down Mark Duggan, who was 29, whereas the former article adds that Duggan was shot after the police had stopped the cab in which Duggan had been. Supposedly, Duggan had opened fire towards the police, after which the police shot him down. In another article that was published on the same day “Londoni rahutuste käigus arreteeriti üle 40 inimese [Over 40 people arrested during riots in London]”, Teelemari Loonet explained that rioting had started from a protest which was aimed at demonstrating against the killing of Duggan, who had died through the actions of the police on 4 August. Duggan’s family had assured that they had not encouraged violence and that the riots should not be associated with the death of the victim. The police operation had been planned ahead, stated the article.

An article on 9 August titled “Endine suursaadik Suurbritannias: rahutusteni on viinud pikk protsess [Former Ambassador to United Kingdom: A long process has led to the riots]” indicated that the former Estonian Ambassador to the United Kingdom, Margus Laidre, thinks that the incident in Tottenham, where a 28-year-old father of four had died because of the police, was not a cause for the riots, it was rather a spark that ignited a powder keg. According to Laidre, the events simply indicated that this situation is of very serious nature in the context of the country. Laidre believes the actual causes to be the economical and integration policies affecting the everyday lives of third-generation immigrants.

### 1.4.1 Analysis of the information from *Eesti Päevaleht* and *Postimees* regarding the identity of Mark Duggan

On 9 August, “Briti politsei kavandab laamendajate vastu plastikkuulide kasutamist” (2011) referred to Mark Duggan with the words that would translate as ‘alleged drug dealer’. Suurkask’s (2011a) article that was published on the same day included the Estonian equivalent of the word ‘crook’ already in its title, despite saying that he had had a family and three children. Overall, the information provided about Duggan’s private life was relatively basic. The latter journalist concentrated instead on his criminal background, such as his
association with the notorious Star Gang. The fact that he had been armed at the time of his death with what was said to be an illegal weapon is attributed to both his gang membership and the violent past of the suburb in general. Suurkask went on to describe the underworld connections of the gang to which Duggan had belonged, revealing that one of their allies in the area represents ethnic homogeneity under the name ‘Jamaican Yardies’.

*Postimees*, on the contrary, discussed the topic in question with neutral vocabulary throughout its articles on 7 August. Rudi (2011), for instance, stated Duggan’s full name and how old he was prior to the incident with the police. Vosman (2011a) wrote that Duggan may have initiated an exchange of fire in which he died. Loonet (2011a) explained that the police had planned their operation and had carried it out in the way that had resulted in the death of Duggan. In addition, Loonet conveyed the sentiments of Duggan’s family, who wished to dissociate themselves and their efforts to protest from the erupting riots, as they were convinced that Duggan was the victim of the circumstance – one that the authorities would eventually attempt to compensate.

The article “Endine suursaadik Suurbritannias: rahutusteni on viinud pikk protsess” on 9 August featured the opinion of the former Estonian Ambassador to the United Kingdom, Margus Laidre, saying that Duggan was completely responsible for neither his death in the shooting nor the riots in the area, which had resulted because of the desperate conditions in the society. Laidre was convinced that the actual reasons of the rioting were rather complex, including economic and cultural factors affecting the entire population of the area, including probably Duggan himself and his family.

### 1.5 Comparison of the details featured in the newspapers

The British newspapers referred to Duggan in its early articles with the words, for example, ‘a young man’, ‘dead man’. Unlike, the newspapers from other countries, *The Guardian* quoted the words of Duggan’s relatives and used such information to describe his life. Details, such as the institutions where he was educated and the neighbourhoods where he had grown up and lived, were probably selected and presented to the reader in order to characterise Duggan’s persona in a collaborative effort between people who knew him and journalists who conveyed their thoughts. The articles from 8 August began to observe the identity and criminal activities of Duggan. Moreover, the articles from that date onwards expressed their attitude so that it was in favour of Duggan, stating that he had not shot at the police. In addition, the word ‘killing’ was prevalent at least in of the articles observed, which
again indicates that Duggan was a victim of the authorities’ actions. In the British media, Duggan’s criminal past was connected with his belonging to the illegal Star Gang.

The American and Australian sources also focused on the word ‘killing’. What is more, the Canadian newspaper articulated the incident itself by using the words ‘death at the hands of police’, which implicitly demonstrates that the blame was placed on the authorities. Otherwise, the chosen newspapers from other English-speaking countries in question used neutral vocabulary.

On the other hand, the Estonian source Eesti Päevaleht did not began to cover the topic about the identity of Duggan until 9 August, and they did it with very emotionally loaded and accusatory vocabulary, such as phrases ‘alleged drug dealer’ and ‘crook’. In connection with the previously mentioned words, the newspaper focused specifically on Duggan’s criminal past, highlighting his membership in the notorious group, which is in that respect comparable to the information presented in The Guardian. Postimees, however, presented the topic about Duggan’s death through a neutral choice of words. On the very first day observed, the newspaper explained that Duggan may have fired indeed. Postimees, like the British source, provided the opinions expressed by Duggan’s family. An article from Postimees cited an ambassador exonerating Duggan of all the blame of which some journalists had accused him: the shooting and the ensuing riots, which the other sources tended to associate with Duggan because of the demonstrations in his name.
2 THE RIOTERS

2.1 Van Dijk’s theory of ideological mental models

Teun A. van Dijk, a Dutch linguist and specialist in the field of discourse analysis, detailed in his article “Opinions and Ideologies in the Press” that was published in Allan Bell and Peter Garrett’s *Approaches to Media Discourse* in 2001 the role of ideologies and opinions in the press. According to him, the “three main components” (2001: 23) of the most recent theory concerning ideologies are as follows: social functions, which explain “why people develop and use ideologies in the first place” (ibid.); cognitive structures, “such as socially shared values, norms, attitudes, opinions, and knowledge, on the one hand, and personal and contextual models /…/, on the other hand” (ibid.); discursive expression and reproduction, which involves “the ways ideologies are expressed and reproduced by social practises in general” (ibid. 24). The social functions of ideologies, for instance, are said to be important from the perspective of “dominated groups /…/ as a basis for resistance” (ibid.).

The collective behaviour of group members, the above-mentioned social functions category, is defined by their cognitive structures, which in turn develop in accordance with prevalent social practises: “ideologies reflect the basic criteria that constitute the social identity and define the interests of a group” (ibid. 25). Van Dijk identifies the following components of group self-schemata: membership, collective activities, goals and values, plus position and resources socially shared by individuals belonging to group. For example, he writes that

[f]or journalists as a group, these ideological categories will feature basic information about who is recognized as a journalist (e.g. through holding a diploma or licence), what journalists typically do (e.g. write news and editorials), their goals (e.g. to inform the public, to serve as a ‘watchdog of society’), their values and norms (e.g. truth, reliability, fairness), their position with respect to their readers or the authorities, and their typical group resource (information) (ibid.).
Even though theoretical analysis of ideologies is to “take place at the abstract level of groups, and not at the level of individual cognition” (ibid. 26), it should be noted that “individuals may belong to a number of social groups /…/ [and] have several ideologies, each variably influencing their social practise” (ibid.) as dictated by circumstances.

Mental models, according to van Dijk’s definition, entail “personal and specific opinions [that are] derived from socially shared opinions or attitudes as well as from people’s personal experiences and evaluations” (ibid.), and these are manifested in all forms of social discourse, including the media. These are models that “are personal, subjective and context-bound” (ibid. 27), resulting from individual memories and interpretations of past events.

The purpose of the analysis is to discover the innate mental models of those involved in the demonstrations as well as in the riots on the basis of their social functions, cognitive structure and discursive expressions as portrayed in the articles. This chapter will conclude with a concise analysis of the vocabulary used by the journalists in order to identify and describe the rioters, distinguishing them from the people responsible for the initial demonstrations.

2.2 Articles from the British newspaper

The very first article on the topic in The Guardian on 6 August 2011, titled “Tottenham in flames as protesters riot”, stated clearly, already in its title, that the whole rioting had begun because of the gathered protesters who, on the same date, had become violent and started looting. Paul Lewis (2011a: para. 2) wrote in his 7 August article “Tottenham riots: a peaceful protest, then suddenly all hell broke loose” that the turning point must have occurred when “a gathering of around 200 protesters demanding answers over the death of Mark Duggan /…/ culminated 12 hours later in a full-scale riot that saw brazen looting spread across north-London suburbs”. Lewis (para. 17) was still unclear about what had been the precise trigger, “but what [was] clear [was] that tensions gradually escalated, as police made only limited attempts to talk to the demonstrators”. On the very first night, ‘teenagers’ had been stealing goods from shops, and continued by adding that, in another location, on Wood Green high street ‘100 people’ had been burning cars, breaking into shops and that “[s]ome were even filling suitcases” (ibid. para. 3–5) with stolen objects. Serious events had resulted from fire set to a supermarket and carpet store. Lewis referred back that the group of protesters over the death of Duggan “consisted of local residents, community leaders, and some of Duggan’s relatives, including his fiancée” (para. 11), and that it was “initially fronted by women” (para.
According to Lewis (para. 23), “organisers said some younger men turned their anger to two police cars, which were set on fire”. Conversely, “[o]thers present said the spark for the rioting was a specific incident involving a 16-year-old woman, who stepped forward to confront police /…/, demanding answers, but was attacked with shields and batons” (ibid. para. 26). Bystanders “described seeing a younger, more aggressive crowd arrive around dusk, some carrying weapons”; seemingly, “[t]hose people were prepared” (ibid. para. 18). Lewis concluded that the rioters were of mixed races, and most of them were men or boys, some very young.

In his other article “Tottenham riot: Sustained looting follows night of violence” on the same day, Lewis (2011b: para. 4) described the participants as ‘looters’ “with cars and shopping trolleys to carry away stolen goods”, and continued that “[n]earby, large groups of youths congregated in the surrounding streets with sticks, bottles and hammers”. Some had worn ‘balaclava masks’, obstructing traffic, and others had used rubbish bins to form barricades. Lewis also reported the following about the looters: approximately 100 youths had run in the high street to steal from game shops, electrical stores and clothe chains. These looters had mostly been young men, covering their faces with masks. Lewis described an incident where a very young boy who was around 14 had stolen a minicab, and who had caused a dangerous situation by driving down the street.

Lewis’ (2011c: para. 5) article “Tottenham riots: 26 police officers injured and 42 people arrested” profiled the rioters as follows: “[t]eenagers and adults were said to have turned up in cars and filled them with stolen items, unimpeded by police. Others arrived on foot and piled shopping trolleys with looted /…/ goods.” Large groups of the young had gathered in the streets with sticks and hammers. Sandra Laville, Paul Lewis and Caroline Davies wrote in “Tottenham riots: Police ‘had not anticipated’ extreme violence” that the Tottenham area was described by Commander Adrian Hanstock with words such as ‘mindless thugs’ and that, due to them, the situation had gone out of control. Dave Hill (para. 4) explained in “Tottenham riots: This could happen in a dozen boroughs” the situation in “Tottenham and neighbouring Edmonton” as having been caused by “[w]orklessness and its associated subcultures /…/ becoming more deeply ingrained” in those areas.

Crime correspondent Sandra Laville reported the amount of adolescent participants, in accordance with witnesses, to have been 150–300 youths, some even in their preteens. Sarah Bolesworth et al. wrote in “Tottenham in flames as riot follows protest” in the Sunday edition, The Observer, in connection with an attack against two police patrol cars, a passenger bus and local shops, that the rioters “pelt[ed] officers with bricks, bottles and eggs” (para. 5) at first,
then modified their arsenal with “bottles [filled] with petrol to throw at the police lines /…/ [and other] makeshift weapons[,] including metal bars and baseball bats” (para. 6).

