

"The homeless charity that works" : a critical sociolinguistic analysis of charity discourses and English-only ideologies in Emmaus London

Autor(en): **Garrido, Maria Rosa**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée / VALS-ASLA**

Band (Jahr): - **(2016)**

Heft 104: **Neue Perspektiven in der empirischen Linguistik : Arbeiten von jungen Forschenden in der Schweiz = Nouvelles perspectives dans la linguistique empirique : travaux de jeunes chercheurs en Suisse = New perspectives in empirical linguistics : studies from young researchers in Switzerland**

PDF erstellt am: **27.05.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-978662>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

"The homeless charity that works": A critical sociolinguistic analysis of charity discourses and English-only ideologies in Emmaus London

Maria Rosa GARRIDO

Institute of Multilingualism, University of Fribourg
Rue de Morat, 24, CH-1700 Fribourg, Switzerland
mariarosa.garridosarda@unifr.ch

A la lumière d'une approche sociolinguistique, ethnographique et critique, cet article examine les intersections entre les idéologies langagières d'*English only* et les discours néolibéraux sur/par les organisations caritatives (*charity*) dans le contexte d'Emmaüs Londres (GB). Le mouvement Emmaüs (re)insère des personnes marginalisées qui habitent et travaillent au sein de groupes locaux nommés "communautés" qui réalisent des travaux de recyclage et des projets de solidarité. Cet article fait partie d'une ethnographie multi-site d'Emmaüs et se focalise sur une communauté à Londres recherchée en 2012. L'analyse historicise l'appropriation d'Emmaüs, à l'origine un mouvement francophone, au sein de la tradition de *charities* et des politiques de laissez-faire depuis les années 1990 au Royaume Uni. L'article montre qu'Emmaus UK est une *multinationale du cœur* (Pech et Padis 2004) dont la localisation dans le régime sociolinguistique de Londres met en question le plurilinguisme attendu des ONG internationales. En conclusion, les idéologies langagières qui construisent l'hégémonie de l'anglais à Emmaüs Londres font partie intégrante de l'économie mixte d'aide sociale (Gilbert 2004) et du nationalisme banal (Billig 1995).

Mots-clés:

ethnographie sociolinguistique, idéologies linguistiques, nouvelle économie, ONG, anglais, nationalisme, discours néolibéraux.

1. Introduction: Goals, Approach and Overview

The goal of this research is to explore the discursive and linguistic appropriation of the transnational social movement Emmaus. Originally founded in post-war Paris, this article focuses on a local Emmaus community in London, established in 2007. This article investigates the intersections between neoliberal discourses about/by charity organisations and English-only linguistic ideologies in Emmaus London (UK)¹. It is based on my PhD dissertation (Garrido 2014) that reports on a broader critical sociolinguistic ethnography of Emmaus centred on two local groups, one in Barcelona and another one in London, in 2011-2012. My fieldwork mainly consisted in participant-observation in different socio-communicative spaces and shadowing key actors, complemented with one-to-one interviews, as well as relevant institutional texts. The data for this article were mostly gathered in

¹ The local communities investigated agreed to disclose the name of the movement, which is so unique that it would be hard to anonymise, but the exact geographical locations and people's identities have been kept confidential and are anonymised in this article.

2012 at the London community and the Emmaus UK federation that it belongs to. This research about a social movement contributes an anthropological account of the (re)production of a transnational imaginary that intersects with sedimented discourses and sociolinguistic regimes in multiple nation-states.

Many longstanding members in my ethnographic sites describe Emmaus through the metaphor of a "big family" that crosses borders. Heterogeneous Emmaus groups are glued together by common values, discourses, practices and information. Accordingly, I conceive Emmaus as a transnational social movement, i.e. a "dense, stable, pluri-local and institutionalised framework composed of material artefacts, the social practices of everyday life, as well as systems of symbolic representation that are structured by and structure human life" (Pries 1996: 8). The movement is partly institutionalised in/by an international NGO (Emmaus International) that licenses national federations, among which we find Emmaus UK. Local Emmaus communities simultaneously engage, to a different extent, in bottom-up "transnational" activities among organised groups or networks of individuals across borders and "multinational" ones, top-down activities typical of large-scale organisations whose activities take place in various nation-states (Portes 2001).

Within a critical sociolinguistic perspective (Heller 2011), the two guiding concepts for my analysis will be *language ideology* and *discourse*. These linguistic ideologies and societal discourses will be contextualised in their historical, economic and political conditions of emergence (Duchêne 2008). Woolard defines language ideologies as "representations, whether explicit or implicit, which construe the intersection of language and human beings in a social world" (1998: 3). In other words, they are discursive representations of language varieties, their speakers and social groups in a given socio-political and historical context. Following Duchêne, I understand discourses as "the place of emergence, crystallization and materialization of the positioning of actors and institutions" (2008: 30). Discourses define the situated, everyday actions and decisions of social and institutional actors in our ethnographies. In Emmaus London, the discourses on charity provision are articulated with, and justify, language ideologies that naturalise English as the only language for communication. The genealogy of contemporary discourses is a product of their appropriation over time and space in ways that make or erase linkages with other discourses and traditions (Gal 2003).

