HOW THE 'PLUMBER' BECAME A PROBLEM: THE UNITED KINGDOM, POLISH IMMIGRANTS, AND THE EUROPEAN UNION, 1945–2014

Rachel C. Pawlowicz

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

December 2019

Committee:

Douglas Forsyth, Advisor

Neal Jesse

ABSTRACT

Douglas Forsyth, Advisor

This thesis examines the critical role that the Polish immigrant community has played in recent British history. A large influx of Polish migrants settled in the UK in the years immediately following World War II. The British government pressured the Poles to repatriate or settle elsewhere, due in part to the post-war scarcity environment. By the early 1960s, against the backdrop of Commonwealth immigration—many of whom were non-white—the Polish immigrant community was extolled for their ability to adapt and assimilate with comparative ease.

When a second wave of Polish immigration began in 2004, it was as a result of Poland's accession to the EU. The UK did not limit Polish immigration between 2004 and 2011; it was one of three member states that did not. By the end of 2011—when the other member states lifted their restrictions—Polish was the second most commonly spoken language in Britain, behind English and ahead of Welsh. As a result, the Polish community became a focal point for Eurosceptics, who argued that the UK's inability to limit the number of Poles seeking employment in the island nation threatened not only low-paid, unskilled British labor but also the integrity of British society.

This was not a new concern; throughout its history with the EU and the European Communities, the UK objected strongly to the possibility of relinquishing sovereignty over key policy issues, and, especially after 2004, control over immigration proved to be a particularly delicate issue. The only way the UK would be able to limit immigration by EU citizens would be to seek an exemption to the free movement of workers or by leaving the EU, which led to the Referendum on membership put forth by Prime Minister David Cameron. When British citizens

went to the polls in 2016 to decide whether or not to remain a member state, the Polish immigrant community was a conspicuous reminder of how Britain's destiny was no longer decided in London.

For Christopher, Theodore, and Auden

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many people to whom I owe a debt of gratitude for helping me complete this project. First and foremost, I have to thank Douglas Forsyth for his seemingly unending patience. You have guided me on this project from its inception, treated me with nothing but respect throughout, encouraged me when I felt like I had lost all hope in it, and I would not have completed it without your belief in it and in me. Thank you.

I must also thank Neal Jesse for being willing to step in and help guide me through my nascent understanding of the British political system. Your encouraging words and humor were greatly appreciated during the days that I was not sure I could complete this work.

I also need to thank Kathy Burrell. Not only are you one of the handful of people researching Poles in post-war Britain and after accession, you were willing to offer help to a graduate student who contacted you out of the blue. I would not have been able to complete this without the resources you pointed me to and provided.

It would be remiss of me to not also thank my sister Rebecca. The countless hours we spent arguing about specific phrasing to help capture the correct shade of meaning I was looking for was both entertaining and invaluable. Even if half the time we still were not able to *quite* get there. Thank you, Beck. I'll return the favor when the time comes.

Speaking more broadly, I must thank the history department at Bowling Green State University as a whole. The spirit of camaraderie among the students, the stalwart professionalism of the faculty, and everyone's willingness to be supportive of each other made it possible for me to find my bearings and my lodestar for this project. It has taken me much longer to complete than I'd hoped or anticipated, but I would not have been able to complete it without your support. Thank you all for helping show me what and who I could be.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

When Poland acceded to the European Union (EU) in May 2004 as part of the Accession 8 (A8),[1] the United Kingdom (UK) was not prepared for the number of Polish immigrants who, in the following years, would seek employment in and settle in the country. As a result, British public opinion grew increasingly hostile towards Polish immigration. This thesis will examine how the reaction to this migrant movement follows historical trends in the UK, both with regard to immigration and with regard to the UK's relationship with the EU and its predecessor European Communities. Polish immigrants were the largest immigrant community in the UK immediately following World War II. Despite their contributions to the Allied war effort, the British public was uncomfortable with the prospect of their settlement in the country, particularly during a period of marked scarcity and rationing. After 1948, Commonwealth immigrants arrived in the UK in increasing numbers. Many of these immigrants were people of color and during the 1950s and into the 1960s, discussions about race, race relations, and racist attitudes became inextricably linked with the concept of immigration. This intertwining of race and immigration was at the root of the riots in Nottingham and Notting Hill in 1958, the contentious, raced-based Parliamentary campaign run by Peter Griffiths in 1964, and Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech in 1968, all of which contributed pressure to restrict Commonwealth immigration. By the early 1990s and into the early 2000s, the migrant communities of focus became refugees and asylum-seekers. Over the last half of the 20th century, Conservative and Labour governments alike moved to limit migrants' ability to stay in residence and their access to benefits and employment.

[1]Ten countries acceded to the EU in May 2004. Eight of them–Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovkia, Slovenia, the Czech Republic, and Poland–are Eastern European; it is these eight countries that are referred to as the A8. The other two countries to accede at this time were Malta and Cyprus.

After the A8 accession, the UK was one of only three member states that did not restrict Polish migration; as a result, Polish immigrants came in numbers that far outstripped original estimates. They once again became the migrant community of focus. They were targeted by Eurosceptics in the UK who focused on the ceding of sovereignty over immigration to the EU and the volume of Polish immigrants in residence. Concern about sovereignty had been a serious point of conflict between the UK and EU and its predecessor European Communities since the late 1940s. These issues, viewed together, illustrate clearly that while the volume of Polish immigrants in the UK in the post-A8 accession period was a source of anxiety for the British public and British politicians, they became the prominent reminder of the loss of legal competence over fundamental policy domains to the EU. Backlash against the community became entangled with backlash against EU membership in ways that it did not for other EU immigrant communities.

To develop a better sense of why post-A8 accession Polish immigrants have been portrayed as they have in British media, it is necessary to examine broader British reactions to immigration. Jerzy Zubrzycki's work[2] detailing the development of the post-war Polish community is invaluable to that end. He and Keith Sword[3] provide the most commonly cited accounts of the development of the community during this period. Research addressing the Polish community in the UK between the mid-1950s and the 1990s is limited. Peter Stachura[4]

---

[2] See *Polish Immigrants in Britain: A Study of Adjustment*, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956) and *Soldiers and Peasants: the Sociology of Polish Migration, a Lecture* (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies University of London, 1988).

[3] Keith Sword, *The Formation of the Polish Community in Great Britain 1939—1950*, (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies University of London, 1989).

[4] Peter Stachura, ed., *The Poles in Britain 1940—2000: From Betrayal to Assimilation* (Portland, OR: Frank Cass Publishers, 2004).

and Sword[5] both have research that examines how the community developed during the second half of the twentieth century. Additionally, Kathy Burell's research[6] has filled in more information about the Poles in the UK during this period but, overall, research focusing on this period would benefit from additional perspectives and exploration.