Paul Lewis, Matthew Taylor and Ben Quinn (para. 4) said in their article “Second night of violence in London – and this time it was organised” on 8 August that teenagers had targeted St Andrews Road, and that this had been “a preplanned destination”, which Paul Lewis’ (2011d) article “Enfield and Edmonton riots: ‘The mood was calmer, it felt premeditated’” also states, saying that about 200 youths had been in the area, with some of them covering their faces. The teenagers had “broke[n] down walls on terraced streets so they could collect bricks to throw at police” (Lewis, Taylor, Quinn 2011: para. 4). Also, shops on Church Street had been “ransacked and a police car smashed” (ibid.). In the morning, about 100 teenage boys “had broke[n] into a jewellery store” (ibid. para. 5). According to the authors, some youths had known exactly what they had been targeting. Youths had attacked shops and stolen copious amounts of goods. In Brixton as well, youths had looted shops as the night had come. Sandra Laville, Paul Lewis, Vikram Dodd and Caroline Davies (para. 18) conveyed in their article “Doubts emerge over Duggan shooting as London burns” the words of the Tottenham MP David Lammy, saying that “the community ‘had the heart ripped out of it’ by ‘mindless, mindless people’, many of whom had come from outside Tottenham”.

Sam Jones, Paul Lewis, Matthew Taylor and Ben Quinn repeated that same information as the two previous articles in “London riots spread south of Thames” on the same day: teenagers had attacked shops. Furthermore, they continued by reporting that “a fight broke out when rival gangs went to King’s College Hospital in Denmark Hill, south London, after two victims of minor stabbings were admitted” (ibid. para. 13), and that the looting in London had been the work of “‘small and mobile’ groups” (ibid. para. 15). With the violence spreading, 50 youths had gathered in “central London and damaged property” (ibid. para. 1). In addition, over 30 teenagers, many of whom were wearing masks, “[had] vandalised and looted shops in Walthamstow Central, including BHS” (ibid. para. 17).

Senior political correspondent Andrew Sparrow (para. 25) expressed in article “Nick Clegg defends government response to London riots” on 8 August that Kit Malthouse, “a deputy mayor of London who is responsible for policing, had said that ‘feral youth’ and violent people were the blame for the violence” in the riots. Malthouse had also said to the BBC that, in London, there are people who are violent and “who are looking for the opportunity to steal and set fire to buildings and create a sense of mayhem, whether they are anarchists or part of organised gangs, or just /…./ feral youth who fancy a new pair of trainers” (ibid. para. 26).
David Lawrence condemned the rioters in his article “The Tottenham riot makes me embarrassed to live here”, as the majority of the people had not been seeking for justice but just using the opportunity to steal private property. Duggan had lived and died in Tottenham, but sadly, the riots had gone far beyond the Tottenham area. According to Paul Lewis (2011d: para. 4), “[s]ome in the crowd had knocked down walls, and were smashing bricks into smaller pieces against the floor to make them easier to throw at police”. Also, small groups of up to 20 people moved through the streets in search of ‘unguarded shops’, and they had advanced quickly and, in some cases, in cars. In Tottenham, on the evening of 7 August, the rioters had confronted the police; those groups had withdrawn at the sign of police, but still had come together later. Crowds had been attacking shops as well as the police with rocks. The majority of the rioters had been young men, although some older people had also been present. Contrary to the reports circulating, the rioters in Enfield had been mostly white and not “black youths” (ibid. para. 16). Many young people had “put their hoods up and disappeared into the darkness” (ibid. para. 23). Others had shouted at the police upon the police asking questions from them. A young woman had been very angry with the police, saying the rioting is happening because people hated the authorities.

Alexandra Topping (2011) conveyed in her article “Looting ‘fuelled by social exclusion’”, already in the synopsis, the beliefs of experts: “[y]oung looters from poor estates have nothing to lose and no reason to obey social norms”. According to criminologist and youth culture expert Professor John Pitts, many of the rioters had had low income and been unemployed and “do not have much of a legitimate future” (ibid. para. 2). Topping also reported that youths had stolen goods from shops and that some of them even had uncovered faces. Some looters had also been trying to sell the stolen goods. Some looters had found justification for their actions, saying that big “companies have lots of money, while they have very little” (ibid. para. 9). Looting had been perceived “as a less risky activity than rioting: ‘Looting tends to involve a wider range of people – children, women, older people – because it does not involve physical violence. Riots enable people to lose their inhibitions, give them liberty to do things they wouldn't normally do.’” (ibid. para. 13) A Tottenham resident had said that “looters had disregarded the needs of the area and local people” (ibid. para. 14), as smaller shops were also looted.

Paul Lewis (2011e) wrote in article “Hackney rioters and police in hand-to-hand combat” on 8 August that youths had been using burning vehicles as barricades. On the evening of the same day, unlike on previous nights, there had been more women involved in acts of rioting. Also, police officers were being attacked by youths. Matthew Taylor (para. 15) conveyed in
article “London riots: conflagration and carnage in the capital and beyond”, in the section about Croydon on 9 August, the thoughts of the Leader of Croydon Council: this was ‘mindless hooliganism’ and that “[t]his [was] pure criminal activity by mindless thugs and morons who think it's acceptable to be able to go out, cause criminal damage and steal from people”.

Gavin Knight (para. 2) believed in “London riots are not the work of organised gangs” on 9 August that those riots were not organised by gangs because gangs “do not attack members of their own community”. Lisa O’Carroll and Caroline Davies (para. 3) reported in “London riots: photographers targeted by looters” that a reporter “was mugged by three hooded looters outside Currys in Brixton on Sunday night with £2,500 of video equipment stolen”. Similar attacks occurred on the Pembury Estate in Hackney and on multiple occasions in Tottenham.

Gavin Knight (para. 2) believed in “London riots are not the work of organised gangs” on 9 August that those riots were not organised by gangs because gangs “do not attack members of their own community”. Lisa O’Carroll and Caroline Davies (para. 3) reported in “London riots: photographers targeted by looters” that a reporter “was mugged by three hooded looters outside Currys in Brixton on Sunday night with £2,500 of video equipment stolen”. Similar attacks occurred on the Pembury Estate in Hackney and on multiple occasions in Tottenham.

Severin Carrell said in “Glasgow boy arrested for ‘inciting riots’ on Facebook” that a 16-year-old boy has to appear in court because of inciting riots using Facebook. This is comparable to incidents in London as well as other cities where advanced communication technology devices, such as BlackBerry, Twitter and other social networks, were used for inciting and spreading the riots, as reported by various articles in The Guardian.

Kevin Braddock (para. 1) wrote in the 9 August article “The power of the hoodie” that the use of hooded sweatshirts for concealment (i.e., to prevent visual identification) was widespread during the riots, through which, for some people, “a generation’s default wardrobe choice was transformed into an instant criminal cloak for London’s looting youth”, even though “the hoodie and the folk devil it represents have been with us for a long time” prior to these events.

Sandra Laville and Jessica Shepherd (para. 1) stated in “England riots: primary school assistant pleads guilty to Croydon burglary” that a learning mentor at Stockwell primary school, south London, 31-year-old Alexis Bailey “ha[d] appeared in court accused of being part of a mob that tried to loot an electrical store during the riots in London”. Nobody had witnessed Bailey taking goods, but “[h]e pleaded guilty to burglary with intent to steal” (ibid. para. 6).

2.2.1 Analysis of the information from The Guardian regarding the rioters

According to the article “Tottenham in flames as protesters riot” in The Guardian, the initial mental model applying to the gathered protesters was that of demonstrators, as supported by Lewis (2011a), and, therefore, their actions were restrained. Demonstrating had
been their primary social function. Both of the aforementioned newspaper sources explored the turning point when their actions had become violent, which implies that their cognitive structures were receptive to this turn to violence and “brazen looting” (ibid. para. 2). One of the mental models of the rioters presented by Lewis was ‘teenagers’, who were doing the looting, while other non-descript people were destroying property. Lewis referred to other attackers simply as ‘people’, which implies that the social functions were neutral and not purposefully violent. As a result, their behaviour could be described as passive on the outset, and that is reflected in Lewis’ article, but his note “[s]ome were even filling suitcases” demonstrates that their cognitive structures became ‘gradually’ aggressive as their actions became illegal. The fact that the group of protesters “consisted of local residents, community leaders, and some of Duggan’s relatives, including his fiancée” (ibid. para. 11) and that it was “initially fronted by women” (ibid. para. 16) shows that the identity (mental model) of the protesters was heterogeneous, because various people take part in passive and peaceful actions, such as protesting. “[O]rganisers said some younger men turned their anger to two police cars, which were set on fire” (ibid. para. 23) signifies that the cognitive structures of the younger men became in the course of the protesting violent and this was reflected in their social functions. Witnesses, who were likely demonstrators-protesters themselves (as opposed to passive bystanders), attributed the so-called spark to an incident that saw ‘a 16-year-old woman’ “attacked with shields and batons” (ibid. para. 26) for expressing the interests of the collective group of demonstrators-protesters in demanding answers from the police. According to bystanders, “a younger, more aggressive crowd arrive[d] around dusk, some carrying weapons” (ibid. para. 18), which means that their intentions were aggressive from the very start, so that was the group with that specific mental model.

Lewis’ (2011b) choice of words, ‘looters’, shows that the thinking and aims of rioters were not passive or peaceful and that their behaviour was in accordance with their mental model. His description “[n]earby, large groups of youths congregated in the surrounding streets with sticks, bottles and hammers” (ibid. para. 4) focuses on the age of the rioters and thus indicates unrelated ideological affiliation with the original protesters revealed by the attitude of these participants. In addition, their use of ‘balaclava masks’ demonstrates that the rioters did not want to be identified as a precautionary measure, showing that violence was their planned course of action. As in the previous article, Lewis (ibid., 2011a) mentioned that there was a mob of 100, which hints at herd mentality as the driving force or a factor that intensified their behaviour.
In accordance with the previous article, in which he said that the looters were mostly young men (even though, one car-jacking incident was caused by a 14-year-old boy), Lewis’ (2011c: para. 5) next article pointed out that this description applied to “[t]eenagers and adults” as well – it shows the two opposite sides of the identity of the rioters, rather highlighting their age and not focusing on their behaviour and attitudes. The fact that large groups of youths had gathered in the streets with sticks and hammers seemingly implies that these rioters had united under the same mental model, and that their thinking and intended as well as actual behaviour were violent. Sandra Laville, Paul Lewis and Caroline Davies quoted the words ‘mindless thugs’ spoken by police commander Hanstock, which shows both that this discursive evaluation originates specifically from the authorities and that the thinking of the rioters was, in addition to being violent, uncontrolled and their plans disorganised. Dave Hill was concerned that subcultures that had been formed due to unemployment-related conditions were not unique to Tottenham, but were present also in other suburbs surrounding London. A crucial factor in determining rioters’ thinking and behaviour is their background. His article brought to attention the existence of societies with potentially violent ideologies within the greater society.

Sandra Laville reported the accounts of non-participating witnesses saying that the number of people involved in the riots had amounted to ‘150–300 youths’ together in one place at the same time, with implications that their gathering had been well directed and their thinking was opportunistic, aiming at violence. Sarah Bolesworth et al. extended the mental model of the rioters to armed groups, who made a concerted effort to upgrade their weaponry in order to attack the police. The fact that they had brought weapons along in the first place shows that the rioting was in their thinking, and, therefore, it was expressed through their actions.