The article is organised as follows: The second section will briefly historicise the Emmaus movement and socioeconomic regimes in the UK to ground my subsequent ethnographic analysis. The third section will be devoted to the analysis of firstly, charity discourses by Emmaus UK and Emmaus London, and secondly, the daily construction of English hegemony in Emmaus London.

The fourth and last section will discuss language ideologies linked to banal nationalism and the new economy.

2. Context: Historicising Emmaus in the UK

Emmaus London forms part of a transnational social movement called Emmaus that has a holistic nature which encompasses unconditional shelter, cooperative work and solidarity projects. It is dedicated to the (re)insertion of underprivileged (mainly homeless) people who live and work with other people who look for a more altruistic lifestyle in live-in "communities". These communities are self-financed through cooperative work, done mainly by the residents as full-time workers for a small weekly allowance and also assisted by part-time external volunteers (as in any other charity). Their economic activities typically involve waste recovery and recycling. Many European communities, for example, collect second-hand furniture donations from the public that they might renovate and/or sell in their stores. Besides, the surplus from their cooperative work is used to organise and fund solidarity projects both locally and abroad, such as a residential project for homeless migrants in Emmaus Barcelona. These projects vary in each community according to the socio-political context, institutional connections and group size.

In the post-war depression, a French working priest and Parliamentarian, the Abbé Pierre (1912-2007), created a live-in "community" of people called "companions", mainly formerly homeless people, who built houses for the poor thanks to donations and their work as ragpickers in the Parisian *banlieue*. Since the 1960s it evolved into a network of Emmaus groups worldwide thanks to the Abbé Pierre's conference tours overseas and also the international work camps for youth in Europe (see Brodiez-Dolino 2013 for a critical history of the movement). The first Emmaus World Assembly (1969) adopted the *Universal Manifesto* which entextualises (Bauman & Briggs 1990: 73) the movement's principles "serve before yourself those who are less fortunate" and "to serve first those who suffer most" that circulate(d) in communities. In 1971, the second World Assembly created an overarching coordination secretariat called Emmaus International located in Paris. Concerning language policy, Emmaus International adopted three "official languages": French, Spanish and English, with French as the main lingua franca, followed by Spanish due to the weight of Latin American communities, and English as the least used language in the movement.

The diversification and expansion of the movement in France in the 1950s, and abroad since the 1960s, gave rise to tensions between two (longstanding) trends, which Lefèvre calls "*les gestionnaires*" and "*les aventuriers*" (2001: 36). The former corresponds to the "centripetal trend" seeking internal stability and solidity through increasing professionalisation and tight management. Out of this trend, Emmaus International was created in order to institutionalise and

oversee all local initiatives. The latter corresponds to the "centrifugal trend" favoured by the Abbé Pierre that sets out to maintain the adventure spirit, poverty and spontaneity of the origins, which encompasses socio-political activism, more horizontal communities and cross-border networks (Brodiez-Dolino 2013). Nowadays, Emmaus is formed by hundreds of local groups in 37 different nation-states that have differing orientations. The spectacular growth of local communities affiliated to Emmaus UK since 1992 falls under the "centripetal" trend.

The first British Emmaus group was created in 1992 by a businessman, who we will call Alwyn, based on his experience in Emmaus Neuilly-Plaisance with the Abbé Pierre in the 1960s. Confronted with homelessness in Cambridge, he was inspired by the Emmaus ethos and he put together a business plan and started fundraising among the local middle classes who, according to him, knew how to navigate the welfare system and spoke the (legitimate) national language, standard English, on behalf of the underprivileged (interview, 05-09-2013). Owing to the lack of knowledge about the Emmaus movement and the founder inspiring the centrifugal trend, Alwyn adopted a professionalised model of charity and social enterprise for Emmaus in the UK. According to him, the adoption of this model was determined by the local socio-political conditions that favoured top-down organisations in the UK. Throughout the early development of the Cambridge community, he became a key mediator between the British middle-class donors and the Abbé Pierre by virtue of his fluency in French. He writes that "Abbé Pierre still spoke not a word of English and most of the local friends and colleagues I was able to involve scarcely a word of French" (in Brodiez-Dolino 2013: 16).

In our interview, he readily identified Thatcher's neoliberal dismantlement of the welfare state and "care in the community", which refers to the Thatcherite shifting responsibility of welfare care from state institutions to families, as the socio-political regime that caused homelessness in the early 1990s. In the post-war years the expansion of the Keynesian welfare state developed a wide range of statutory services and social allocations in the UK. Let us recall that the three successive governments of Margaret Thatcher (1979-1990) gradually privatised the public sector in light of her free market neoliberal ideology. The following (in)famous Thatcher quote is based on the idea of a diminishing welfare state and self-responsibility, targeting the homeless in particular. "Society" exists only in the people who also help look after themselves and their neighbours in lieu of the government.

"I am homeless, the Government must house me!" and so they are casting their problems on society and who is society? There is no such thing! There are individual men and women and there are families and no government can do anything except through people and people look to themselves first. It is our duty to look after ourselves and then also to help look after our neighbour". (*Woman's Own*, 23rd September 1987)²

In her last term in office, coinciding with the homeless crisis in Cambridge, the Tories developed a more aggressive programme epitomised by the White Paper "Caring for people" (1989) that promotes the independent sector and especially develops the voluntary sector in a mixed economy of care. Alwyn's adaptation of Emmaus as a charity in the privatising, neoliberal movement became the main model for new communities like the one I investigated, Emmaus London.