Given this dearth of research, it is unsurprising that little work has been done to analyze how the perceptions and representations of Polish immigrants in British print media relate not just to the Polish immigrant community within the UK, but also how those representations additionally reflect the relationship between the UK and the EU. This work seeks to help fill the gap in that literature.

In order to do so, the UK's relationship with immigration and its relationship with the European Communities and the EU will be addressed. To that end, the first chapter of this project will address the UK's relationship with immigration since 1945. It begins with a discussion of the Polish immigrant group that settled in the UK at the end of World War II. This not only establishes a baseline for how the British have interacted with Polish immigrants in the recent past, but also presents a unique case because the influx of these immigrants was a temporally limited event. It draws on the work of Jerzy Zubrzycki and Keith Sword to investigate the development of the post-war Polish community. The chapter moves on to discuss Commonwealth immigration from the post-war period through the passage of the British Nationality Act 1981. The focus in this section is predominantly on West Indian immigrants and racial tensions as they increased during this period, ultimately resulting in immigration

---

[5] Keith Sword, *Identity in Flux: The Polish Community in Britain* (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies University of London, 1996).

[6] See Kathy Burrell, "Managing, Learning and Sending: The Material Lives and Journeys of Polish Women in Britain," Journal of Material Culture 13, no. 1(March 1, 2008): 63—83 and "Materialising the Border: Spaces of Mobility and Material Culture in Migration from Post-Socialist Poland," Mobilities 3, no. 3(November 1, 2008): 353—373.

restrictions and changing criteria for British citizenship. It draws largely on the work of Panikos Panayi,[7] D.W. Dean,[8] and Wendy Webster.[9] These works elucidate the complex interplay among the volume of immigration, immigration as a source of identity, racism as a tool of moral authority, and the enmeshment of racism and immigration.[10] After that, the ways in which asylum seekers were addressed in the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s is briefly examined.

The second chapter explores some of the EU's legal framework that limits member state competence in specific areas. It becomes clear that, after declining to initially limit their numbers after accession, the UK did not and—until Brexit is finalized—does not have the ability to limit the number of Polish immigrants seeking employment in the UK. The ceding of legal competence to a supranational authority has long been a point of anxiety for the UK, which is discussed in second half of the chapter. It explores the relationship between the UK and the European Communities as it developed from the late 1940s through the UK's first, failed application to join in 1961. This is done against the backdrop of the UK's declining global position, which became clear after the Suez Crisis in 1956. The work of Alan Milward[11] and Hugo Young[12] help to elucidate just how contentious this relationship has been from its inception.

---

[7] See Panayi's *An Immigration History of Britain: Multicultural Racism since 1800*, (Harlow, Great Britain: Pearson Longman, 2010).
[8] Particularly his article "Conservative Governments and the Restriction of Commonwealth Immigration in the 1950s: The Problems of Constraint" in *The Historical Journal* 35, no. 1(March 1992): 171—194.
[9] See Webster's *Englishness and Empire 1939—1960* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).
[10] Paul Gilroy and Stuart Hall are generally considered major contributors in this field, as well, and while I do draw upon their work, the emphasis of their research is focused in a different direction than this project explores.
[11] In particular, Milward's works *The European Rescue of the Nation-State*, 2nd ed (New York: Routledge, 2000) and *Politics and Economics in the History of the European Union*, (New York: Routledge, 2005) informed this discussion.
[12] See Hugo Young's *This Blessed Plot: Britain and Europe from Churchill to Blair*, (London: Papermac, 1999).

The third chapter discusses the Polish immigrant community in the UK between 2004 and 2014. As applies directly to Polish immigrants, current research largely relates to the experiences of immigrants experiences after settlement in the UK, including their ability to take advantage of networks and secure necessities such as employment and housing.[13] Additionally, there has been work that seeks to address the ways in which the Poles have been portrayed in the British media since accession. In particular, research by Spigelman,[14] Frech,[15] and Hoops et. al.[16] analyze the ways that Polish immigrants have been referenced in British newspapers both qualitatively and quantitatively. This chapter builds on that work and qualitatively analyzes newspaper articles from *The Times*, *The Sunday Times, Financial Times, Guardian, Daily Telegraph, Sunday Telegraph, Daily Mail, Independent, and Independent on Sunday*. Framing discussion through the lens of critical discourse analysis, this chapter examines the emergence, the contestation, and dominance between discourses.[17] That is, it looks at the ways Polish immigrants are portrayed in these papers over time to develop a sense of how the perception of the community was influenced by the way they were discussed in newspapers, how that

[13] In particular, see the second half of Kathy Burrell's edited volume *Polish Migration to the UK in the 'New' European Union: After 2004* (London: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2009) and Anne White's *Polish Families and Migration since EU Accession* (Portland, OR: The Policy Press, 2011) and Louise Ryan, et al., "Social Networks, Social Support and Social Capital: The Experience of Recent Polish Migrants in London," *Sociology* 42, no. 4 (August 2008).
[14] Ariel Spigelman, "The Depiction of Polish Migrants in the United Kingdom by the British Press After Poland's Accession to the European Union," *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 33 (2013).
[15] Alexandra Frech, "'Mass Migration', Crime and 'Decent People': The Portrayal of Polish Migrants in British Newspapers," *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism* (2008).
[16] Joshua Hoops, Ryan J. Thomas, and Jolanta A. Drzewiecka, "Polish 'Pawns' between nationalism and neoliberalism in British newspaper coverage of post-European enlargement polish immigration," *Journalism* 17, no. 6(2015):727—734.
[17] See Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (New York: Pearson Education Limited, 2010), 19 for more information.

discussion evolved, and which narratives about them became dominant. That evolution will then be related to the UK's relationship with the EU.

Ultimately, what this project seeks to achieve is to provide evidence that while discourse about the post-accession Polish community in Britain was framed largely negatively, it ultimately became another facet of the contentious relationship between the UK and the EU. This is not to say that there was not a negative reaction to the number of Poles in Britain after accession or fear of or frustration with the rapidly growing community. But because the Poles had legal rights to enter and seek employment because of their status as EU citizens, the relationship is ultimately defined as one representing a frustration with the limitations placed on legal competences with regard to immigration.

CHAPTER I: THE POLES, THE COMMONWEALTH, AND ASYLUM IN GREAT BRITAIN 1945—2004

One of the main themes that has defined the United Kingdom (UK) politically and socially over the course of the last century has been immigration. This chapter will explore this issue during the period from 1945 through roughly 2004 with a particular emphasis on the post-war immigration and integration of Polish nationals, though it will begin with a brief discussion of the history of Poles in the UK. Additionally, it will investigate issues concerning immigration from the Commonwealth, with focus on the West Indies and the development of racial tensions through the 1950s and 1960s. It will also briefly examine the way in which political asylum was regulated in the 1990s and early 2000s. These issues highlight not only some of the tensions that have arisen in the UK regarding immigration, but also the ways in which those tensions were addressed, when the British government has had the legal competence to do so.