Paul Lewis, Matthew Taylor and Ben Quinn explicitly referred to the rioters as ‘teenagers’. They explicitly called their target “a preplanned destination” – the aim of these rioters was violent from the beginning and this was reflected in the incidents connected with them. Lewis (2011d) added that some had covered faces, which indicates that their intent was to stay unidentified. Lewis continued by describing the general aggressive actions of those answering to the mental model of rioters – the author believed that they were deliberately violent and destructive. Lewis, Taylor and Quinn emphasised that the prevailing demographic was almost uniformly that of younger males. According to them, their looting was well co-ordinated. Sandra Laville, Paul Lewis, Vikram Dodd and Caroline Davies quoted the words of the MP for Tottenham to have been ‘mindless, mindless people’, focusing on the violent thinking and behaviour of the rioters in general and the illegality of their whole undertaking.
Sam Jones, Paul Lewis, Matthew Taylor and Ben Quinn (2011: para. 13) described an incident where “a fight broke out [between] rival gangs” on a neutral ground. This shows the existence of rifts between rioters themselves. The use of the word ‘gangs’ by the authors illustrates their attitude towards such subcultures being part of the underworld mentality, even though the goals of the individuals of both groups in question had not been violent, since they had gone to see a hospitalised acquaintance. The same authors concluded that the looting in London was carried out mainly by “‘small and mobile’ groups” (ibid. para. 15) designed specifically for robbing poorly protected targets. The people damaging property in central and northern London were simply referred to as youths or teenagers, without making such a distinction as looters or rioters. Again, their possession of masks shows their preparation.

Sparrow’s (2011: para. 25) article expressed the Deputy Mayor of London’s opinion describing the participants as follows: “‘feral youth’ and violent people”. His assessment had been that “they are anarchists or part of organised gangs” (ibid. para. 26), whose objectives were to “create a sense of mayhem” (ibid.) and to take advantage of the opportunities to loot in the aftermath.

David Lawrence confirmed the previous assessment in identifying opportunistic looting as the initial goal of the large proportion of the rioters, not demanding justice for the shooting, as was believed to be the aim of the demonstrators-protesters. Lewis (2011d) applied the generalised term ‘crowd’ to refer to everyone who exhibited the violent tendencies of damaging walls in order to obtain stones which to throw at police officers. Therefore, the rioters’ actions had turned violent and become more planned. Smaller groups tended to avoid confrontations with the police, looking instead for ‘unguarded shops’. In Enfield, the majority of the rioters was of white ethnicity, contrary to allegations that the rioting was done exclusively by “black youths” (ibid. para. 16), indicating that the social functions were not ultimately determined by the skin colour. The rioters’ determination to hide their identities demonstrated that they were unwilling to take responsibility of their actions, possibly due to their original motives. In one case, a young woman was quoted expressing her opinion about the police bringing about the unrest. Likely, her opinion was characteristic of other people as well, some of whom may have done the rioting.

Alexandra Topping’s article, as exemplified by the quote “[y]oung looters from poor estates have nothing to lose and no reason to obey social norms”, focused on the background of the young and shows that their thoughts and actions are formed and influenced by their background. The mental model of looters and rioters was consequently applied to them by criminologist and youth culture expert Professor John Pitts. Looters themselves were quoted
to have defended their actions as follows: firstly, because of the obvious financial inequality in the society; secondly, they distinguished themselves from the rioters, whose activities they considered more risky, as it involved ‘physical violence’. They were quoted to have said that these riots have allowed them to express their true intentions.

Paul Lewis’ (2011e) description of youths using burning vehicles as barricades shows that they started creating stationary strongholds to take control of certain areas and maintain them. The reporter mentioned the increase in the involvement of women in comparison to the previous days. Foremost, this implies that the social functions and cognitive structures of such young women were comparable to those of males. Matthew Taylor’s (2011: para. 15) article quoted the assessment of the Leader of Croydon Council, who berated the groups as “mindless thugs and morons” whose actions were “pure criminal activity”.

Gavin Knight (2011: para. 2) believed that these riots had not been organised by gangs because gangs “do not attack members of their own community”, excluding the possibility that different gangs might attack each other due to conflicting interests and social functions. O’Carroll and Davies stated that the mugging of a reporter resulted in expensive work-related equipment being stolen, thus showing that their actions were informed and precautions were taken so as not to be identified in the media.

Severin Carrell reported the use social networks by the rioters to a significant extent. This shows either that the organisers had been preparing for this eventuality or that the modern mass communication devices enable such planning in unprecedented efficiency.

Kevin Braddock explained the use of hooded sweatshirts by looters, muggers, robbers, etc. He concluded that this is not a new phenomenon, but has seen such use in other analogous instances. The fact that such a great proportion of looters and rioters attempted to avoid identification through this illustrates their preparedness prior to joining the event.

Laville and Shepherd’s article began to evaluate the aftermath by focusing on a primary school learning mentor who had confessed to an attempted robbery of a local store, without even being witnessed. He was one of the individuals who had joined the looting and later accepted the responsibility for his contribution (i.e., enforcing the herd mentality and prolonging the riots). However, this sheds light on the actual diversity of the groups who were involved, giving a similarly diverse idea of their motives.
2.3 Articles from newspapers in other English-speaking countries

John F. Burns and Ravi Somaiya’s (para. 5) article “Britain Debates Riots and Fears They Set a Pattern” in The New York Times on 10 August 2011 considered “the presence of young men and women with regular jobs among the riot suspects lined up in police wagons outside courthouses in London” to be surprising, since their actions were characteristic of “an underclass of alienated young people, with no jobs and few prospects”. The looters who had been identified by the police “included a graphic designer, a postal employee, a dental assistant, a teaching aide, a forklift driver and a youth worker” (ibid. para. 6), who consequently appeared in the court “still in their jeans and hooded sweatshirts” (ibid.). David Cameron condemned the gangs leading the riots, which attracted unaffiliated individuals, as ‘groups of thugs’.

Richard Sennett and Saskia Sassen (para. 1) said in their article “Cameron’s Broken Windows” on the same day that “looters [had] rampaged through Hackney” and that, in addition to police officers, there were also “residents [who] had to chase them off with butcher knives, truncheons and baseball bats”. The same journalists are of the opinion that the rioters are “young men of varying races – despite reports of a monolithic mob of alienated ‘black youth’” (ibid. para. 5).

In the article “Looters target Brixton store as lawlessness spreads after Tottenham riots” on 8 August in The Sydney Morning Herald it was stated that “gangs of youths [had] pelted police with missiles” (AFP, AP, PA 2011: para. 2). Georgina Robinson et al. conveyed in the article “Australians caught in London riots” on 8 August the words of an Australian living in London, who had said that ‘teenagers on school holidays’ were the rioters.

According to Georgia Robinson et al. article “Riots spread as police lose control”, social media had been an important part in the spread of the riots. “Youths used sites such as Twitter and messaging services on Blackberry handsets to co-ordinate attacks” (ibid. para. 21).

Julia May (2011: para. 1) wrote in 8 August article “‘You’re attacking the community you come from’” that “masked and hooded rioters [had taken] over the streets”. “Large groups of youths, many of them no older than 16 and wearing hooded tops, congregated on street corners in the early afternoon” (ibid. para. 6). The majority of the rioters were “in their teens and on summer holidays from school” (ibid. para. 9). Ravi Somaiya and John Burns said in their article “Mayhem spreads to other major cities” on 10 August that the rioters had connected their grasp of digital technology with racing through London’s traffic ‘on bicycles and mopeds’.
In his article “History trashed by ‘mindless yobs’” on 11 August, Graeme Paton wrote that the MP for Croydon Central, Gavin Barwell, had referred to the rioters with the quoted phrase for destroying an old symbolic furniture store. Martin Evans and Raf Sanchez focused in their article “Mother of brazen looter tells of shame” on the identity of a young woman who had stolen training shoes. As it turned out, she was “unemployed mother-of-one, who [had] recently [been] evicted from her council flat” (2011: para. 3). During the looting, she “made no attempt to hide her identity as she joined others” (ibid.). The woman was born in London and has lived mainly in Tottenham, “growing up in the streets around where this week’s disorder began” (ibid. para. 10). Neighbours from her previous block, “from where she [had] recently [been] evicted”, said that “she was a troublemaker who was always having parties and creating lots of noise” (ibid. para. 12).

“Picture emerges of alleged UK rioters” and Nino Bucci’s article “Well-heeled join downtrodden in looting spree” on 11 August said that the rioters were “[f]rom an organic chef and an opera house steward to a university student” (AFP 2011c: para. 1), whereas, the latter article adds that the rioters included ‘an 11-year-old boy’. Also, “a youth worker and a forklift truck driver” (ibid. para. 7) were involved in the unrest. According to the former article, “many involved seemed to fit a picture of youngsters from broken families marginalised by society” (ibid. para. 2). However, an alleged rioter had been a student “at Essex University near London” (ibid. para. 7). The majority were “young men from poor areas” (ibid. para. 10) and the rioters were of varying races. Women were also present, in the ages “from their teens to their forties” (ibid.), but “gangs of hooded youths from deprived areas were undoubtedly some of the main participants in the trouble” (ibid. para. 12).

Megan Levy (2011b: para. 4) reported in her article “‘They threatened to stab me’: student tells of backpack attack that shocked the world” that a student’s bicycle had been stolen by a boy “no older than 12” and that another thief had taken his phone. In addition, the attacking group was armed with knives.

The article “Scott Stinson: If the London rioters were protesters they wouldn’t look so happy” in National Post on 9 August 2011 depicted the rioters as ‘giddy youths’ who had looted shops, and that this is not to be considered their fault. An article “Peter Goodspeed: CCTV puts eyes on London rioters” by Goodspeed on 9 August said that “[t]he looters, [thugs] and arsonists who have ravaged a half-dozen cities and boroughs” (para. 5) were being recorded by closed-circuit television (CCTV) security cameras, and added that Scotland Yard had referred to them as “people that were engaged in criminality” (para. 9). In the article, it was added that the “[p]olice also could be turning to criminals themselves to make arrests”
(ibid. para. 18). The 10 August article “U.K. PM dismisses ‘phoney concerns about human rights’ as police post riot photos” reported that “London’s Daily Mail, meanwhile, felt the release of photos hasn’t gone far enough, and compiled their own list of alleged looters” (NPS 2011: para. 5).

Courtney Greenberg stated in her “BBC should have stopped calling rioters ‘protesters’ sooner, corp. admits” article on 11 August that “[t]he BBC has received a number of complaints regarding the use of the word ‘protesters’ when describing the participants of the chaotic London riots” (para. 1), but the BBC saw their “coverage of the London riots [as] not inaccurate, despite calling those involved ‘protesters’” (para. 4). Mohammed Abbas and Adrian Croft (para. 1) wrote on 11 August in “‘This is not about poverty, it’s about culture’: Cameron” that British Prime Minister David Cameron had “blamed the worst riots in Britain for decades on street gang members and opportunistic looters and denied government austerity measures or poverty caus[ing] the violence”. Cameron had also promised to punish “the lawless minority, the criminals who’ve taken what they can get” (ibid. para. 4).

2.3.1 Analysis of the information from The New York Times, The Sydney Morning Herald and National Post regarding the rioters

Burns and Somaiya (2011: para. 5) were astonished by the fact that “young men and women with regular jobs” had become rioters and were consequently accused of crimes. This illustrates that the demographic diversity was represented by the presence of individuals from various social backgrounds. Cameron had called the gangs ‘groups of thugs’ for attracting individuals. Regular people began looting and rioting, and, therefore, their social functions and cognitive structures became that of the rioters. As a result, their mental model was recognised as such characteristic of a repressed underclass.