This community was founded in 2007 within the socio-political context of New Labour's government (1997-2010). Tony Blair promoted the European Third Way, whose ideological father is Anthony Giddens (Giddens 1998), as a centrist political position moving away from free market neoliberalism and top-down socialism. In the UK, Third Wayism mitigated the harshness of Thatcherite measures but essentially pursued the same economic measures. It promoted public-private partnerships, a move towards workfare and devolution of welfare to civil society organisations as partners of local authorities (Taylor 2002). Social capital and personal responsibility continue to justify the centrality of voluntarism under Blair and the following Brown Labour government. In this socioeconomic context, Emmaus London contributed to the offloading of public services as a local charity run by (upper-) middle-class trustees and middle-class staff and based on the companions' volunteer work for the recycling business.

Emmaus London opened in 2007 thanks to a local fundraising initiative under the expansion scheme of Emmaus UK. In 2012, Emmaus London had 27 companions and was run by a team of administrative staff who were in charge of gatekeeping new entries, managing the finances and making decisions on projects. Like all other Emmaus communities in England, it was registered as an independent charity in England and Wales and it is part of the growing Emmaus UK federation, serving as a liaison with Emmaus International. In order to gain access, I offered to give Spanish lessons at the companions' request and I volunteered to collaborate in the various tasks, which met my ethnographic demands and their need for workforce.

3. Analysis

The section will firstly analyse the neoliberal discourses of voluntarism and efficiency in Emmaus London as an English charity and secondly the construction of an English-only regime within the national mixed economy of

² Transcript accessed on: <http://www.margareththatcher.org/document/106689> [26th July 2016]

welfare and in the transnational movement as a whole. By and large, my analysis shows the impact of the neoliberal discourses and measures, namely voluntary labour for the activation of the homeless and economic efficiency in local charity-provided services, on the hegemony of the English language in Emmaus London.

The discourse of (cost) efficiency for the nation state justifies the offloading of services to charities regulated by local authorities. Emmaus London constructs itself as a "homeless charity" that mainly collaborates with other local associations in English as the administrative language. This partly explains this "newer" community's (relative) lack of transnational connections in the movement, which often require French. This strong local collaboration and the lack of overseas connections jointly erased multilingualism in the community and for companions' mobility. Besides, volunteering as a companion in Emmaus London required meeting a few legal conditions and a non-institutionalised demand for certain work "skills" including communicative skills and knowledge of the English language, the latter made explicit in staff's oral comments about (potential) companions. The neoliberal charity culture jeopardised the unconditional welcome principle of the social movement in Emmaus London, i.e. who can join as a companion/volunteer. State regulations for charities, namely the requirement for Housing Benefit and regular legal situation in the UK, kept out a pool of foreigners from Emmaus and strengthened the role of English as a predominant language in London. There was unequal access to the legitimate institutional language, English, among the social actors, which separated the middle-class trustees/staff from the candidates whose capital had to be evaluated for entry.

3.1. Charity discourses in Emmaus UK

During my fieldwork in 2012, the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition in power (2010-2015) ran the "Big Society" scheme, which fused the free market and social solidarity so that "productivity is wedded to social solidarity, the market to a moral community, and efficiency to a caring, moral order" (Muehlebach 2009: 501). It continued New Labour's policies to strengthen neoliberal activation of passive populations through voluntary labour and offloading of services to the third sector. The plan to encourage more citizen involvement for community empowerment draws on the idea that civil society has been crowded out by an overlarge state, which echoes Thatcher's conservatism. Two of the specific initiatives under the Big Society that had an impact on Emmaus in 2012 are skill development through volunteering and devolution of power to local authorities, in the form of local service networks (see Alcock 2010 for an overview).

The Emmaus UK motto, "the homeless charity that works", points towards these discourses of labour and efficiency. This discursive justification emerges out of the Protestant work ethic in the history of British charities (Alvey 1995)

and of the neoliberal offloading of services to efficient charities in the third sector (Gilbert 2004). On the one hand, "work" indexes the actual voluntary labour that formerly passive populations engage in. The main goal of this British charity is to activate capable homeless people through voluntary work so that they sign off primary welfare benefits and become active members of society. On the other hand, "work" refers to Emmaus' efficiency in providing welfare assistance to the homeless *in lieu* of the state as an independent self-funded charity. In order to achieve their goals, every local Emmaus is a registered charity in England and Wales that is non-profit and receives no direct funding from the state.

In the framework of current activation policies for passive populations, voluntary labour aims for improvement of individual moral, character and soft skills, including communication and language. The New Labour and Cameron-Liberal Democrats governments reinforced activation policies for passive populations through voluntary work, not only for the retired and the unemployed but also, increasingly, marginalised populations such as the homeless (Bowgett 2007). In my ethnography, voluntarism was central to Emmaus London's discursive self-construction and clasped this locality with the broader Emmaus movement of solidarity with others, as well as with the individualised (Protestant) work ethic (Weber 1984) and more recent neoliberal discourses in the UK. Public discourses rely on intense discursive regimentation of people into active, moral citizens who sacrifice their time for the common good and for their own (redeeming) future in the case of passive populations such as Emmaus companions.