The Poles in Britain Before May 1945

The earliest known official interaction between Poland and England came in 1522, when the Kingdom of Poland sent an ambassador to the court of Henry VIII. From then until the end of the eighteenth century, it was largely Poles who sought religious education or refuge from religious persecution who came to the island nation.[1] At the end of the eighteenth century, Poland was partitioned for the third and final time. After that, it was largely Polish political refugees who sought asylum in the UK, particularly after failed uprisings against Russian rule in 1831 and 1863—1864 as well as the failed uprising in 1848 against Prussian rule.[2] Between 1830 and 1870, the number of Poles in Britain grew from 500 to 1,500.[3]

---

[1] Keith Sword, *Identity in Flux: The Polish Community in Britain* (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies University of London, 1996), 19.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., 20.

By the 1880s, the number of Poles migrating to the UK to seek employment began to increase, particularly from the Russian and German Partitions. Many of these laborers settled in urban areas like Liverpool, Manchester, and London's East End. Though most of the Polish immigrants from this period were of Jewish descent, there were also sufficient Catholic immigrants to justify the establishment of two Polish Catholic churches by 1930.[4]

During the First World War, Polish prisoners of war from the German Partition were brought to the UK; at the same time, members of the Polish intelligentsia began to gather in London in an effort to influence the Foreign Office to support Polish independence before the peace conference in Versailles.[5] After the war, the economic downturn in Poland led many of the Poles in the UK to decide to stay, and by 1931 there were 4,500 Christian Poles estimated to be living in London.[6]

When Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, a number of Polish naval and air force units were deployed to the UK, in accordance with diplomatic agreements between the allies.[7] After the Soviet invasion on September 17 and the detention of the Polish government—then in Romania—a Polish government in exile was established in Angers in France by President Władysław Raczkiewicz and Prime Minister Władysław Sikorski. After the fall of France in May 1940, the government in exile, along with the remaining free Polish forces in France, were evacuated to Britain. The total number of military evacuees at that time was 19,457.[8] From that point, the government in exile was based in London.

---

[4] Ibid., 20—21.
[5] Ibid., 21—22.
[6] Ibid., 22.
[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid., 23.

Polish forces contributed to coastal defenses and helped defend the UK during the Battle of Britain. After the reestablishment of Polish-Soviet diplomatic relations after Germany invaded the Soviet Union in 1941, Polish troops that had been held captive in the Soviet Union were combined with General Stanisław Kopański's Carpathian Brigade to form the Polish Second Corps, which served in the Italian campaign.[9] There were also Poles who had served in the Wehrmacht who were either captured or deserted and who would eventually serve in the free Polish forces on the Allied side.[10] These forces composed most of the Polish population in Britain in May 1945.

The Poles in Post-War Britain

At the end of the war in Europe, free Polish forces found themselves in a difficult situation. Returning to Poland meant returning to a country that was functioning under steadily increasing Soviet influence. The alternatives were to seek asylum abroad or to otherwise officially emigrate. Since the free Polish forces had been under British command, a likely first option for many would have been to stay in or gain entry to Britain. Ultimately, while some of these forces migrated back to Poland and others moved further abroad to places like Canada and the United States, the majority maintained affiliation with Britain.[11] This process was not without its difficulties.

During the Yalta debate in the House of Commons in February 1945, Winston Churchill addressed the free Polish forces that had fought alongside British forces throughout the war. He commented that he hoped "it may be possible to offer the citizenship and freedom of the British Empire" to those Polish troops who wished to stay, given the "debt [His Majesty's Government]

[9] Ibid., 24.
[10] Ibid., 25.
[11] Eleanor T. Brzenk, "The Distribution of Polish Immigrants in Great Britain" (PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, 1957), 49—57.

owe[d] to the Polish troops who have served them so valiantly,"[12] while acknowledging that they still owed allegiance to the Polish government in exile. He also noted the government's goal of providing return passage to Poland "under every safeguard"[13] for as many of the Polish troops as possible.

Churchill's comments during this debate highlight the major issues that would dominate discussion concerning the free Polish forces during the years immediately following the end of the war. There was acknowledgement of the contribution of the Polish forces to the war effort, while emphasizing the desire to have as many of those troops as possible exit Britain, with the stress being on having them return to Poland. Indeed, Churchill's declaration would be predictive, and that the British would provide "every safeguard" for that return their would become socially, if not politically, important.

After the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, it became increasingly clear that Poland would come to be dominated politically by the Soviet Union. Churchill openly acknowledged this fact in his 'Sinews of Peace' speech in March 1946, stating that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all the famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high, and in some cases, increasing, measure of control from Moscow."[14] Soviet hegemony became even clearer after the Polish legislative election in January 1947, in which politicians affiliated with Soviet Communism won a majority of seats in and

---

[12] "Winston Churchill's 'pledge' to Polish troops during the Yalta Debate in the House of Commons, 27 February 1945," in *Soldiers and Peasants: the Sociology of Polish Migration* by Jerzy Zubrycki (London: Orbis Books, 1988), 126.
[13] Ibid.
[14] Robert Rhodes James, ed., *Churchill Speaks: Winston S. Churchill in Peace and War. Collected Speeches, 1897—1963* (New York: Atheneum, 1981), 881.

control of the Sejm.[15] Despite the Big Three's promise to Poland of 'free and unfettered elections' at the Yalta Conference, the election had been preceded by a campaign of terror during which members of anti-Soviet political parties were arrested, censored, removed from ballots, and in some cases murdered.[16]

The consolidation of power under a pro-Soviet, Communist regime was particularly problematic for the free Polish forces. Some had spent as much as two years in the Soviet Union during the war as political prisoners, prisoners of war, or as deportees.[17] Additionally, because portions of eastern Poland were annexed by the Soviet Union at the end of the war, there were members of the free Polish forces who no longer had Polish homes to which to return and who had become Soviet citizens.[18] While some harbored animosity towards the Soviet government because of this, other members of the free Polish forces were concerned about the safety of those who had been held prisoner in the Soviet Union and who would choose to return to Poland.[19] The British government did guarantee, at least nominally, that no members of the free Polish forces that had served in Britain would come to any harm if they chose to repatriate, but it is important to note that this would not apply to those servicemen who found their homes now part of Soviet territory. This offer also excluded those who had served in the Wehrmacht, those who had committed treason, or those who were guilty of other lesser crimes.[20] This amounted to more than 89,000 servicemen.[21]

---

[15] "The Polish 'Election'," *The New York Times* January 21, 1947, p. 22.
[16] Ibid. and Keith Sword, *Identity in Flux: the Polish Community in Britain* (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1996), 27.
[17] Jerzy Zubrzycki, *Polish Immigrants in Britain: a Study of Adjustment* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956), 56.
[18] Sword, *Identity*, 26.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Evan McGilvray, "General Stanisław Maczek and Post-war Britain," in *The Poles in Britain 1940—2000: From Betrayal to Assimilation*, ed. Peter D. Stachura (London: Frank Cass Publishers, 2004), 62.
[21] Zubrycki, *Polish Immigrants*, 56.