Sennett and Sassen described the rioters as violent, ‘rampaging’ people. The rioters were young males of various ethnicities. The last statement was written in an effort to debunk the rumour that the rioters were a homogeneous “mob of alienated ‘black youth’” (Sennett and Sassen 2011: para. 5)

The article “Looters target Brixton store as lawlessness spreads after Tottenham riots” said that ‘gangs of youths’ had confronted the police. The rioters’ behaviour was aggressive and it had been recognised by the police as ‘lawless’, since they were attacking the police. Georgina Robinson et al. wrote that ‘teenagers on holidays’ were the rioters.
According to Robinson et al. (2011) article, youths had used social networks to spread the riots. This shows that they were preparing for violence.

May (2011) devoted her article to highlight the fact that ‘masked and hooded rioters’ were attacking their own community. There were large groups of them, the majority of who were on ‘holidays from school’. This leads to the conclusion that the social functions of these teenagers contrast with those of the communities at large, causing paradoxically counterproductive objectives and actions within the same communities. According to Somaiya and Burns (2011), the spread of the riots was facilitated by the use of digital technology as well as various vehicles that allow a higher degree of mobility. This demonstrates that the rioters were not acting spontaneously, but had the means to carry out looting raids.

Paton (2011) quoted an MP as having said that ‘mindless yobs’ had ‘trashed’ a historical store. The cognitive structures of these people were therefore unconcerned with such values as history and culture, focusing instead on personal interests over those of collective ones. Evans and Sanchez’s (2011) article emphasised, in connection with the incident of looting by a young woman, that there is a certain age at which people can become looters and take advantage of such a larger-scale disorder. In addition, this criminal behaviour, of which other demographics are more likely to disapprove, is also associated with domestic problems and recurring phenomena thereof.

The article “Picture emerges of alleged UK rioters” and Bucci’s (2011) article revealed once again that the demographic of the rioters was diverse in terms of professions and ages. The former source presented the following mental models: “youngsters from broken families marginalised by society” (AFP 2011c: para. 2) and “young men from poor areas” (ibid. para. 10). The rioters had two noteworthy characteristics: although there were also women of all ages present, the majority were ‘young men’ and multiracial ‘gangs of hooded youths’ played a more significant part than any particular ethnic group.

Levy’s (2011b) article focused on the violent tendencies of a group of youths who had mugged a student in the street. Unlike most of those attacking the police with improvised weapons, that group had brought weapons along.

The article “Scott Stinson: If the London rioters were protesters they wouldn’t look so happy” drew a distinction between two groups divided by motivation, namely the rioters that had been the original protesters and ‘giddy youths’ whose actions were guided by short-term objectives and generally uninformed. Goodspeed (2011: para. 9) conveyed the words of Scotland Yard, who had recognised no such difference between participants on the basis of
the latter’s knowledge and awareness regarding their actions, but identified all those involved as “people that were engaged in criminality”. The article “U.K. PM dismisses ‘phony concerns about human rights’ as police post riot photos” showed that, unlike the authorities, the media started to labelling everyone caught on camera as ‘looters’.

Greenberg (2011) believed that the BBC should not have kept calling the ‘protesters’ as such after their actions turned violent. Apparently, there were multiple occasions on which someone had disagreed with the BBC’s assessment of the groups’ identity. But the BBC downplayed the importance of such descriptors in favour of maintaining the accuracy of their coverage of the riots. This reveals that the public pays close attention to the choice of words concerning the identity of social groups. Abbas and Croft (2011: para. 1) quoted the words of Prime Minister Cameron, who had blamed ‘street gang members’ and ‘opportunistic looters’, whose criminality had not been caused by “government austerity measures or poverty”. Rather the events had been initiated and influenced by fundamental differences in the societal norms of the ‘lawless minority’.

2.4 Articles from Estonian newspapers

The three articles from Eesti Päevaleht: “Venemaa soovitab kodanikel teatud Londoni piirkondi vältida [Russia advises its citizens to avoid certain areas in London]” on 8 August 2011, “Briti politsei kavandab laamendajate vastu plastikkuulide kasutamist” and Heiki Suurkask’s article “Politsei tappis päti, Tottenham põleb” on 9 August expressed clearly that the rioters were offenders, whereas Suurkask said that the rioters included mostly gangs. The article “Graafik: tänavarahutused koguva d Inglismaal hoogu [Chart: Street riots gathering momentum in England]”, released on the same day, presented the fact that Tottenham, where the rioting had begun, is one of the poorest areas of London, where unemployment rate is very high. The borough is known for having a great population of immigrants from Africa and Caribbean.

On 10 August, “Londoni linnaosa ähvardab tänavatel märatsejad kodust ilma jätta [London’s borough threatens to leave street rioters without home]” basically declared in the text that the rioters were people who had committed a crime through their actions – a wording that is essentially very neutral and objective. Sten Mahov conveyed on 10 August in “Eestlased Londonis: muretseme, kuidas õhtul koju saada [Estonians in London: We worry about getting home in the evening]” the experience of Priit Piip, who lives in East London in Benthal Green, and who had witnessed the riots. Reportedly, Piip had seen youths who were
wearing big hoodies and scarves to hide their faces. Piip adds that those youths were a completely unrelated party to the shooting incident on the day in question. He thinks that their participation is pure violence. Mari Murumets, whose experience is also conveyed in the same article and who lived in East Dulwich at the time, described seeing men running while wearing masks on their faces and carrying plastic bags, without describing them through words with subjectively negative connotations. It should be taken into account that she had not witnessed any large-scale rioting. According to Eva Otsing, on the other hand, these people, who Mahov himself calls mässajad ‘rebels’ as well as märatsejad ‘rioters’ throughout his article, are essentially victims themselves. She had encountered situations which she calls chaotic, but she blames the society: This is, by no means, the fault of these innocent children, “the lost generation”, who are not taught basic values, and who would therefore have no sympathies or principles to guide their actions.

Heiki Suurkask described in “Rüüstaja tüüppportree: 19-aastane, kes õppis lugema kolme aasta eest [Portrait of a rioter: a 19-year-old who learned to read three years ago]” on 11 August that a typical rioter had been a citizen whose livelihood depends on dole money. He stated that predominant types were youths on the irresponsible side. This article is comparable to other Estonian news articles in the way in which it calls participants gangs.

Vosman’s (2011a) article as well as Loonet’s (2011a) article in Postimees on 7 August both call the people active in the events märatsejad ‘rioters’. In addition, the former article reported stores to have fallen victim to lootings by the rioters. Martin Smutov conveyed the words of Tereesa Protes, who works in an oil company, in his article “Eestlane: loodetavasti on politsei tänaseks valmis [Estonian: Hopefully, the police will be prepared for today]” on 9 August. She called the rioters mässajad ‘rebels’.

Vosman titled his article “Briti peaminister huligaanidele: te saate tundma sea duse täit jõudu [British Prime Minister to hooligans: You will feel the full force of the law]” on the same day with ostensibly partial language. Vosman described Cameron as having said that hooligans are not only ruining the lives of other people, but those of themselves as well. Inga Höglund reported on 9 August in “Vägivald šokeeris Londoni elanikke [Violence shocked London’s residents]“ the experience of the residents of the London Borough of Croydon who had suffered a severe damage during the riots. She translated the words of an anonymous local resident as follows: “Nad on kõik ajudeta idioodid, kes tahavad midagi varastada. Selle pole mingit seost sellega, mis toimus Tottenhamis.” (Höglund 2011a: para. 2), which includes such words as ‘brainless idiots’ to describe the individuals responsible, since there is no connection between their actions and the Tottenham incident. Höglund (2011c: para. 7)
proceeded in another article, “Londonis valmistutakse uueks mässuks [People of London are preparing for a new riot]”, to share Sandra Laville’s words to The Guardian that “500 uurijat vaatavad läbi turvakaamerate videoid rahutustest, et tabada võimalikke kurjategijaid“, which implies that 500 investigators are dedicating time to distinguish possible criminals from the crowds.

Merje Pors conveyed the thoughts of Simon Brunning, who was an IT consultant and lived in London at the time, in “Inglane: see pole protest, vaid lihtsalt viha [Englishman: This is not a protest but simply anger]” on 9 August, that the riots are not about protesting, it is an expression of anger. For Brunning, it was shocking to see youths rioting in their own neighbourhoods. Brunning had called them vandaalitsejad ‘vandals’. The rioters that he indicated were mainly unemployed young people. Brunning is of the opinion that 99 percent of the rioters did not even know the name of Mark Duggan.

Loonet’s article on 9 August “Londoni rüüstajad: näitame politseile, et võime kõike teha [London’s looters: We’ll show the police we can do anything]” focused on an incident where young women had considered lawlessness as a way of amusing themselves, drinking wine on the street from a bottle that they had stolen from a local store, contrasting themselves to the government, the rich as well as the authorities.

Höglund’s 10 August article “Reuters: Londoni mäss viitab palju laialdasemale noorte rahutuste riskile [Reuters: London’s riot indicates to a much more broader risk of youth unrest]” began by comparing the rioters in question to those in the Muslim world who are fighting for democratic progress, but continued by calling the former group youths without perspectives who are angry at the system. According to Reuters, the wave of violence in Britain is almost completely nihilistic.

2.4.1 Analysis of the information from Eesti Päevaleht and Postimees regarding the rioters

The articles “Venemaa soovitab kodanikel teatud Londoni piirkondi vältida” and “Briti politsei kavandab laamendajate vastu plastikkuulide kasutamist” defined the rioters as offenders, and Suurkask’s (2011a) text described them as gangs. The article “Graafik: tänavarahutused koguvad Inglismaal hoogu” emphasised that the population of the area from where the riots originated is poor and with a great rate of unemployment. According to the previously mentioned source, the population of the area in question consists mainly of immigrants of African ancestry.
The article “Londoni linnaosa ähvardab tänavatel märatsejad kodust ilma jätta” presented information with no evaluative distinctions regarding the identity of those involved in the riots, but relied on neutral vocabulary. Mahov’s (2011) article described the experience of three Estonian eyewitnesses to the riots, the first of whom had seen hooded youths with covered faces, and determined their actions to have been unrelated to the earlier demonstrations for demanding answers to the shooting of Duggan and instead focused on pure violence. The second person had also seen masked people, but no explicit violence, and she related the experience to the reporter without recourse to evaluative labels. The third witness’ account display terms like ‘lost generation’, which contrasts with the reporter’s choice of words between her quotations.

The purpose of Suurkask’s (2011b) next article was to characterise a typical rioter and, therefore, compose a mental model which to present to the Estonian reader. The average that he derived was a poorly educated youth sustained by social welfare. The reporter associated the activities of such a person with those of gangs.

Neither Vosman (2011a) nor Loonet (2011a) distinguished between looters and rioters, but generalised all those involved as the latter. Smutov (2011) quoted a locally employed person who believed the rioters to be rebels.

Vosman (2011b) quoted Prime Minister Cameron saying that those involved were hooligans, who were unwittingly disrupting their own lives in addition to those of others. His statement illustrates that all those groups are interrelated and their actions influence the whole society. Höglund (2011a) reported a local resident’s opinions concerning the rioters as brainless idiots, who were ultimately not motivated by the notion of seeking justice after the shooting incident. This is obviously a very emotionally loaded evaluation and this shows that the locals themselves did not identify with those groups of rioters, having formulated their own mental models of gang members. Höglund’s (2011c) second article referred to Laville, who had said that the authorities were determined to establish the guilt of participants prior to their arrest, not just categorising all suspects as criminals.