Emmaus London companions could choose to do "solidarity work", namely to donate one working day out of five to another charity. Emmaus companions were encouraged to become volunteers in local organisations mainly working at soup runs, homeless shelters or day centres (but also with regard to other social issues such as helping cancer patients or children in need). Companions' volunteer work in other London charities was justified with solidarity discourses linked to the Emmaus principle of "helping those less fortunate before yourself". In John's formulation in the example below, "solidarity" seems to be located outside the Emmaus community (i.e. the fellow companions). John claims that business surplus should be devoted to helping "other people" outside Emmaus (lines 1-3). The main point is that voluntary labour fulfils the Emmaus mission since people "give up" - that is, sacrifice - their time for others (lines 8-10). Some companions in my study overtly objected to such a view and regarded themselves as "those less fortunate" owing to their histories of homelessness rather than active volunteers helping others. In practice, however, only a handful of companions engaged in external "solidarity work" for other charities, which implicitly shows a lack of commitment to John's appropriation of the Emmaus value of solidarity.

Example (1) Solidarity as donating time through voluntary labour. Interview with John, General Manager. 21-06-2012.³

1 *JOH: expanding the business would generate more income which
 2 will enable us to do more solidarity activities to help
 3 other people # an area where I struggle sometimes is to
 4 convince people to convince companions that solidarity is
 5 much more than writing a cheque for somebody # quite often
 6 when companions request solidarity activity they just want
 7 us to give a chunk of money # it actually goes a lot
 8 deeper than that # it's actually about going and doing
 9 something # giving up your time is probably more valuable
 10 than money # em so yeah # that's a challenge.

Interestingly, staff members and companions (in line with Emmaus UK and the Big Society discourses) constructed companions' (voluntary) labour as valuable work experience that allowed them to gain skills, especially relational and communication skills. For instance, one link to an online video which appeared in the staff members' email signatures featured staff and companions alike adhering to the discourse of developing skills (Allan 2013). The general manager claimed that Emmaus allowed companions to develop new skills and hidden talents, which they could then use for work (re)insertion. A borough-wide volunteering scheme in which Emmaus London participated, aimed to provide homeless volunteers with new skills enabling them to move on to paid employment in the future. In fact, the programme coordinator Mike referred to soft skills such as establishing work habits and "redeveloping communication skills as part of a team and in the later stages, to talk with shop customers" (fieldnotes, 19-04-2012) implicitly in English, as we shall see in the next section.

This work ethic overlaps with, and even informs, neoliberal programmes at the turn of the century that aim for a *mixed economy of welfare* that involves state institutions, non-profits and for-profit companies as partners in social protection (Gilbert 2004). The offloading of public services to un-politicised charities in Britain is due to their lower cost to the state and increased efficiency as local agencies. In the Big Society scheme, Emmaus London measures the success of this charity in terms of people served, re-insertion figures and the costs spared to the British taxpayer. In a 2009 community newsletter, I encountered a news report of a visit by a local celebrity who decorated the Emmaus Christmas tree with "miniature nurses, policemen and a skateboard park", which symbolised the savings that this Emmaus community had meant for the local authority. This investment in neoliberal efficiency discourses will also impact the unconditional welcome principle of Emmaus since companions will

³ The transcriptions in this article are used for a content and discourse analysis. I have not focused on linguistic formalities. Pauses are marked by the symbol # in order to support reading.

have to claim Housing Benefit to cover their accommodation costs (see section 3.2. below).

In their public representations, Emmaus UK extensively quotes independent economic studies that calculate their social return on investments both in monetary terms, which would amount to "£11 in social, environmental and economic return for every £1 invested", and in qualitative terms as shown in the following quote.

Example (2) Emmaus UK saving British taxpayer money. "Our social impact", Emmaus UK webpage. March 2013.

Emmaus Communities also generate significant savings to the taxpayer. For the 21 Communities included in the research, the study forecasts that the present value of savings to local and national Government stands at almost £6 million per year. Key outcomes for Government from Emmaus' work include fewer rough sleepers, fewer people claiming benefits, reduced substance misuse, reduced crime and fewer health problems.

These savings to the state actually enable the downsizing of the National Health System, social benefits and security services in the Conservative agenda. This discourse also implies intertextuality with a discourse of alleviating poverty in the interests of the middle classes or "comfortable Britain"- i.e. the taxpayers.

In order to construct its efficiency as a charity, the Emmaus UK discourse of financial independence argues with that of "savings to the taxpayer" and low costs for re-insertion through voluntary labour as discussed above. Eventually, Emmaus communities in the UK seek to become social enterprises that are self-sufficient after a few years of operation, to move away from the traditional charity model based on external grants (Emmaus UK "The homeless charity that works" DVD). This institutional front allows Emmaus to secure collaboration contracts with the local administration to provide homelessness services. The contract culture calls into question the ideological independence of charities such as Emmaus London, whose board of trustees discussed welcoming undocumented people but was unable to do so because of charity regulations imposed by the nation-state, as explained by the community leader in our interview (12-06-2012). This restriction will keep linguistic diversity out of the community and will reinforce an English-only regime as we shall see below.