Because the political climate in Poland was becoming increasingly hostile to those who supported a Polish state outside the influence of the Soviet government, alternatives to repatriation were sought. One such alternative began to take shape in 1946. In a message to the members of the free Polish forces in March of that year, Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin noted that, while the official position of the British government was that those able to return to Poland should do so as soon as possible, they would seek to assist those unable to repatriate in finding suitable living arrangements outside Poland for themselves and their dependents. There was, however, no promise "that they [would] all be enabled to settle in British territory at home or overseas."[22]

At least part of the unwillingness to guarantee residence in the United Kingdom and the Commonwealth nations for those members of the free Polish forces who did not wish to or were unable to repatriate was due, in part, to growing concern about the number of immigrants and foreign nationals residing in the UK at the end of the war. Despite their increased presence during the war, British attitudes towards immigrants and other foreign nationals had not become more welcoming or tolerant.[23] Rather, during the period immediately following the war, migrants came to be seen as a drain on resources. Certain goods, particularly food items, remained rationed through the early 1950s,[24] and immigrants and foreign nationals, both those transient and those intending to stay on a permanent basis, came to be viewed as placing additional strain on a system struggling to support its own citizens.[25]

---

[22] Jerzy Zubrzycki, *Soldier and Peasants: the Sociology of Polish Migration* (London: Orbis Books, 1988), 142.
[23] Keith Sword, *The Formation of the Polish Community in Britain 1939—1950* (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 1989), 218.
[24] Ibid., 216.
[25] Evan McGilvray, "General Stanisław Maczek," 60.

The cost of maintaining Polish forces was perceived to be problematic in particular. John Maynard Keynes estimated the cost of supporting Polish units at £2.5 million per month, which led him to suggest disbanding them as early as February 1946.[26] Taken into consideration along with international debts, particularly to the United States, and the pressing need to invest in the redevelopment of British infrastructure left devastated by the war, this figure helped create enough pressure to lead Clement Atlee to hasten the demobilization of Polish forces.[27]

In early 1946, the War Office had divided the members of the Polish forces into five categories: 'volunteers' willing to return to Poland under the current circumstances, 'hard core' members that likely would be unwilling to return under any circumstances, 'repatriates' who would likely seek to return to countries other than Poland in which they had previously lived, 'emigrants' who would likely leave for other countries in which they had not previously lived, and 'immigrants' who would likely seek to remain in the UK.[28] By August of the same year, brochures began circulating among the free Polish forces regarding the establishment of the Polish Resettlement Corps (PRC), which was developed as a branch of the British Army.

These brochures explained to the Polish forces what their options moving forward would be. If they did not choose to join the PRC, they would receive no help from the British government; if they did join, provisions would be made for them to return to Poland or emigrate to another country free of charge, which would include family members. They would also be able to choose to serve in the PRC for a period of two years and settle in the UK. During that two-year period, provisions would be made for the wives and families of married men to join

[26] Sword, *Formation*, 239.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid., 245.

them in the UK, the men would be provided lessons in English culture and language, and the PRC would work toward placing all members in civil work.[29]

Of the nearly 250,000 members of the Free Polish Forces that were in the UK at the end of the war, 114,000 chose to join the PRC, and of those 91,400 sought to settle in the UK.[30] An additional 2,300 chose not to join the PRC and directly entered civilian life. Furthermore, during the immediate post-war period, 29,400 Polish nationals entered the UK as European Voluntary Workers (EVWs) and 34,200 dependents and distressed relatives were admitted to the UK by the War Office.[31] Of those Polish forces who chose not to settle in the UK, 8,912 members repatriated and 11,409 emigrated to countries including—but not limited to—Canada, Argentina, France, Australia, and the United States by February 1949.[32]

By the close of 1949, 157,300 Polish nationals were residing in the UK, of whom 120,000 remained by the end of 1954. This was due in part to additional repatriation, emigration of some of the EVWs to Germany and then to the United States, and the naturalization of 10,300 Polish nationals as British citizens.[33] However, it is important to note that the 120,000 that remained accounted for 30% of the immigrants registered in the UK at that time.[34]

Between 1948 and 1950, data indicate that 66,000 members of the PRC transitioned into manual labor. The three sectors that absorbed the largest number of workers were building and construction, agriculture, and coal mining, which together accounted for 24,500 of the workers.[35] During the same period, 18,000 transitioned into non-manual labor, serving in miscellaneous

---

[29] Zubrycki, *Soldiers and Peasants*, 148—149.
[30] Zubrycki, *Polish Immigrants*. 62,
[31] Ibid.
[32] Brzenk, *op. cit.*, 52.
[33] Ibid., 63.
[34] Brzenk, *op. cit.*, 61.
[35] Zubrycki, *Polish Immigrants*, 66.

positions that included creating their own businesses, working in various professional services, or becoming students.[36] In 1951, some restrictions on PRC members' employment were lifted and little distinction was made between Polish and British labor.[37]

Of the Poles who settled in the UK, 89.7% stayed in England, 3.8% settled in Wales, and 6.5% settled in Scotland; none were reported to have settled in Northern Ireland.[38] Of those Poles who settled in England, 50% were concentrated in London, Lancashire, Middlesex, and the West Riding in Yorkshire, which tracked roughly with the breakdown of the British population at the time. Despite accounting for 30% of the immigrant population registered in the UK at the time, the Poles did not compose more than 1% of the population in these areas.[39] This distribution was impacted by the pre-1951 restrictions placed on Polish employment, which included an agreement only to "employ Poles in industries with appropriate wages and conditions, where no unemployed British workers were available,"[40] and took into account the location of industrial centers in the UK.

During this period, a variety of opinions about what would be best for both the UK and the Poles were published in local and national newspapers. While there was a sense that the Poles had earned, or were owed, the opportunity to settle in Britain given their service during the war, there was also concern about how to accommodate logistically the number of immigrants that chose to stay. This situation was further complicated by fears that many of these men would enter the job market and provide cheap labor, undercutting wages for British workers, when

[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid., 65.
[38] Brzenk, *op. cit*., 74.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid., 84.

wages and quality of life were perceived as problematic issues for British nationals. This was in spite of the agreement only to employ Poles where unemployed Britons could not be found.