Pors (2011) once again referred to the words of a local resident in order to establish that the protesters and the rioters were not the same group of people and the latter is unaffiliated with the demonstrations against the shooting of Duggan. Furthermore, he had described the rioters as the unemployed young, calling them vandals for turning against their own communities.

Loonet (2011b) gave revealing insights into discursive expressions of a few of the looters themselves, specifically young women who had derived enjoyment (and private property not
belonging to them) from lawlessness. They themselves referred to the difference between their material resources and status compared to that of higher classes.

Höglund (2011d) began by implying that the consequences of these riots were comparable to those in the Muslim world presently fighting for democratic rights, but it contrasts in terms of underlying ideologies, because the rioters in Britain lacked specific objectives. Overall, Reuters agreed that these rioters do not use violence as the means, but as the end itself, which leads to the conclusion that these groups are neither self-sufficient nor would they be able to continue to exist on their own.

2.5 Comparison of the vocabulary utilised in the newspapers

The British articles I observed began the subject by calling the rioters ‘demonstrators’, who consequently turned violent, ‘people’ or ‘teenagers’. This choice of wording is rather neutral and descriptive. Most of the articles used the word looters, which shows that the attitude of journalists towards them was rather condemning because of their violence. Many articles in The Guardian focused on the gathering young people. On the contrary, some articles highlighted that those involved had been small yet mobile groups. Articles reflected that young people had been preparing for the riots. The participants had included ‘adults’ as well as ‘children’, and there had been no discernable difference on the basis of ethnicity, ‘white’ or ‘black’. The aforementioned points demonstrate that a diverse demographic constituted the participants identified as the rioters. Quite a few of those groups had been armed and were confronting the police. Then there were those articles the journalists of which expressed opinions, anger about the rioters, referring to them as ‘mindless people’ or ‘mindless thugs’ and ‘morons’ or as ‘feral youth’ and ‘violent people’, which shows that the journalists thought of them as pure criminals. Those journalists described the background these youths come from and focused on the issue of unemployment. Some rioters had even attacked reporters. British articles added mentions of the use of social networks by the rioters in order to spread the riots. The defining characteristics of the rioters and looters were that they had covered their faces and wore hooded sweatshirts – an article of clothing that was referred to in very many articles. Even among the rioters themselves, social rifts had created conflicts.

Similarly to the British articles, the ones in The New York Times also referred to the demographic diversity among the rioters that did not allow profiling solely on the grounds of either specific age or race. The articles also revealed that Prime Minister Cameron had used
the word ‘groups of thugs’ because they had attracted other individuals to join them. Another article said that the rioters had been young men from various ethnical backgrounds. Some authors called them ‘violent’ and ‘rampaging’ people, as had done the British articles.

The articles in the Australian newspaper focused on essentially the same characteristics and brought out the same words as the British articles; for example, ‘teenagers’ and their background as marginalised social groups, but added that the younger of them were on school holidays and that the rioters were masked and wearing hoodies. Their actions were considered to be lawless. The articles also highlighted the prevailing demographic diversity, as well as explained the use of social networks in organising the riots.

In the Canadian articles, the rioters were differentiated from the original protesters, with the journalists calling them ‘giddy youths’. The media had started calling everyone caught on camera as ‘looters’, not just those who were proven to be guilty of that. It was believed that the rioters should not be called ‘protesters’, for their actions were becoming violent and their motives were fundamentally different from those of the original demonstrators. Cameron had called the rioters ‘street gang members’ and ‘opportunistic looters’, adding that their violent tendencies had resulted from their underlying societal values, not just from difficult economic conditions.

Estonian articles relied on such vocabulary as laamendajad ‘brawlers’, offenders and gangs. Like the previous articles, these also connected the motivations of the rioters with the influence of the unemployment rate and with the fact that young people in these troubled areas, populated mainly with African or Caribbean immigrants, are often poorly educated. Comparable to the British as well as other articles published in English is the fact that Estonian sources employed the word märatsejad ‘rioters’ to refer primarily to masked and hooded youths, whom a compassionate analyser described with the term ‘lost generation’. One eyewitness had even described them as mässajad ‘rebels’, fighting to improve social conditions. According to quotations from Prime Minister Cameron, all participants were ‘hooligans’. The locals disapproving of the rioters’ methods distanced themselves from the latter group by describing the destructive participants as ‘brainless idiots’ who were suspected of being unaware of the real reasons, namely the shooting incident. In contrast with the information given in the paragraph about the Canadian newspaper, it was eventually concluded that ‘criminal’ should apply only to those whose guilt has been officially established. The Estonian sources referred to a distinction that originated among the local residents: between those protesting against Duggan’s killing and ‘vandalising’ rioters. One article featured an interview of female looters, who themselves defined their identity in terms
of materialistic conditions and their relative relationship to other, wealthier groups. One occasion warranted a comparison to the contemporary rebellions in the Muslim world, but the British counterparts, the rioters, were said to lack noble ideologies.
3 DESCRIPTIONS OF SPECIFIC EVENTS

3.1 Van Dijk’s theory of opinions

Van Dijk’s (2000: 29) above-named theory defines opinions as “beliefs that feature an evaluative concept”. Categorisations of human groups depend on beliefs that may be either factual or based on subjective evaluations, making them opinions, so it is crucial to distinguish between the two because they carry different weight in the legal system and social interactions in general. Judgements that are not based solely on facts are formed instead by individual as well as collective factors, such as culture, and the inclusion of “groups and conflicting group interests” (ibid.) makes opinions created under these circumstances ‘ideological’.

In addition to factual beliefs and opinions, van Dijk (ibid.) recognises another important contrast between “the [parallel] criteria of truth and falsity”. Since both types of the aforementioned beliefs “involve a judgement” (ibid. 30), which is either true or evaluative. Therefore, if a judgement is relevant only in the context of a single group and depends on their cultural norms, then it is an opinion. But if a judgement has a potentially intercultural validity at any given point of time, then it is based on criteria that are recognised as truthful. Both factual and evaluative beliefs are nonetheless subject to change over time and vary across cultures, but the former is derived from knowledge. The knowledge itself, though, may be ideological if it is ostensibly subjective in favouring one group’s truth criteria above that of others.

Van Dijk states that his theory does not define opinions as ‘false beliefs’, but as beliefs based on norms and values. On the other hand, factual beliefs can be false if they are based on flawed knowledge, and groups and cultures may rectify such flaws over time, hence truth criteria are not universal and likely to change. Van Dijk concludes by saying that the distinction between facts and evaluations are not revealed by subjectivity, objectivity or
consensus of the speaking subjects. Neither does he propose that facts “are mental representations” (ibid.) and evaluations are verbally expressed because the reverse can also be true. The descriptions of the specific events that are presented in this chapter are ultimately either factual beliefs or opinions, which will enable the observation of their defining characteristics in the following analyses.

3.2 Articles from the British newspaper

Paul Lewis gives the reported figure of injuries by 7 August 2011 in the title of his article in *The Guardian* “Tottenham riots: 26 police officers injured and 42 people arrested”, specifying that, in addition, buildings and vehicles had been set alight in Tottenham, north London, as well as shops had been looted in the area. In another article by Lewis (2011a: para. 5) “Tottenham riots: a peaceful protest, then suddenly all hell broke loose” on the same day, he repeated that shops had been looted, but continued by adding that the riots had spread, saying: “on Wood Green high street, where approximately 100 people had spent hours burning cars and breaking into high-street shops. Some were even filling suitcases.” Arsonists had started a blaze at a supermarket and a carpet store; both had been ‘huge fires’.

The three subsequent articles, “Second night of violence in London – and this time it was organised” by Paul Lewis, Matthew Taylor and Ben Quinn, “London riots: Home secretary flies back after second night of violence” by Caroline Davies, Jasmine Coleman and Matthew Taylor and Lewis’ “Enfield and Edmonton riots: ‘The mood was calmer, it felt premeditated’” on 8 August reported that the riots had spread out of the Tottenham area. In “Hackney rioters and police in hand-to-hand combat” Lewis wrote that local youths of Hackney, east London, had used burning vehicles as barricades, plus several other vehicles had been set ablaze. Also, bystanders and journalists had been attacked by the rioters. The article “London riots: how a peaceful festival in Brixton turned into a looting free-for-all” by Taylor stated that the riots also erupted in south London, where the police had been attacked. “Shops along the high street were broken into and goods were taken from H&M, Vodafone, McDonald’s and T-Mobile as the police stood by, apparently powerless” (Taylor 2011: para. 4). The police had been confronted with rocks and other projectiles. Unfortunately, only the spread of fire ended the looting. In addition, a local Currys, an electronic store, was also looted by crowds.

Josh Halliday and Mark Sweney (2011) reported in “London riots: Sky, ITN and CNN reporters attacked” on 9 August that the BBC’s and Sky News’ journalists had been attacked in Croydon and Mark Stones, the Sky News reporter, was “forced to flee” from Clapham
Junction disturbance. Also, the broadcasting vans of ITV News, Channel 4 News and London Tonight had been smashed by the rioters. Lisa O’Carroll and Caroline Davies gave details of muggings and physical attacks suffered by photojournalists in “London riots: photographers targeted by looters”. A returning war correspondent had “£2,500 [worth] of video equipment” stolen “by three hooded looters outside Currys in Brixton” (2011: para. 3) two days prior. Other incidents included a “photographer [being] kicked to the ground and beaten by four youths on the Pembury Estate in Hackney” (ibid. para. 4) on 9 August, a videographer in Tottenham needing medical attention “after an angry mob broke into his home and started bashing him with bottles left in his hallway for recycling” (ibid. para. 5), two photographers for The Mail on Sunday had their “£8,000 [worth] of equipment robbed and smashed by a gang during what was described as a ‘lawless’ scene near Bruce Grove in Tottenham” (ibid. para. 6) and a freelance photojournalist “lost five hours of video footage from [7 August] when he decided to leave the protection of the police line on Effra Road in Brixton and get closer to the looting that had started after midnight in Currys” (ibid. para. 11).

By 10 August, major disturbances had subsided in London. According to Laville et al. (2011: para. 2) article “UK riots: London in lockdown, but violence flares across UK”, the events of the night of 8 August had been “described by Scotland Yard as the worst UK urban violence in living memory”. To counter that, the government had mobilised ‘16,000 police’ officers and granted them “the option of using plastic bullets” (ibid.). Although London had thus been contained to prevent “further significant trouble” (ibid. para. 1), they had not managed to stop the riots from spreading to other cities in the country.

3.2.1 Analysis of the information from The Guardian regarding the descriptions of specific events

Lewis’ (2011a, 2011c) and Lewis, Taylor, Quinn’s (2011) as well as Davies, Coleman, Taylor, Lewis’ (2011) articles reported how many people had been injured, the damage that had been done and the extent to which the riots had spread. They presented apparently mainly factual information, citing the authorities as their main source. This does not mean, of course, that they would exclude and not rely on unspecific or imprecise data, with such words as ‘approximately’ and ‘some’ in order to refer to unclear numbers of people involved. Lewis (2011a), for example, included the word ‘hell’, the connotation of which is very specifically negative, already in the title of his article, and according to him, the fires that had been started at a supermarket and a carpet store had been ‘huge’, which reflects an opinion and a
comparison based on a cultural norm. In addition, Lewis (2011e) wrote that journalists had also fallen victim to attacks by the rioters.