To sum up, this section has shown the interconnection between discourses of voluntary labour and economic efficiency in Emmaus London as part of the Big Society scheme. Voluntarism serves the transnational Emmaus mission of "helping those less fortunate" but is locally appropriated as a neoliberal activation policy to develop skills, including communication. Efficiency is interpreted as lower costs to the taxpayers thanks to the offloading of services to charities relying on volunteers. However, becoming a welfare partner to the

local authority implies abiding by state regulations for charities and thus jeopardises the unconditional welcome Emmaus principle.

3.2. English-only regime in Emmaus London

Apart from the exclusionary discourses and measures in the mixed economy of welfare, there was another factor restricting the unconditional welcome principle in Emmaus: the construction of an institutional English-only regime. Speaking English was constructed as an unwritten, non-institutionalised entry requirement for would-be companions to live and work in this Emmaus community located in London. First, the dominance of English is linked to Emmaus London's participation in the local Borough pathway of services, which is a partnership between the Council that offloads welfare services and the third sector organisations that jointly provide them. In order to receive services within this network, homeless users had to have recourse to state benefits and this often excluded foreign nationals who had no access to them, many of whom speak English as an additional language in this diverse London area. Second, the charity's few connections in the Emmaus movement outside the UK reinforced the English-only habitus in everyday relations, erasing the existing multilingualism on the ground and especially French as a *lingua franca*.

As an English charity, this Emmaus community mainly partnered with local associations under the London Borough as promoted by the Big Society measure to devolve power to local authorities. Access to these charity-provided services in this service pathway required homeless users to claim and contribute their Housing Benefit, hence excluding foreigners without recourse to it. In 2012, many Eastern European nationals (mainly from Romania and Bulgaria) could not claim Jobseeker's Allowance or even Housing Benefit due to recent eligibility changes. In actual fact, 25 out of 27 companions in Emmaus London also had to claim Housing Benefit in order to cover their accommodation costs and only two "solidarity" places were open for those without access to them, mostly non-British nationals. Consequently, most companions were British nationals and English-speaking, with the exception of non-European nationals occupying the two solidarity places as well as one German companion and another Irish one.

This legal condition to enter the pathway of services and most Emmaus places in practice kept out the foreign multilingual residents in this London borough. Emmaus London was located in a diverse London borough that one former companion (then living in a local park) described to me as "the international borough for a homeless person" where he enjoyed different cuisines, different customs and the learning of different languages (fieldnotes, 09-05-2012). According to the 2011 census (Office for National Statistics), 76% of residents reported English as their main language, but these discrete categorisations do not account for hybrid uses. It was an ethnically diverse local authority, with

40% of White British and sizable minorities from Afro-Caribbean, Black African and Portuguese descent. Nevertheless, the Emmaus community was not very porous to this local diversity in terms of the language practices observed inside the community throughout my fieldwork.

In addition to the entry requirement to claim Housing Benefit, the community leader Laura posed the "problem" of insufficient English language skills for their fully-fledged integration in everyday life. In the past, Emmaus London had welcomed "poor" English speakers from Eastern European origin who had become isolated from the community. According to Laura, L2 speakers were offered English language instruction at Emmaus, but I was not able to document this claim ethnographically. In the following extract, the community leader discusses the case of a potential companion from Eastern European origin who did not speak English. She directed him to other communities that had Eastern European people whom he shared a language with in order to avoid his (potential) isolation and to speed up his English language learning. Laura's argument is that this candidate would learn English more easily if he had somebody to use his language repertoire with (lines 21-23). According to Laura this would facilitate his social inclusion in the community, and avoid his potential isolation, but I argue that it would not necessarily enhance his English learning process with other companions. However, it is noteworthy that the goal is for this person to learn English and that other European languages are conceived as temporary vehicles conducive to learning English.

Example (3) English as a non-written requirement of entry. Interview with Laura, community leader, Emmaus London, 12-06-2012.

- 1 *LAU: we get an increasing proportion of Eastern Europeans.
- 2 *MRG: mm.
- 3 *LAU: and particularly given that they changed the law about
- 4 whether they can claim benefits or not they changed last
- 5 year # em so people they a lot of people Eastern Europeans
- 6 who get referred have been here quite some time have worked
- 7 and then lost their jobs or they worked for cash so they've
- 8 lost their jobs and they can't go on Jobseeker's allowance
- 9 # some of the other communities have groups of Eastern
- 10 Europeans we've never actually had that # we haven't really
- 11 had many people live here and I saw a man last year who
- 12 didn't speak English # I mean # he would have been a very
- 13 good companion but he spoke no English and I know from
- 14 experience that that doesn't fit very well in this group
- 15 people become isolated if their English isn't good.
- 16 *MRG: oh really-? has this happened before-? that they can't
- 17 communicate with companions?
- 18 *LAU: aham ## we've had it more with volunteers not too many
- 19 companions # with that problem # my recommendation to them
- 20 is that they try some of the other communities who had
- 21 Eastern Europeans so that they found and they did they

22 found someone where they had 2 or 3 Eastern Europeans who
 23 he could talk to so then it's much easier for him to move
 24 in and begin to learn to speak English but we had nobody
 25 here who could speak an Eastern European language then that
 26 person would be very isolated.