One article from May 1946 highlights these issues with reference to the decision to demobilize Polish troops. The demobilization announcement had been delayed in part due to the necessity of finalizing plans with Washington for the transportation of Polish troops stationed in Italy, which took several months.[41] Additionally, the article noted that while the UK would allow some of these troops to stay as members of the PRC—of special interest were those who had 'technical qualifications'—there was an understanding that some of them would also be heading to the Dominions and to Latin American republics.[42] Part of the concern with this emigration was that the UK would lose a significant portion of the 'qualified' Poles and would be left supporting those who would only be employable as unskilled labor.

Another article from the same month highlighted the dissonant opinion about the Poles by arguing that while "[n]o one could for a moment deny that we owed a duty to the men who fought alongside of us" it would "be best if they went home and took part in the reconstruction of their Motherland."[43] The article also emphasized the importance of not settling the Poles in one geographic location, so as not to place undue stress on the economy in that region. Of particular concern were wage suppression and lower unemployment, which would make it more difficult for British workers to find well paid positions. While the article also addressed the need for additional labor for post-war reconstruction, it acknowledged that it would be impossible to know whether the need for labor would remain high. If that need were to decrease, the influx of

[41] "Britain to Demobilise Her Polish Forces," *The Yorkshire Post and Leeds Mercury* May 20, 1946, p1.
[42] Ibid.
[43] "Britain Honours Debt to Polish Comrades," *The Sunderland Echo & Shipping Gazette*, May 26, 1946, p2.

Poles into Britain might become problematic.[44] The concern was that the Poles, though useful in the immediate future, could become an economic drain on British citizens in the longer term.

Economic concerns form the core of the issue in both of these articles. Poles that had technical skills or that could be taught technical skills were favored over those that did not have those skills or were thought to be incapable of developing them. These concerns had not been alleviated by 1950. One 'concerned' British man submitted an editorial in which he asserted that

> "[t]he official explanation about the entry of large numbers of Polish refugees into England is unconvincing. There are 500,000 unemployed in Britain, and the entry of tens of thousands of refugees can only augment the trouble. In order to help these people why not take them to the Colonies, or to South America, where there is real need for immigrants? When some of the large sums of money spent on them, and official activity, is used in the interests of British unemployed, then we shall be impressed and agreeably surprised by the leaders of "planned democracy."[45]

The letter writer created a clear distinction in identity; by invoking his British identity as a counter to the Poles, he portrayed the Polish identity as being unjustly and incorrectly privileged within British society. He implied that the Poles would likely take jobs away from unemployed Britons, and that they would require social services and welfare that would be 'better spent' on British citizens. This implies a strict social hierarchy based on ethnicity, where the culturally and ethnically English ought to be positioned above the Poles, rather than representing the Poles as contributing members to British society. Instead, they are presented as a drain on finite resources and therefore as a threat to British citizens. They ought to be sent abroad, rather than allowed to remain in the UK.

Another article raised the issue of Poles stymying development even inadvertently. In December 1949, the Ministry of Health—which had taken responsibility for overseeing the

---

[44] Ibid.
[45] "Entry of Refugees," *Daily Mail*, September 5, 1950, p4.

remnants of the PRC after it was disbanded—requested that the Hambledon Rural District Council[46] take over management of the Tweedsmuir Camp, which still housed roughly 100 Polish families. The council would be granted the ability to remove individuals and families deemed problematic, and they were to promote individuals and families seeking and securing employment and housing outside of the camp. In return, the council would be reimbursed for the camp's expenses and funds would be contributed towards its administrative costs by the Ministry of Health. However, the land on which the camp was established was not approved for development. This meant that structures on the land could not legally be redeveloped with expanded or improved structures despite applications from residents seeking permits, which contributed to the value of the land being depressed relative to the areas around it.[47]

It was not just economic issues related to the Poles that caused concern, though. There were also questions regarding Poles' political loyalty. One article from 1950 pointed out that Scotland Yard, MI5, and other State Security Departments would be working in conjunction with immigration officers to interview resident aliens regarding their political alignment. It stated: "while most of these people have settled here and become good citizens, there are many with Communist sympathies, and some who have maintained contact with Red organisations and various other bodies behind the Iron Curtain."[48] The article continued on to point out specifically the roughly 120,000 members of the Polish armed forces and their families as some of the immigrants who would need to be interviewed; no other racial, national, or ethnic groups were specified. The implication was that given the political situation in Poland at the time, there was

[46] This district no longer exits; in 1974 it was combined with several other districts to create the Waverly District.
[47] "Hundred Polish Families in Surrey Camp: Ministry Press Council to Take Charge," *Surrey Advertiser*, December 14, 1949, p1.
[48] "Big Security Drive Among Aliens," *Sheffield Telegraph*, October 19, 1950, p1.

an increased likelihood that those Poles who stayed in Britain after the war would be more likely than others to have ties, political or even familial, to undesirable and subversive political individuals and organizations. Elucidating who among them might have been a Communist or Communist sympathizer became a matter of national security.

Within a few years, discussion of the Poles in print media began to die down. This is due in part to the fact that the influx of Polish immigrants virtually ended. An article from 1953 referenced the Poles only within the context of broader immigration trends; they were not the focus of the piece. It noted that between 1931 and 1951, immigration had totaled 505,000 people, of whom 80,000 were "Polish and other Servicemen" who had settled in the UK after the war.[49] It is important to note that the article includes more than just Polish forces in the estimate of 80,000[50] and it accounts for less than a fifth of the net population increase due to immigration during that twenty year period. This has the effect of deemphasizing the volume and impact of the post-war Polish immigration in the UK.

By 1964, journalist and author Elspeth Huxley was writing about the Poles in the UK in almost romantic terms. She argued that "[s]eldom can a minority have arrived *en bloc* carrying such a high proportion of trained, educated, and presumably useful people and so few of *hoi polloi*"[51] and went on to compare them favorably to other immigrant groups from the UK's history. She also noted that while there was some effort to maintain a sense of separate Polish

---

[49] "More Coming Here Than Leaving," *Evening Express*, April 13, 1953, p8.

[50] This number is off by approximately 40,000 people compared to other estimates and figures. It may be the case that this was an issue stemming from poor research on the reporter's part, but the 120,000-person figure should have been relatively well known and easy to find during this period, as evinced by the fact that other news articles from the same period use it. I suspect, but cannot confirm, that this is more of an indication of a lack of interest in the Poles as a specific immigrant group because there was not a continual influx of Poles immigrating during this period, those that were living in the UK had been there for several years, and they had begun the process of assimilation by that point.

[51] Elspeth Huxley, *Backstreet New World: a Look at Immigrants in Britain*, (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1965), 38.

identity, the Poles as a group had largely assimilated. The number of Polish language daily newspapers had fallen from over 200 to one, and few children of Polish immigrants attended separate cultural or language schools, instead preferring to embrace British identity.[52] She argued that "[w]ith the language Polish culture, too, will fade and die."[53] The Poles, then, would have been 'successful' in their assimilation; the Poles and their children, with a few minor noticeable character traits, would shortly, or already had, become 'British' and indistinguishable from other white Britons.