Taylor (2011) stated that the riots had spread and shops had been consequently looted. He used such an evaluative expression as ‘peaceful’ to refer to the earlier demonstrations in the title of his article, and he described the looting of shops as ‘free-for-all’. His source of information was primarily authoritative, but his vocabulary included opinions as well; for instance, ‘apparently powerless’, which he employed to refer to the police attempting to control the volatile situation, and which neither claims to be a cited fact nor free of evaluations relative to both the circumstantial context and cultural norms in general.

Halliday and Sweney’s (2011) as well as O’Carroll and Davies’ (2011) articles reported in detail and with necessary facts the attacks on various journalists by the rioters, whereby the former group had suffered considerable material losses. Due to the vocations of the victims described in these articles, the details given were quite specific. Nevertheless, O’Carroll and Davies, for example, demonstrated their opinions with the expression ‘angry’ to describe a mob that had attacked and robbed one individual. ‘Lawless’, on the other hand, is a term that does not reflect an evaluative opinion, like ‘powerless’ did in the previous paragraph, because it has a precise definition that is derivable from the cultural as well as social context and is not quantifiable along a continuum from one extreme to the other.

Laville et al. (2011: para. 2) conveyed the factual announcements as well as evaluative opinions of Scotland Yard who had declared that the events of the night of 8 August had been “the worst UK urban violence in living memory”. This superlative relies completely on the historical background of the specified region. Hence, the quoted noun phrase is essentially a contextually relevant fact that is influenced by an evaluative concept.

3.3 Articles from newspapers in other English-speaking countries

Ravi Somaiya (para. 9) described in his article “London Sees Twin Perils Converging to Fuel Riot” in The New York Times on 7 August 2011 that a ‘peaceful march’ had “turned into a pitched battle between hundreds of officers, some on horses, and equal numbers of rioters, wearing bandannas and armed with makeshift weapons that included table legs and an aluminum crutch”. Looting throughout northern London had left “streets littered with glass” (ibid.).

Somaiya with John F. Burns (2011a: para. 9) said in their article “Rioting Widens in London on 3rd Night of Unrest” on 8 August, in connection with Home Secretary Theresa
May’s statement, that “huge fires [had been] burning into the night in several of the neighborhoods overrun by the rioters”. They also mentioned that ‘hundreds’ of youths with covered faces had attacked police officers with various kinds of weaponry and that these youths had set alight vehicles and buildings.

Landon Thomas, Jr. and Somaiya (2011: para. 1) wrote in “London Riots Put Spotlight on Troubled, Unemployed Youths in Britain” on 9 August about the specific looting incidents, saying: a man of 19, a participant in the riots, had “showed off what he described as a $195 designer sweater that he [had] said he [had] taken during looting in Camden Town, a gentrified area of north London”. On 8 August, “an elderly woman [had been] hospitalized after a riot in which as many as 300 people [had] rampaged, setting fire to cars and looting stores” (ibid. para. 17).

John F. Burns and Ravi Somaiya (2011: para. 3) referred in “Britain Debates Riots and Fears They Set a Pattern” on 10 August to an incident where three Pakistani men had been killed on the night of 9 August “when a car mounted a sidewalk and crashed into a group of residents who had gathered to protect local businesses from attack”. According to the witnesses, the driver ‘appeared to be’ of Afro-Caribbean descent, “a 32-year-old man”, whom “the police arrested and charged /…/ with murder” (ibid. para. 3).

Robin Millard wrote in “Blazes, looting in London riot” in The Sydney Morning Herald on 7 August that the rioters in north London had been burning vehicles and buildings in the widespread looting. Millard (2011a: para. 5) continued by saying that a bus had been torched while the violence was spreading and that “gangs of hooded youths [had] descend[ed] on the area”. “The situation [had] raged out of control as hundreds ran amok, setting shops and other vehicles on fire” (ibid. para. 6). Millard (para. 8) noted that the riots were “the worst seen in years in the suburbs”. Officers had tried hard to regain control. Rioters had also looted shops from where they stole various kinds of goods.

In another article on 8 August, “London burns as youths run riot after shooting”, Millard added that eight police officers had been injured and taken to hospital. Also, “two patrol cars” (2011b: para. 7) had been attacked “about 200 metres from the police station” (ibid.). The rioters had thrown bottles at those cars, which were subsequently set alight. The vehicles had been empty and, therefore, officers were not hurt. The riots had “spread to another area of London as looters attacked a shopping centre in Wood Green, several kilometres away from the riots” (ibid. para. 10). On the same day, the article “New disturbances in London after rioting” said that the riots had spread to Enfield, “about eight kilometres north of Tottenham” (AP 2011: para. 3). In that area, a police car had then also been attacked.
The article “Looters target Brixton store as lawlessness spreads after Tottenham riots” said that “[t]housands [had] looted a giant electrical retail store in the southern area of Brixton in Monday's early hours and gangs of youths [had] pelted police with missiles” (AFP, AP, PA 2011: para. 2). Scotland Yard had commented on the developments that “‘copycat’ looting had spread to a number of boroughs in the capital’s north, east and south, while a mob of about 50 youths damaged property in Oxford Circus, at the heart of the city’s tourist area” (ibid. para. 3). The article on 8 August “London police arrest 100 in riots” stated that the riots had spread to many boroughs in north, south and east London, “with reports of trouble in Brixton, Enfield, Walthamstow and Islington” (PA 2011: para. 3). The official Metropolitan Police report to the press was as follows: “at least nine officers were injured, including three who were taken to hospital after being hit by a fast-moving vehicle at 12.45am local time. The officers had been in the process of making arrests in Chingford Mount, Waltham Forest, after a shop was looted by youths.” (ibid. para. 4) Also, a fight had broken out on the night of 7 August between “rival gangs attend[ing] King's College Hospital after two victims of minor stabbings were admitted” (ibid. para. 12), according to the police. In Brixton, a Foot Locker shop had been burnt and a nearby Currys store was looted. About 50 youths had “gathered in Oxford Circus, central London, and caused damage to property” (ibid. para. 18) in the area. The article detailed specifics accordingly: “Elsewhere, more than 30 youths, many in masks, vandalised and looted shops in Walthamstow Central, including BHS. The windscreen of a police vehicle was smashed after groups caused a disturbance in Islington, and goods were stolen from a Tesco store in Ponders End.” (ibid. para. 19–20)

The article “Australians caught in London riots” by Georgia Robinson et al. (2011a: para. 6) on 8 August conveyed the experience of Melbourne-born Sarah and described that the streets had been “an absolute mess”. Another Australian living in London had written to the agency that the centre of Ealing had been looted indiscriminately: “They set several cars and a liquor shop alight, smashed 90 per cent of shop windows and strewed rubbish and metal throughout the streets” (ibid. para. 9). The same source was very precise about details such as the size of the police force and the gangs who outnumbered them, with “60 youths charg[ing] past the street I live on waving sticks and even entire street signs that they managed to rip from the ground” (ibid. para. 11). Two people from Perth had been hurt by “a violent mob” (ibid. para. 13). Two young Australian women detailed a gathering of rioters, who confronted the police on the afternoon of the previous day, knocking the aforementioned bystanders down in the process, with one of them losing consciousness as the result.
Paul Lewis (2011f: para. 5) described in “London violence spreads with ‘copycat’ looting” on 9 August, in detail, the trouble in Enfield, which had been ‘smaller’ and occurred “from about 7pm” onwards. A seemingly planned gathering of teenagers “on St Andrews Road” (ibid. para. 6) had resulted in the destruction of “walls of terraced streets” (ibid.) in order to obtain “bricks to throw at police” (ibid.). “Shortly after 8.30pm, a crowd of about 100 mainly teenage boys broke into a jewellery shop” (ibid. para. 7), which led to a ‘chaotic’ situation, where people were physically subdued by the arriving police officers and canine units.

The article by Josie Ensor (2011) repeated the information already given by other reporters and agencies in a relatively similar order: the riots had spread to other areas of London, shops had been looted and the police had retaliated with force, etc. The article by Georgina Robinson et al. (2011b), “Riots spread as police lose control”, summarised the preceding events, dividing them by locations around London, thus indicating the extent of their spread.

The article “Large blaze engulfs Sony warehouse in London” on 9 August started as follows: “A Sony warehouse in north London has partially collapsed after being engulfed in flames, as riots rage across the British capital for a third night” (PA 2011e: para. 1), with “a gang of about 20 looters leaving the warehouse with electrical goods before the fire took hold” (ibid. para. 4), repeating, once again, the fact that the riots were spreading.

On the same day, “Three arrested for attempted murder of policeman in riots” focused exclusively on an incident where an officer “was hit by a car during the London riots” (AP/PA 2011: para. 1), when the authorities attempted to apprehend suspected looters. “Man dies after being shot in car” informed that a man had died after being shot in a car during the riots, “becoming the first fatality from three days of unrest in the British capital” (AFP 2011b: para. 1).

Gareth Hutchens (2011: para. 1) detailed in his article “Kitchen staff chase rioters with rolling pins” on 10 August the event where, in “a top London restaurant run by a leading Australian chef”, customers had been “terrorised and robbed by rioters before the rioters were driven away by kitchen staff brandishing rolling pins”. Around 50 people had crashed through the door “of the two Michelin-starred Ledbury restaurant in Notting Hill on [the] night” (ibid. para. 2) of 8 August. The looters had been only interested in stealing phones from the customers.

Megan Levy (2011a: para. 14) wrote on the same day in her article “Britain’s most wanted: retailers ‘physically sick’ at looters who tried on shoes in $157m rampage” briefly that “[o]ne of the worst hit retailers was sporting goods store JD Sports, where looters were so bold as to try on shoes before stealing them”. The reporter specified that the looters had “calmly queued
at registers to take off the security tags before placing their loot into JD Sports carrier bags” (ibid. para. 15)

Graeme Paton (2011: para. 2) referred in “History trashed by ‘mindless yobs’” on 11 August mainly to an incident where “House of Reeves, a 144-year-old furniture store in the heart of Croydon” had been ‘razed’ through fire. The shop had been “a local landmark” (ibid. para. 3), which had managed to survive the turmoil of the 20th century.

In “‘They threatened to stab me’: student tells of backpack attack that shocked the world”, Levy (2011b: para. 1) focused on the incident where a “young Malaysian student” had been robbed. “Mr Haziq, a 20-year-old accounting student, had been riding his bicycle with a friend to buy food to break his Ramadan fast when he was attacked by a group of youths in the east London neighbourhood of Barking” (ibid. para. 3). The attackers with concealed knives had “broke[n] his jaw and knocked him unconscious” (ibid. para. 5).

National Post published an article “Violence in London erupts in wake of riots” on 7 August 2011 on the topic of the physical assaults committed during the London riots, with Reuters (para. 1) reporting that, in north London, “[g]roups of youths attacked [and looted] shops and damaged a police car”. Matt Falloon and Angus MacSwan (2011: para. 12) touched upon a specific incident where “a 26-year-old man who was shot in a car in Croydon, south of London, during disturbances had died, becoming the first fatality of the riots” in their article “Man shot during London riots dies” in the same newspaper on 9 August, and also said that several police officers and members of the public had been injured.

Kathryn Blaze Carlson (2011: para. 1) wrote in her article “Chefs at posh Notting Hill restaurant fight off looters with rolling pins” that rioters had “smashed through the glass facade”. The manager of the restaurant had seen ‘a masked gang’ rush in. The article added that the restaurant “was one of several upscale establishments hit [on] late [8 August] as violence spread to wealthier neighbourhoods in and around London” (ibid. para. 3). Carlson (para. 4) reported that “[d]ozens of hooded rioters ransacked The Ledbury, overturning linen-covered tables and ordering guests to get down on the floor and hand over their cell phones, wallets, and jewelry”.