27 *MRG: ahmm and the volunteers you mentioned-? where were they
 28 from-? the ones that didn't speak English?

29 *LAU: parts in Africa.

30 *MRG: so they were not Eastern Europeans then?

31 *LAU: no they were African # but that's because that's our
 32 catchment area there's a lot of Africans around here so #
 33 that's that's why.

34 *MRG: Alright-! have you had any African companions here in the
 local community?

35 *LAU: not from the local community # well # I didn't even think
 36 about it # Elizabeth was a volunteer so she's an obvious
 37 when she came to us when they weren't going too well # emm
 38 yes we had quite a few Africans and that was I wondered if
 39 that was the quote you were going to come up because we um
 40 we have more people from our Afro Caribbean than any other
 41 community in Britain I think that's because of where we
 42 are.

Emmaus London had not had many companions who did not speak English fluently because of this rather explicit linguistic requirement which was not implicitly mentioned in institutional texts. This example also shows that diversity was linked to ethnic and cultural backgrounds in Emmaus London since it was assumed that everybody shared the national language, English. Instead of linguistic diversity, Laura pointed to ethnic diversity among companions and volunteers since they had had "African" and "Afro-Caribbean" recruits like Elizabeth (see lines 32, 40-42). As mentioned above, this is due to the "catchment area", as the London Borough had sizable populations of Afro-Caribbean descent and Africans.

In my fieldwork, a case in point was Iancu, a Romanian-born companion occupying a "solidarity place" who was very isolated and barely spoke to anyone in the community despite his fluency in English. Both staff and companions openly complained to me and also in meetings about his perceived passive attitude. According to various staff members, Iancu's educational, mobility and job aspirations did not match his perceived level of English. Some considered that the problem was that he was "stuck" and did not move forward with his English. This institutional categorisation ideologically erased his wide multilingual repertoire, an extended transnational trajectory (Anglophone Canada, Sweden and Bulgaria) and his BA in IT Sciences. Contrary to these categorisations, Iancu presented himself as a multilingual gifted learner in the context of Spanish classes that I was asked to teach. In our interview, however, he appropriated the institutional categorisation as an

immobile L2 English learner as he thought that he needed to "improve English to continue life on a higher level", which he imagined to include taking MA courses in IT in Holland (interview, 29-05-2012).

Speaking English did not seem to be enough for Iancu, as he was not perceived as an active companion and legitimate English speaker. In other words, both staff members and more established companions regarded him as somebody who was not well integrated in the community and explained it with his "poor" English skills, as well as his unwillingness to engage with work and communal activities. Therefore, Emmaus London constructed the ideal companion as a *legitimate* speaker of the national language (Bourdieu 1982) in keeping with its construction as an English charity under the linguistic nationalist ideologies and the legal restrictions to welcome foreign people under state regulations. On the other side of the coin, Emmaus London ideologically erased (Irvine & Gal 2000) multilingualism among local companions, but this was also the case with multilingual members or even visitors who had a transnational trajectory.

An illuminating episode was the initial tour for Guy, a French undergraduate doing a summer internship in this community. John, the general manager, asked me to act as an interpreter for Guy's family and I accompanied them during the tour. To my surprise, he did not make any references to the movement in France, which the family knew first-hand. Additionally, he explicitly asked Guy, who had trouble understanding London accents, to speak "only English from tomorrow" on two occasions and banned French during his internship (fieldnotes, 30-05-2012). Although there were two people who were native-like French speakers (a British companion who had lived in France for 12 years and a French university graduate staff member), both used only English with the volunteer's family who did not speak English. Both were ideal candidates to tell them about the Emmaus movement in Britain, due to their fluency in French and their first-hand experience of Emmaus. In retrospect, this would have violated the English-only habitus in Emmaus London, but at the time I found it hard to understand why they would ask me (and not them) to act as an ad-hoc interpreter (struggling at times).

Another example of the English-only habitus comes from the community's rare contacts with the Emmaus movement in France. The two French speakers in the community (see previous paragraph) had to act as interpreters for the UK groups who participated in the *Salon Emmaüs* in Paris, which is a yearly sale of second-hand goods held by various international Emmaus groups jointly collaborating to raise funds for international solidarity projects. This comes to show that French remains the main lingua franca in the transnational Emmaus movement. Note that today most Emmaus communities in the world are non-English speaking, but Emmaus UK has become the second largest state federation in the movement. Although English has been an official language in

Emmaus International since 1971, it has recently gained some terrain as a lingua franca, especially in Northern Europe, including the UK, and in South East Asia (interview with Emmaus International board member, 13-09-2013).

While members with transnational trajectories were socialised in this English-only habitus, local English-speaking companions who wanted to go to Emmaus communities abroad looked for "English-friendly" ones, especially in "Holland". Charlie, a senior companion from Emmaus Brighton and Hove, told me that the kind of companion who is transnationally mobile across the Emmaus network is either a travelled person who is "slightly more adventurous" or a previously immobile person looking for "English-language friendly communities" (interview, 31-05-2012). In fact, most companions whom I asked about the possibility of visiting or moving to a different Emmaus community only referred to those in the UK. A handful considered those in "Holland", and even fewer those in Benin, France or Serbia. The companions who had lived in other Emmaus communities had only been to British ones. One of the Emmaus International board members, Englishman Sam, also told me that "language is a barrier" and most companions decide to go on exchanges to Holland or Germany, where they will find English speakers (interview, 13-09-2013). Besides the monolingual mindset, formerly homeless companions would prefer a familiar environment geographically and also linguistically to feel safer.