An Increase in Commonwealth Immigration

It is important to point out that while the Poles were able to assimilate and become largely indistinguishable from white Britons because people of color, coming from the British Commonwealth, experienced a different reality in post-war Britain. In 1948, the Labour government passed the British Nationality Act, which afforded citizens of self-governing Commonwealth nations, in addition to those considered "Citizens of the UK and Colonies," free entry into the UK and "regarded them as 'British citizens'."[54] This period of free entry would not last, due to increasing racial tensions between white Britons and Commonwealth immigrants; the vast majority of the latter were indeed people of color. In 1951, there were approximately 17,200 Commonwealth immigrants in the UK.[55] By 1961 that figure rose to nearly 174,700 and by 1971 it was roughly 304,000.[56] Racial tensions flared up almost immediately.

---

[52] Ibid., 42.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Keith Robbins, *Great Britain: Identities, Institutions and the Idea of Britishness*, (London: Longman Pearson, 1998), 326.
[55] Panikos Panayi, *An Immigration History of Britain: Multicultural Racism since 1800*, (Harlow, Great Britain: Pearson Longman, 2010), 43.
[56] Ibid.

Two dates during this period tend to be mentioned as being among the most significant with regard to immigration. June 1948 marked the arrival of the *Empire Windrush* at Tilbury Docks in London.[57] Carrying more than 400 immigrants from the West Indies, its arrival is typically noted as the starting point for the UK's post-war relationship with Commonwealth immigrants, likely because it received more media attention than other, earlier ships carrying Commonwealth immigrants.[58] The second date frequently cited as being significant with regard to race relations during this period is August 1958, when the Nottingham and Notting Hill riots occurred.[59] Kevin Searle has asserted that an additional date, August 1949, should also be considered significant. It was at this time, at the Causeway Green hostel, that one of the earliest race riots occurred.[60]

This riot is of particular interest to this period of immigration because it involved both West Indian immigrants and also Poles. On August 8, armed Polish tenants entered an area of the hostel that housed mainly Jamaican workers and began attacking them. Fighting became so severe that other tenants fled to nearby air raid shelters, while some of the Jamaicans fled and attempted to find shelter in nearby private residences.[61] The police were summoned, and by the time that the riots were under control, all of the Jamaican tenants—less two that were hospitalized—had been isolated in one sleeping block.[62] The police suggested removing all of the Jamaicans from the hostel; management agreed, but decided it would be "impracticable at the time and asked the police to maintain guard all night."[63] An official from the National Service

---

[57] Ibid., 53.
[58] Kevin Searle, "'Mixing of the unmixbles': the 1949 Causeway Green 'riots' in Birmingham," *Race and Class* 54, no. 3 (2013): 44.
[59] Panayaki, *op. cit.*, 63.
[60] Searle, *op. cit.*, 48.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibd., 49.
[63] Ibid.

Hostels Corporation (NSHC) argued that, while it was not ideal to remove the Jamaicans from the hostel, it would be less problematic than removing the Poles, because there were more than 200 Poles housed in Causeway Green and only 65 Jamaicans.[64] This was despite the fact that the Poles had developed a reputation for creating conflict with other resident groups before the fighting with the Jamaican contingent at the hostel broke out.[65] Although removing the Jamaican residents based on their numbers might seem to have presented fewer logistical challenges, other considerations influenced the decision, as well. Searle cited a regional welfare officer going on record as saying "[w]hilst the disturbances with the Jamaicans have mainly affected the Poles, emphasis, by this time, had been given to the wider question of 'blacks' versus 'whites."[66]

This is significant for several reasons. By the time the Causeway Green riot occurred, the British Nationality Act had come into force. The Jamaican tenants ought to have been afforded the rights of British citizens, and, despite the fact the Polish instigators damaged Jamaican property and caused bodily harm to several Jamaicans, the police did not pursue charges, citing a lack of evidence.[67] Despite the fact that the Jamaicans ought to have been protected under British law, there was no recompense for their losses and their attackers were not charged. Because the perpetrators were foreign nationals residing in the UK, it seems perplexing that they would be favored over their victims, especially given the anxiety related to their being in the UK, as discussed above. However, given that the issue had become one of "blacks versus whites" it becomes evident the reason that charges were not pursued is likely related to the fact that the victims were black, British citizens or not.

---

[64] Ibid.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid., 53.

Additionally, and importantly, the welfare officer's quote indicates a shift in blame for the riot; instead of acknowledging that it was the Polish tenants who instigated the riot, it implied that the Poles had been provoked by the Jamaicans. Not only was this used to justify a lack of charges against the Poles, it was also used to justify the implementation of a quota for West Indians—not just specifically Jamaicans—at hostels.[68] The Ministry of Labour and National Service (MLNS) called for a quota limiting West Indians to 10% of the total number of beds in a hostel, up to a total of 30, while including the options to reduce that number to a limit of 12 if deemed appropriate; it also offered the option to refuse to house West Indian immigrants at all.[69]

In 1951, a memo from the chief administrative officer of the NSHC further addressed the issue of quotas. It stated that the "nature of the problem has not varied at all. Poles and Coloured men do not mix, and in the agreement of January 1950 [the adoption of the quota scheme] forty-four hostels were listed as inappropriate for the admission of coloured workpeople. Nettlebed [hostel] is one of these; its population is quite predominately Polish."[70] West Indian immigrants were barred from tenancy in this hostel because they were deemed to be too much an of irritant to the Polish residents. Again, it is important to recall that it was the Polish tenants at the Causeway Green hostel that instigated the riots; the result was that quotas were put in place to limit the number of West Indians in hostels across the board. Quotas for the Poles were not instituted, and neither were 'Polish only' hostels adopted in an attempt to curtail the problem; blame and punishment were placed squarely on the shoulders of the West Indian immigrants. The quotas against West Indians provided legitimacy to the Poles' actions at Causeway Green and therefore added further legitimacy not just to racist behavior, but to systemic racism.[71]

---

[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid., 56.
[70] Ibid., 57.
[71] Ibid, 60.

The quotas were not created or instituted in a vacuum. Stuart Hall argued that "identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse, [and] we need to understand them as produced in specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices, by specific enunciative strategies."[72] These quotas, then, were established as not just a means to limit where West Indian immigrants would be able to live and work, but also as a means to more broadly define their position in society. Even though, at the time, they were legally considered British citizens, they were purposefully positioned lower in society than other, white immigrants.