Since the riots occurred in London and other places in the UK, the newspapers in other English-speaking countries – the exception to that was The Sydney Morning Herald, which wrote about the experiences of several Australians living and working in London – did not focus on giving in-depth accounts of these events, omitting certain details that were apparently deemed irrelevant to the target audience altogether; for example, the incidents involving assaults on journalists were not mentioned at all. Instead, the fact that people had
been attacked was conveyed in generalised statements, applying to civilians as well as police officers.

3.3.1 Analysis of the information from *The New York Times, The Sydney Morning Herald* and *National Post* regarding the descriptions of specific events

Somaiya (2011) reported to the American readership how the demonstrations had become violent and how the looting had begun. His article included occasional evaluative concepts, exemplified by the words ‘peaceful’ and such figurative imagery as ‘pitched battle’, with determiners like ‘some’ used throughout the text. Furthermore, the choice of words “hundreds of officers /.../ and equal numbers of rioters” (ibid. para. 9) demonstrates that the factual aspect of his article is somewhat limited.

Somaiya and Burns (2011a) gave the number of the rioting youths as the same approximation as in the previous paragraph: ‘hundreds’. In addition, these journalists conveyed the evaluative belief that had been expressed in the Home Secretary’s statement about the specific incidents, saying that “huge fires [had been] burning” (ibid. para. 9).

Thomas, Jr. and Somaiya (2011) wrote about the chaos that had occurred in the course of the riots. They broadened their range of reliable sources to include, for instance, a looter who had told the exact price of a stolen item. In addition, information was contributed by a miscellany of sources in connection with hospitalisations and people who were otherwise affected by the ongoing events.

Burns and Somaiya’s (2011) text detailed the ethnicity of those involved in a specific incident. They referred to the nationality (e.g., Pakistani) as well as the racial identity of the victims as well as the perpetrator. The latter ‘appeared to be’ a person from the Caribbean region and of African extraction, which shows that the evidence is interpretative.

Millard (2011a: para. 8), again, said about the riots the following: “the worst seen in years in the suburbs”, in connection with vehicles and buildings being looted and set ablaze. This demonstrates the opinion of this specific journalist. Likewise, ‘hundreds’ was chosen to refer to the size of the ‘raging’ mob.

Another article by Millard (2011b) continued by reporting the specific numbers of police officers who had been attacked and their patrol cars that had been set on fire, giving even such details as the latter’s actual distance from the police station at the time. However, the text in question relied on approximations, such as ‘about’, to refer to the aforesaid distance in metres, and ‘several’, to explain the extent of the spreading riots in kilometres. An article by the
Associated Press (2011: para. 3) specified the latter detail: “about eight kilometres north of Tottenham”.

The article “Looters target Brixton store as lawlessness spreads after Tottenham riots”, which was compiled from information publicised by various news agencies, used the description ‘lawlessness’, which is culturally specific, to refer to the prevalent conditions in the affected areas. Compared to the previous articles, the number of the participants had risen in general to the approximation ‘thousands’, and an incident of lootings in Oxford Circus was attributed to ‘about 50 youths’, which is another estimation. The Press Association’s (2011) article was predominantly factual, with the source of information being a Metropolitan Police press release. Therefore, it probably employed such estimations as ‘at least’, ‘about’ and ‘more than’ to divulge only confirmed information or the maximum probable numbers, while otherwise relying on concrete evidence, like the number of officers hospitalised after an incident and the exact time.

Robinson et al. (2011a) chose Australians living in London as the source of information for their article. The first of the persons interviewed had evaluated the resulting damage to have been “an absolute mess” (ibid. para. 6). The second individual gave specific numbers regarding smashed shop windows (i.e., 90% of the total in the area) and the participants (i.e., 60) this person had witnessed together, which is essentially an opinion presented in the form of factual information – without any actual statistical bases. Two women who had been attacked described their assailants as “a violent mob” (ibid. para. 13), which is an evaluation based on these victims’ first-hand experience.

Lewis (2011f), in the course of relating underlying facts, supplied them with a noticeable comparative and evaluative dimension; for example, words like ‘smaller’ and ‘chaotic’. The approximate time of the events described required the addition of words like ‘about’ and ‘shortly after’. Moreover, ‘about 100 mainly teenage boys’ is a phrase that manages to be unspecific in every area, except the age and/or gender of the majority. Articles by both Ensor (2011) as well as Robinson et al. (2011b) reported primarily factual information, which were essentially the same details that had been stated in the other articles.

The Press Association’s (2011e) article used the approximation ‘a gang of about 20 looters’, which in this article described the rioters involved in a specific looting incident that had ended with a fire. The source that was mentioned last used the word ‘rage’ in the title of the article to describe the intensity of the spreading riots, therefore evaluating the situation.

The articles “Three arrested for attempted murder of policeman in riots” and “Man dies after being shot in car” focused on individuals attacked in the riots, with neither source giving
neither approximations nor opinions. This probably indicates that the news agencies had obtained their information from the authorities, who likely specialise in releasing factual news.

Hutchens (2011: para. 1) related the experience of a kitchen staff at a catering establishment that he referred to as “a top London restaurant”, adding that “a leading Australian chef” was involved either directly or indirectly in the incident. The word ‘top’ demonstrates that it is an evaluation determined by the majority in this particular area, and the same applies to the word ‘leading’ used to describe its manager. The fact that the invading looters had robbed the clientele contrasts with the evaluation that the latter group had been ‘terrorised’, as opposed to just scared or frightened.

Levy (2011a) wrote about the rioters who had robbed a sporting goods store, to which she referred as ‘one of the worst hit’ – an evaluation which is probably derived from facts presented by news agencies and from her own experience and personal input. In addition, the way she described the actions of the looters – for instance, that they had queued ‘calmly’ at the store’s counters – features other evaluative beliefs as well. Paton (2011) presented in his text only factual information about the age and reputation of a furniture store, which had been targeted and set ablaze during the riots. However, he employed the evaluative word ‘razed’ to describe the consequences of the fire, meaning that the destruction was complete.

Another article by Levy (2011b) stated that one particular incident had “shocked the world”. This implies two things, apparently without any factual basis: that the majority of global reader- and/or viewership had been made aware of this assault, and that the reaction of the majority of those people had been ascertained.

The article “Violence in London erupts in wake of riots” published in National Post conveyed factual information as it had become available to the newspaper. Likewise, Falloon and MacSwan (2011: para. 12) contributed mainly information for which the newspaper was willing to take responsibility as factually true, such as who had been “the first fatality of the riots”. In addition, the word ‘several’, which described the number of people injured, is probably the most neutral choice to describe an unspecified number, as opposed to evaluative ‘few’ or ‘many’ that were not used in this specific case.

Carlson (2011) used the word ‘posh’, which has a somewhat negative connotation of ‘expensive’, in the title of her article to define an area of London that has an international reputation of being affluent. The establishment on which the article focused was described as being ‘upscale’. Moreover, the approximation “dozens of hooded rioters” (ibid. para. 4) was used to identify the attackers of the previously mentioned target location.
3.4 Articles from Estonian newspapers

Articles in Eesti Päevaleht “Venema soovitab kodanikel teatud Londoni piirkondi vältida” on 8 August 2011, “Briti politsei kavandab laamendajate vastu plastikkuulide kasutamist” and “Politsei tappis päti, Tottenham põleb” on 9 August all reported briefly that buildings had been set alight and shops looted by the rioters, while the last one said that the riots had taken place in north London, Tottenham. In addition, in the article “Briti politsei kavandab laamendajate vastu plastikkuulide kasutamist” it was said that, during the riots, a man had been found with bullet wounds in the London Borough of Croydon, who died after he had already been taken to hospital.

Sten Mahov (2011) described in his article on 9 August the experience of Priit Piip, who lived in east London and had witnessed the riots as follows: he had seen about hundreds of youths who wore big hoodies and had covered their faces with scarves. Piip said that the youths had nothing to do with the original protests against the shooting death of Mark Duggan; their goal had been just to loot shops. “Londoni linnaosa ähvardab tänavatel märatsejad kodust ilma jätta” said on 10 August that, on the previous night, there had been large-scale looting in many places throughout the Royal Borough of Greenwich. In addition, the title of the previous article indicates that one of the punishments for participation in the looting was going to be eviction from council-owned flats.

The article by Inga Höglund “Vägivald šokeeris Londoni elanikke” on 9 August 2011 in Postimees indicated an event where, in Croydon, the rioters had burnt down a furniture store, which had been founded in 1867. From there, across the road, a bus stop had also been burning – it was described as a chaos. In another article, “Londoni rahutused nõudsid esimese ohvri [London riots claimed their first victim]”, published on the same day, Höglund referred to an incident where a 26-year-old man who had been shot in Croydon had died, as reported by the police.

The British articles, as those that were written closest to the geographical place where the events occurred, are on the three above-discussed subjects very lengthy and thorough, explaining the reasons behind different incidents and bringing out specific details. The newspaper articles from other countries are not comparable with the ones in The Guardian in that respect.

Surprisingly, the articles in The New York Times are relatively few in number, short and very concise when giving detailed information, focusing on the most significant and general aspects of the incidents. The reason behind this may be that the USA is both geographically as well as culturally distant from Britain and, as the leading global power, the USA focuses more
on their national news. The Australian articles, published in a former British colony that became independent more recently and is a member of the Commonwealth, are comparably full of details. Canada, as the third English-speaking country chosen for this thesis and where English is one of the two official languages, has fewer articles dealing with the subject in its national newspaper, but those that were published are rather lengthy and thorough.

Similarly to articles published in other newspapers outside of the UK, Estonian news reports tended to give only condensed information that was considered to be relevant to the local reader, such as warnings about travelling to certain destinations and the accounts and opinions of Estonians in London at the time.

### 3.4.1 Analysis of the information from Eesti Päevaleht and Postimees regarding the descriptions of specific events

The articles “Venemaa soovitab kodanikel teatud Londoni piirkondi vältida”, “Briti politsei kavandab laamendajate vastu plastikkuulide kasutamist” and “Politsei tappis päti, Tottenham põleb” relied only on the minimal amount of opinions, increasing the relative importance of facts and emphasising the reported numbers, which they had probably obtained from British sources. Furthermore, the aforementioned Estonian articles reflected the events in a rather general manner, without giving elaborate details.

Mahov (2011) related the account of an Estonian man living in London at the time of the occurrence of the events that he had described, meaning that the reporter derived facts as well as possible opinions, which are especially noticeable in his evaluation of the persona of Mark Duggan, from a comparatively unreliable source; for example, the descriptions are accentuated with evaluations like suur ‘big’ to define the hoods that the sweatshirts of the rioters had had. The article “Londoni linnaosa ähvardab tänavatel märatsejad kodust ilma jätta” stated that ‘large-scale’ (ulatuslikud) looting had taken place in the borough of Greenwich.

The article by Höglund (2011a) claimed already in its title that the violence had ‘shocked’ (šokeeris) the residents of London, which is this reporter’s estimation of the intensity of the local people’s reaction. In addition, she utilised the word kaos ‘chaos’ that may have been contributed by the witnesses who had observed the incidents described previously. Höglund (2011b) paraphrased reports that had been publicised by the authorities, without providing any subsequent opinions of her own.
3.5 Comparison of the opinions expressed in the newspapers

The British articles relied on factual information as well as on evaluative beliefs to describe specific events that had occurred within the time frame of the riots. Evaluations were expressed mainly by such vocabulary as ‘approximately’, ‘some’ and ‘apparently’. Moreover, the British source that has been observed in this thesis utilised overly evaluative, almost hyperbolic beliefs, like ‘hell’, ‘huge’, ‘peaceful’, ‘powerless’, ‘angry’ and ‘the worst’.