This limited mobility and multilingualism in Emmaus London is partly due to the fact that this newer community only has institutionalised connections with communities under Emmaus UK and few with overseas communities (e.g. at the annual Emmaus sale in Paris). Most local communities in the UK operate as *English* charities focusing on homelessness and according to Sam, the UK movement had "no involvement at all" with wider aspects of social exclusion like undocumented migration. In 2013, this narrow focus on solidarity was widening in some established communities which no longer defined themselves as "homeless charities" and engaged in Emmaus International priority programmes abroad. Contrary to the studied community, some established communities in the UK, such as Emmaus Brighton and Hove or that in Cambridge, had more transnational mobility among companions, especially with France (fieldnotes, 31-05-2012). Although they were also English-predominant in their linguistic practices, they did not seem to have such strong English-only ideologies owing to more frequent transnational contacts. Despite some exceptions, the French Emmaus movement, known for its socio-political activism and unconditional welcome of undocumented migrants, did not understand the narrow focus of solidarity and the lack of socio-political activism vis-à-vis the UK government (interview with Sam). According to Alwyn, some people in British communities felt that "if they were more vocal they would lose support" among donors, welfare partners and local governments.

In summary, state regulations on charities participating in the network of local outsourced services, namely the requirement for Housing Benefit and having a normal situation in the UK, kept out a pool of homeless foreigners with a resulting majority of native English-speaking companions. In Emmaus London, the linguistic penalty for gatekeeping entrance to the community further reinforced the role of English as a national and administrative language in London. Besides, the lack of connections with the Emmaus movement overseas also erased multilingualism in the community and French as a *lingua franca* in the broader movement. Emmaus as a movement seemed to be divided into language blocks where Emmaus UK is a newcomer that keeps itself relatively isolated in terms of language and international participation.

4. Discussion: Language ideologies in a multi-national at the heart

In order to grasp the hegemony of English in Emmaus London, one has to look outside language and discourse to the socioeconomic order and historical context through a critical ethnographic lens. The findings suggest that language ideologies are part and parcel of the mixed economy of welfare and (banal) nationalist projects in England, in ways that naturalise and promote English (Piller & Cho 2011) even in chapters of a transnational social movement. From the analysis above, it emerges that the construction of multilingualism in a given Emmaus community depends on three main factors: the local sociolinguistic regime, embedded in a given form of (linguistic) nationalism; the geographical range of the group's activities, which require certain language competences; and social actors' linguistic repertoires, which they have to adapt to the linguistic habitus. In Emmaus London, English was constructed as both a national(ist) language in Britain and an emergent *lingua franca* to make transnational connections with certain regions in the Emmaus movement, still dominated by French.

In Emmaus London, modernist language ideologies continue to thrive through *banal nationalism*, the everyday taken-for-granted construction of nationalist feeling (Billig 1995), in ways that naturalise English in Great Britain and especially England. Language continues to be recruited in banal, yet increasingly more explicit, nationalism in response to the recent challenge that migration poses to the monolingual nation-state model. In the neoliberal devolution of services to local authorities, Emmaus communities mainly collaborate with other charities locally and interact with Emmaus UK at a nation-state level. As we have seen, Emmaus London ideologically erased multilingualism among members in the diverse London borough, by constructing an English-only normative regime into which recent arrivals had to become socialised. However, multilingual encounters took place on extraordinary occasions (Guy's family tour or the Emmaus Salon in Paris) or in peripheral spaces such as the Spanish lessons. In this line, administrative staff

also used English to keep the gate for potential companions, as in other public services studied in the city (Roberts 2013). These gatekeeping encounters pass "total judgement" on the candidate's (English) language skills among other traits in the interests of the governmentality (Foucault 1991) of marginalised populations on behalf of the state.

NGOs and charities emerge as "Trojan horses for global neoliberalism" (Harvey 2005: 177). The celebratory discourse of solidarity in NGOs masks the volunteers' contribution to the mixed economy of welfare and overlooks unequal access to services through legitimate linguistic capitals. Due to the neoliberal winds and lack of knowledge on the history of Emmaus and Abbé Pierre's ideas, the model "of the private enterprise with nonprofit goals" (Pech & Padis 2004: 11) has been adopted across communities in the UK based on the first one set up in Cambridge. Local authorities have consequently viewed the local communities federated under Emmaus UK as efficient partners to outsource local services. Emmaus London actually collaborated and competed for contracts with other local organisations and was thus embedded in the mixed economy of welfare orchestrated by the British administration, whose legitimate language is English, as pointed out by Alwyn. The contemporary Big Society scheme is, in this respect, a (neo)liberal continuation of Victorian charities, Thatcherite *laissez-faire* and Labour's Third Way.