This was motivated in part by the fear of miscegenation. The Causeway Green riot had been the result of several days of building anger that began with a fight at a dance at the hostel and then a larger argument over the "attentions of a woman."[73] One Jamaican hostel resident noted that residents, both in and around the hostel, were not overly concerned when white women were seen in the company of German prisoners of war or with EVWs or Poles, but when they were seen in the company of West Indian immigrants they were harassed.[74] Searle asserted that this was due to the fact that white Europeans were seen as essential to help compensate for war losses and were viewed as necessary for a "replenishment of stock" whereas mixed race children were seen as undesirable.[75]

This fear did not diminish over time. It was one of the causes of the Nottingham riot in August 1958. A fight over a black man speaking with a white woman in a pub turned into a major event. The riot was over in roughly 90 minutes, but during that period, more than 1,000 white people had taken part in harassing and attacking West Indians and black Britons; several

---

[72] Stuart Hall, "Introduction: Who Needs Identity?" in *Questions of Cultural* Identity, ed. Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay (London: SAGE Publications, 1996), 4.
[73] Ibid., 48.
[74] Ibid., 52—53.
[75] Ibid., 59—60.

people needed to be hospitalized. Two members of Parliament (MPs) called for immigration controls to limit the numbers of West Indians and Commonwealth immigrants in response to the riot. [76] Again, the reaction was to move to place restrictions on the (black) victimized group rather than to directly address the (white) aggressors.

A week after the Nottingham riots, riots broke out in Notting Hill. For two nights, armed white rioters attacked West Indian immigrants and black Britons, their homes, and their businesses; on the third night, the West Indians and black Britons began to defend themselves aggressively. On the fourth night of the riots, the police became involved and shut the riots down.[77] It was likely not incidental that the police only became involved after the West Indians and black Britons began defending themselves and that they were able to contain the riots within one night despite there being more people involved than in the first two nights of rioting. That said, attempts by some in power, like MP Cyril Osborne, to associate the riots with black crime in the area were unsuccessful. Instead, the press raised concerns about the problem of hooliganism and placed the blame on the Teddy Boys, a subculture of typically young, white men, some of whom were known to have racist, violent tendencies and had been discovered to have been at the center of the attacks in Notting Hill.[78]

These riots led to increased discussion about limiting the immigration of Commonwealth immigrants in both the Conservative and Labour parties.[79] It is important to note, though, that discussion of limiting Commonwealth immigration did not begin as a result of these riots; the

---

[76] Kathleen Paul, *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1997), 155.
[77] Ibid.
[78] Paul Gilroy, "Blacks and Crime in Postwar Britain," in *Writing Black Britain 1948—1998: an Interdisciplinary Anthology*, ed. James Procter (New York: Manchester University Press, 2000), 72.
[79] D.W. Dean, "Conservative Governments and the Restriction of Commonwealth Immigration in the 1950s: The Problems of Constraint," *The Historical Journal* 35, no. 1(March 1992): 189—192.

Eden government actively, though secretly, was discussing enacting legislation to limit immigration as early as 1955.[80] That discussion was stymied, however, by a desire on the part of British politicians to not be seen as overtly racist.

During the early 1950s, the concept of a 'people's empire' was being promulgated in an effort to promote the idea that the Commonwealth was a "multiracial community of equal nations"[81] that would hopefully "maintain Britishness as a global identity through transforming and modernizing its imperial dimension."[82] That is, the 'people's empire' was to be an empire composed of equal members, regardless of their nation of origin or their race. This idea was promulgated in part to help maintain the UK's global position of power; if, after the war, it were to maintain its position as a global leader, rather than a regional power, it would need to assert its global interests, which were expressed through its relationship with the Commonwealth.[83] And if the UK was going to present itself as *primus inter pares* among Commonwealth members, overtly racist policies would threaten its legitimacy. To that end, after the end of the war the British Commonwealth became more commonly known as just the Commonwealth or as the Commonwealth of Nations. When Winston Churchill expressed displeasure with the change in terminology, critics called him "a menace" to its political unity.[84] The need to be viewed as not racist was tied directly to the belief that such a position would support the British global position of power.

The desire to not be viewed as racist might also have been influenced by the desire to create and highlight a contrast between the ways in which the UK dealt with race among its

---

[80] Ibid., 172.
[81] Wendy Webster, *Englishness and Empire 1939—1965* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 8.
[82] Ibid.
[83] D.W. Dean, *op. cit.*, 173.
[84] Webster, *op.cit.*, 63.

citizens and the growing racial unrest in the US and the American political response to it. Presenting the Commonwealth as a 'people's empire' would allow the UK to present itself as "new enlightened force in the world,"[85] which would help secure its global position as a moral leader after the war.

However, while the idea of a 'people's empire' was being discussed publicly, a different narrative was being developed domestically. In this narrative, Englishness as an identity was being defined "against empire and particularly against immigrants…Englishness was increasingly invoked as an intimate, private, exclusive identity that was white."[86] This means that while a theoretically egalitarian version of the Commonwealth was being advertised to the world—including, importantly, to Commonwealth citizens—a much more limited, racist narrative of belonging was being developed in the UK.

As early as 1950, the government had established committees, convened in secret, to find ways in which to limit immigration by people of color from the colonies.[87] In the mid-1950s, Prime Minister Eden appeared before Parliament to deny that there were any plans to enact immigration controls; at the same time, the Eden government formed committees, in secret as before, to discuss which actions might be appropriate in order to curtail Commonwealth, and specifically West Indian, immigration.[88] Those committee members who were involved primarily with domestic issues tended to favor instituting immigration restrictions; those who were primarily involved with Commonwealth and Colonial issues tended to favor a policy of

[85] D. W. Dean, *op. cit.*, 174.
[86] Webster, *op. cit.*, 8.
[87] Ibid., 172.
[88] Ibid.

non-restriction, due largely to the negative perception of the UK that restriction might engender.[89]

While the demand for labor and the needs of the British economy largely dictated the numbers of immigrants in the UK,[90] the "suitability of workers from the West Indies…for British industry"[91] was frequently questioned during this period. While Commonwealth immigrants were needed to help address labor shortages, they were less desirable than other immigrant groups to fill those needs.

Again, because the concern about the impact of the government appearing racist was so prevalent during this period, the issue of immigration was not officially addressed; however, that does not mean it was ignored completely. The Colonial Office informed governors that if nothing were done to curtail the number of colonial immigrants to the UK, domestic agitation regarding the situation would increase and immigration restrictions would likely result.[92] Additionally, information provided to those seeking to immigrate employed a strategic tone that suggested a negative interpretation of the economic and social situations awaiting them in an effort to dissuade them from coming.[93] So while the issue of immigration was not yet being formally addressed on the policy level, by the end of the 1950s officials were attempting to convey the tacit message to Commonwealth immigrants that while they were officially welcome in the UK as citizens, their presence was not desired.