The articles published by the newspapers in the other English-speaking countries used quite frequent evaluations, such as approximations (e.g., ‘some’, ‘hundreds’, ‘about’, ‘several’) to refer to unclear numbers. In addition, these texts gave implicit opinions through either mitigating (i.e., hedges) or rhetorical (i.e., hyperbole) devices; for instance, ‘appeared to be’, ‘the worst’, ‘raging’, ‘an absolute mess’, ‘90%’, ‘smaller’, ‘chaotic’, ‘top’, ‘terrorised’, ‘razed’ and ‘shocked’. In the articles in question, similar to those selected from the British source, the journalists reported mainly the facts and commonly held opinions in their own words, but in some cases also the eyewitness accounts of some of the residents of London, etc.

Similarly, the observed Estonian newspapers employed facts as well as evaluative beliefs in giving rather general information, which the Estonian journalists had seemingly derived from British sources. The opinions included such words as ‘big’, ‘large-scale’, ‘shocked’ and ‘chaos’. As indicated earlier, the Estonian sources that were observed covered the topic in a cursory manner.
CONCLUSION

For this thesis, the author selected and examined altogether 36 British sources, of which 13 texts focused on the direct cause of the riots (i.e., details connected with Mark Duggan), 22 on the topic of the identity of the rioters and 10 on the topics dealing with particular events that had occurred in the course of the riots. As indicated before, the articles published in The Guardian were devoted to a more in-depth investigation of the background of these events and contributing factors, such as social conditions, history, etc. The articles in the aforementioned newspaper tended to be comparatively longer.

There were 39 news articles that had been published in the three other English-speaking countries: the US, Australia and Canada. The New York Times yielded 3 of those articles for the chapter dealing with Duggan, 2 for the chapter about the rioters and 4 for the chapter describing specific events. As already observed, the articles in the previously mentioned source were comparatively few in number and brief content-wise. Of the Australian articles, 2 dealt with the death of Duggan, 10 with the rioters and 16 with individual events. The news articles in The Sydney Morning Herald were rather detailed in terms of including exact names of people and places, which makes the information from this source comparable to those chosen from the British source. The obvious exception to the American and Canadian sources was that the Australian one endeavoured to substitute the eyewitness accounts of local people to those of Australians living in London and their viewpoints. The selected Canadian newspaper, National Post, featured news about Duggan in 2 articles, about the rioters in 5 articles and about the on-going events in 3 articles. The articles from both the Australian and Canadian newspapers were relatively lengthy and generally thorough.

For the Estonian sources, the author of this thesis was advised to select at least two publications, for which purpose the author chose Eesti Päevaleht and Postimees. These sources contributed the total of 28 news articles. Out of these, 6 texts concentrated on the
death of Duggan, 15 on the rioters and 7 on the events. In comparison to the rest of the sources, the texts in the Estonian newspapers were quite short and the journalists’ approaches were somewhat superficial.

On 6 August, *The Guardian* referred to Duggan on several occasions and in connection with the ongoing events with thoroughly neutral vocabulary. The information in these news articles was contributed exclusively by journalists and news agencies. On 7 August, the speakers who are hereby categorised as journalists by profession continued their objective investigation into Duggan’s background; even so, the subject matter of Duggan’s past allegedly criminal activities added a somewhat negative tone. A new source of information on that day included first-hand accounts of the topic dealing with personal familiarity with the subject in question; specifically, the interviews with Duggan’s fiancée, who attempted to negate the effects of his past criminality in favour of an image of his present law abidance. In addition to Duggan’s fiancée, many of the other local residents were committed to the belief that Duggan had not been responsible for the incident in which he had died.

8 August saw the information revealed and opinions expressed by journalists shift noticeably in favour of Duggan; for example, the journalists directed attention to the fact that others of their profession may have portrayed him as a gangster. Furthermore, there was a biographical piece written with an intention to show him as a family man and to describe his achievements (e.g., educational) so that the reader would be able to relate to him. The evidence from the forensic investigation into the shooting incident of 4 August reportedly supported him being not guilty. The sympathy for his family and the support for their cause contributed such statements as him having been a victim and the authorities treating his family insensitively.

On 9 August, the majority of the information about Duggan in *The Guardian* reported his complete exoneration of the blame associated with the incident itself. Nonetheless, at least one article began to turn the public attention to his criminal present in the form of gang membership and association with drug dealers. The author of this thesis did not encounter references to Duggan in news articles published on 10 August, and from this one can conclude that both the media sources that were committed to a favourable image of him and his explicit supporters in the role of the original, passive demonstrators wished to distance the ongoing events and destruction from his name and identity.

The selected newspapers from the three other English-speaking countries, their journalists and the occasional international agencies referred to Duggan in a neutral manner – that is, either by his name or simply with one of the most general expressions possible, ‘a man’, and
sometimes specifying also his ethnicity – and they indicated that the shooting incident in which he had died had been recognised as the primary cause of the subsequent riots. In these newspapers, the articles that were published on the days within the time frame that was observed considered Duggan to have been the victim of the authorities’ actions.

In contrast, the articles in the Estonian newspapers, especially *Eesti Päevaleht*, displayed a markedly negative attitude towards Duggan, calling him a drug dealer and crook, which are the kind of opinions that were not observed to have occurred in the news articles published in the other countries, even the UK, where journalists acknowledged a potential for his overly negative portrayal and tried to avoid it. *Postimees*, however, attempted to maintain a higher degree of neutrality by not resorting to sensationalist approach and, like the British source, presented the opinions given by Duggan’s family.

Concerning the rioters, *The Guardian* initially saw them as demonstrators when their social functions were peaceful despite their objective to confront the authorities in connection with the shooting incident in question, but the same newspaper continued to cover the events past the point when their actions became violent and their social functions turned to looting. Some of the prevalent labels applied to the looters and rioters was ‘teenagers’ and ‘youths’, which communicates a vivid message about their probable mental model. In other instances, the journalists utilised concise and neutral descriptors, such as ‘people’, with individuals being referred to simply as either ‘man’ or ‘woman’ in order not to emphasise their characteristics. The British source called attention to the fact that the demographic range of the rioters included diversity and relatively equal representation in age, ethnicity and social background in order not to single out any specific group of people. *The Guardian* gave frequently politically correct details about the rioters’ appearance at the time of looting, the kind of tools and weapons that they had used and also the approximate numbers of the participants. In addition to the journalists, other authoritative speakers were the MP for Tottenham, the Deputy Mayor of London, a criminologist and youth culture expert, plus the Leader of Croydon Council discussed the underlying motives of the rioters in an effort to conclude whether violent tendencies have always been present, laying dormant in their mental model.

The articles published in the newspapers of the three other English-speaking countries lacked comparable references to the initial group of demonstrators – the exception to this was the Canadian source, which made a distinction between protesters and looters/rioters that proved to be fundamentally essential for an accurate interpretation of their identity and motives. Both the journalists and their quoted sources, such as the PM Cameron and Scotland
Yard, commented on the participants’ lack of judgement and their resulting criminality in an attempt to explain their way of thinking. Much like the British source, the newspapers of the other English-speaking countries employed such words as ‘gangs’ and ‘mobs’ to apply a specific model of groupthink-driven social behaviour.

The Estonian newspapers, using ethnic or cultural generalisations, contributed to the previous observations an overview of a prototypical rioter. However, the most important element of their identity was still determined to be their social status and educational background, as already established in the British as well as other English-speaking countries’ publications. The Estonians residing in London that were interviewed about the events that they had witnessed expressed through predominantly neutral vocabulary that they either disapproved of the participants’ actions or sympathised with them because of their age or hardships, without associating themselves with any group involved. The most evaluative terms used to identify the rioters in the Estonian sources originated from the statements of the British authorities, such as Cameron’s ‘hooligans’, and local residents, who were quoted to have called them ‘brainless idiots’. In one instance where the looters themselves had been interviewed, they seemed to embrace the outlaw image, which may originally have been an artificial construct devised by distant observers, not the rioters themselves. Like The Guardian and the newspapers of the other English-speaking countries, the Estonian publications conveyed accounts of the rioters’ clothing and other details, although none were as specific as the information in the British source.

The articles from the newspapers published in both the UK, the three other English-speaking countries and Estonia featured in their respective texts factual information about specific events that had occurred and gained attention in the course of the riots as the basis, as well as opinions (including approximations, estimations and evaluations) as the filler, thereby relying fundamentally on press releases from the authoritative sources when presenting available facts. In The Guardian, the speakers included, in addition to the usual group of journalists and news agencies, victims; in The New York Times, for instance, the Home Secretary as well as a looter; in The Sydney Morning Herald, local people from Australia; in Eesti Päevaleht, local people from Estonia.

It should be taken into consideration that the information in the Estonian newspapers has probably been subjected to various methods of translation, as it originates from sources that are in either English or Estonian. In contrast, all the sources in the English language lack an interlingual step of incorporating different quotations and choosing adequately equivalent terms to convey their original message; for example, the translatability of ‘rioters’ as
‘märatsejad’, ‘looters’ as ‘rüüstajad’ etc. In addition, when describing Duggan, the Estonian newspapers introduced such words as pätt ‘crook’ and narkodiiler ‘drug dealer’ and focused on the positive descriptions by his fiancée and other supporters. The publicised descriptions of the events lacked completely equivalent approaches due to the instrumentality of original interpretations and constantly evolving situations (i.e., the communication acts defined and influenced the course of the events), but overall, factual information outweighed opinions and evaluations in all of the newspapers. It can be concluded that only the key concepts and content words were translated directly.
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Annotatsioon:
Käesolev magistritöö vaatleb ja analüüsib, kuidas kajastasid Suurbritannia ajakirjanikud 2011. aasta augustis Londonis aset leidnud rahutusi ning mil viisil tõlgendasid ja edastasid USA, Austraalia ja Kanada ajakirjanikud ning kuidas tõlisisid kahe eestikeelse väljaande ajakirjanikud juba avaldatud informatsiooni. Töö kirjutamise peamisteks eesmärkideks on see, et need sündmused on siiani võrdlemisi värsked, mis teeb käesolevast tööst originaalse analüüsi, ning et neid sündmusi kajastati võrreldaval määral ülemaailmselt. Töö allikamaterjalideks on valitud uudised eespool nimetatud mitmetud nimeaid espool nimetatud riikides ilmuvesest suurematest ajalehtedest.

Töö põhiosa jaguneb järgmiseks kolmeköigis peatükiks: a) Mark Duggani mahalaskmine ja tema identiteeti puudutavad küsimused, b) avalik arutelu rahutuses märatsejatena osalenute identiteedist ning c) rahutuste käigus toimunud üksiksündmuste kirjeldus. Mark Duggani puhul on kasutatud Michel Foucault’i kõneleja ja kõneakti võimu teooriat, märatsejate peatükis Teun A. van Dijki ideoloogiate teooriat ning sündmuste analüüsimisel van Dijki arvamuste teooriat. Eelnimetatud osad hõlmavad vastavate teooriate lühikirjeldusi, artiklite kirjeldusi ja nende analüüsi teooriate põhjal ning kõikide maade analüüside tulemuste võrdlusi.

Tulemustest selgub, et Eesti ajalehtedes esines sõnu, mida teistes ingliskeelsetes väljaannetes ei olnud; nt pätt ja väädetav narkodiiler, mis näitavad, kuidas Eesti Päevaleht avaldas Duggani suhtes selget negatiivset hinnangut, samal ajal kui Postimees püüdis säilitada
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