Emmaus UK is a *multinationale du coeur* (Pech & Padis 2004) whose localisation in London's sociolinguistic regime challenges the imagination of social movements as multilingual owing to the ideological and practical erasure of languages other than English. The London community with its professionalised, top-down management epitomises the centripetal trend of the transnational Emmaus movement, which has been historically documented in France (Brodiez-Dolino 2013). Furthermore, its imbrication in the British mixed economy of welfare suggests that Emmaus might be best conceived as a multi-national rather than as a transnational social movement from the centripetal viewpoint. In other words, my ethnography points to the lack of spontaneous, bottom-up transnational activities and networking in Emmaus London, following Portes' definition (2001). However, the community occasionally participated in institutionalised events organised by Emmaus International (and supported by Emmaus UK) such as the annual international sale in Paris.

The hegemony of English was thus consolidated by the geopolitical extension of the community's activities and communication, which was restricted to the London landscape and Emmaus UK with scarce contact with the broader Emmaus movement. Although English was not the main lingua franca in the movement, the social actors imagined it as a boundary marker with other regions/spaces within it and problematised non-English speaking spaces, notably French-speaking ones. Their preference for "English-only" or "English-friendly" spaces and interactions suggests an imagination of English as *the*

international lingua franca. In conclusion, the case study of Emmaus London shows that banal (linguistic) nationalism in England is (re)produced in/by subsidiary charities regulated by the nation-state and at the same time, neoliberal ideologies reinforce English as a lingua franca in multi-nationals of the heart, such as Emmaus UK and gradually Emmaus International.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all the anonymous informants who have helped me to understand their experiences and the Emmaus movement in the UK. Many thanks to the guest editors, two external reviewers and Zorana Sokolovska for their feedback on previous versions. A special thank you goes to Dr. Eva Codó, without whose encouragement, supervision and conversations this research would not have been possible. This research was funded through the pre-doctoral research grants 2008UAB 2015 (UAB), ESTPIF 2010-23 (UAB) and 2011 BE-DGR 0039 (AGAUR), and the research projects HUM 2010-26964 (MCINN) and 2009 SGR 1340 (AGAUR) awarded to the CIEN research team at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. The writing of this article has benefited from a Swiss Excellence Scholarship for Foreign Scholars (2015.0317) at the University of Fribourg.

REFERENCES

- Allan, K. (2013). Skilling the self: The communicability of immigrants as flexible labour. In A. Duchêne, M. Moyer & C. Roberts (eds.), *Language, migration and social inequalities* (pp. 56-78). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Alvey, N. (1995). *From Chantry to Oxfam: A short history of charity and charity legislation*. Chichester: Phillimore.
- Bauman, R. & Briggs, C.L. (1990). Poetics and performance as critical perspectives on language and social life. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19, 59-88.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). *Langage et pouvoir symbolique*. Paris: Fayard.
- Brodiez-Dolino, A. (2013). *Emmaus and the Abbé Pierre: An alternative model of enterprise, charity and society*. Paris: Presse de Sciences Po.
- Duchêne, A. (2008). *Ideologies across nations: The construction of linguistic minorities at the United Nations*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchnell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault* (pp. 87-104). Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gal, S. (2007). *Circulation in the "new" economy: Clasps and copies*. Paper presented at the 106th Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Washington (USA).
- Garrido, M. R. (2014). *Emmaus as a transnational imagined community: Language, interdiscursivity and stratification in a social movement*. Unpublished PhD Thesis: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. TDX: <http://www.tdx.cat/handle/10803/285359> [Date accessed: 28th January 2016]
- Giddens, A. (1998). *The third way: The renewal of social democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gilbert, N. (2004). *Transformation of the welfare state: The silent surrender of public responsibility*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heller, M. (2011). *Paths to post-nationalism: A critical ethnography of language and identity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Irvine, J. T. & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language* (pp. 35-83). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Lefèvre, D. (2001). *Les combats d'Emmaüs*. Paris: Le Cherche Midi.
- Muehlebach, A. (2009). Complexio oppositorum: Notes on the left in neoliberal Italy. *Public Culture*, 21(3), 495-515.
- Pech, T. & Padis, M.-O. (2004). *Multinationales du coeur: Les ONG, la politique et le marché*. Paris: Seuil.
- Piller, I. & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society*, 42, 23-44.
- Portes, A. (2001). Introduction: The debates and significance of immigrant transnationalism. *Global Networks*, 1(3), 181-193.
- Pries, L. (2001). The approach of transnational social spaces: responding to new configurations of the social and the spatial. In L. Pries (ed.), *New Transnational Social Spaces: International migration and transnational companies in the early twenty-first century* (pp. 3-29). London and New York: Routledge.
- Roberts, C. (2013). The gatekeeping of Babel: Job interviews and the linguistic penalty. In A. Duchêne, M.G. Moyer & C. Roberts (eds.), *Language, migration and social inequalities: A critical sociolinguistic perspective on institutions and work* (pp. 81-94). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Taylor, M. (2002). Government, the third Sector and the contract culture: The UK experience so far. In U. Ascoli & C. Ranci (eds.), *Dilemmas of the welfare mix: The new structure of welfare in an era of privatization*. New York, Boston, Dordrecht, London, Moscow: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Weber, M. (1984). *L'Ètica protestant i l'esperit del capitalisme*. Barcelona: Edicions 62.
- Woolard, K.A. (1998). Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schiefflin, K. Woolard & P. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory* (pp. 3-47). New York: Oxford University Press.