British politicians' reticence to address definitively the growing tension between these narratives of belonging was not without consequence. As they argued behind closed doors about

---

[89] Dennis Dean, "The Conservative government and the 1961 Commonwealth Immigration Act: inside the story," *Race and Class* 35, no. 2(October 1993): 57—58.
[90] Panayaki, *op. cit.*, 61.
[91] Dennis Dean, *op. cit.*, 58.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Ibid.

whether or not enacting restrictive immigration policies would alleviate some of the tension and whether they were appropriate or acceptable,[94] racial tensions continued to grow and fester. By the mid-1950s, British domestic media were posing the question of whether or not Britain had developed a de facto 'colour bar' in response to a 'colour problem' that had come to be closely related to the concepts of 'immigrant' and 'immigration' as well as being defined as a 'domestic problem'.[95] That is, British media were probing how and why the white segment of the population was more frequently viewing the increased numbers of non-white immigrants as a problematic demographic while casting responsibility for that assessment on the immigrant population.

While immigration restrictions were not enacted during the late 1950s, discussion of a 'colour bar' and legislation to limit Commonwealth immigration began to gain significant traction. This was due to a number of factors, including the Nottingham and Notting Hill riots. With reference to those riots, it again is important to note that despite the fact they were caused and instigated by white agitation, as they were in the Causeway Green case, policy reaction was directed against the West Indian immigrants and black Britons, whose presence in the region was blamed for that agitation.

In highlighting the increased racial tensions in the UK, the riots also threatened the narrative the country had constructed about itself as a global moral leader and its identity as a place of racial tolerance, as opposed to the US.[96] However, as the link between immigration and the 'colour problem' continued to develop, immigration began to more strongly represent a threat to Englishness as an identity as it developed domestically.[97] This meant that the Commonwealth,

---

[94] D. W. Dean, *op.cit*., 174—175.
[95] Webster, *op. cit*., 149—165.
[96] Ibid., 165.
[97] Ibid., 166.

to some degree, came to represent a threat to Englishness. As the presence of Commonwealth immigrants became more conspicuous in the late 1950s and early 1960s, criticism of the Commonwealth increased.[98]

At the same time, the Suez Crisis, colonial wars, and continued decolonization made it ever clearer that the UK's position in the world had declined; this was an issue with which the Conservative government had to contend by 1960.[99] It also had to contend with a changing relationship with the continent. In the early 1950s, the UK joining the European Communities was ruled out, in part because it was felt that the relationship with the Commonwealth would be more fruitful and would therefore need to form the basis of any foreign policy.[100] But as criticisms of the Commonwealth grew, especially with reference to people of color, the way in which it was portrayed by the domestic media shifted. Instead of the 'people's empire,' depictions of the Commonwealth began to be limited to the 'Old Dominions' of Australia, New Zealand, and Canada—countries with majority white populations.[101] Because the Commonwealth was redefined in this way, because decolonization was accelerating, and because the UK's global position was declining, it became somewhat easier for politicians to argue for a closer relationship with Europe. In 1961, the UK submitted its first application to the European Communities.[102]

These issues are significant in that they decreased the governmental focus on global and Commonwealth perceptions of and reactions to immigration policy.[103] In the summer of 1960,

---

[98] Ibid., 175.
[99] Dennis Dean, *op. cit.*, 66.
[100] Webster, *op. cit.*, 174.
[101] Ibid., 176.
[102] Ibid., 174.
[103] Ibid., 175.

debates concerning immigration restriction were formally introduced in Cabinet committee.[104] And although debate about immigration restrictions were intense, the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962 went into force by the summer of that year. It established that British passport holders no longer automatically had the right of entry to the UK.[105] This repealed guarantees that had been made to Commonwealth citizens in 1948, but it exempted citizens of the Irish Republic, which "[signaled] to all that the bill was based upon racial discrimination, since in practice most who would find themselves barred were 'coloured' West Indians, Indians, and Pakistanis, not white Canadians, Australians, and New Zealanders."[106] It limited immigration of people of color mainly to dependents joining those who had already settled in the UK.[107]

Discussion of the act, and concern about its effects, led to an increase in immigration that peaked in the eighteen months that preceded its coming into force. In 1961, West Indian immigration to the UK reached 66,300.[108] This likely added to racial tensions, which can be seen in the way that immigrants were depicted in the media. *The Smethwick Telephone*, for example, repeatedly ran stories and headlines about white women being "approached by, assaulted or molested by, or cohabitating" with immigrant men, who were often identified by their race or nation of origin.[109]

---

[104] Dennis Dean, *op. cit.*, 64.
[105] Webster, *op. cit.*, 179.
[106] Elizabeth Buettner, "'This is Staffordshire not Alabama': Racial Geographies of Commonwealth Immigration in Early 1960s Britain," *The Journal of Imperial Commonwealth History* 42, no. 4(October 2014): 715.
[107] Mohan Luthra, *Britain's Black Population: Social Change, Public Policy, and Agenda* (Brookfield, Vermont: Arena, 1997), 11.
[108] Trevor R. Lee, *Race and Residence: The Concentration and Dispersal of Immigrants in London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 13.
[109] Buettner, *op. cit.*, 716.

Smethwick would gain notoriety during the 1964 general election. Nationwide, Labour won, forming its first government in thirteen years. Conservative candidate Peter Griffiths, who won the constituency in Smethwick from incumbent shadow Foreign Secretary Patrick Gordon Walker, pandered to his anti-immigrant base by engaging in unprecedentedly racist rhetoric. The number of colonial and Commonwealth migrants in the district was estimated to be between 4,000 and 7,000 during this period[110] and this concentration of immigrants heavily influenced Griffiths' political platform and campaign. It notoriously used the slogan "If you want a nigger neighbour, vote Liberal or Labour,"[111] although Griffiths refused to take personal responsibility for this slogan or its use.[112] The phrase was commonly used by supporters and printed on stickers; in this way he could claim it was not his campaign that had developed the slogan. However, when he was pressed about the issue by a reporter, Griffiths' said, "I should think that this is a manifestation of the popular feeling. I would not condemn anyone who said that. I would say that is how the people see the situation in Smethwick."[113] In so doing, he tacitly accepted the slogan's use for the benefit of his campaign.

At the same time, rumors that Gordon Patrick Walker's daughters had married black men were circulating. This was in addition to rumors that two "secret leper hospitals" were being built in Smethwick due to rumors that "most of the blacks [in the constituency] [had] leprosy" and would need their services.[114] In addition to these rumors, Gordon Walker also was being excoriated for his opposition to the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962, and during a Town Hall rally people in the crowd heckled him by yelling "[t]ake your niggers away" and "[w]here

---

[110] Ibid., 711.
[111] Ibid., 710.
[112] Ibid., 716.
[113] Andrew Reekes, "The West Midland and Powell's Birmingham Speech," *The Political Quarterly* 89, no. 3(July—September 2018): 403.
[114] Ibid.

are your niggers now?"[115] As scenes like these unfolded, Griffiths continued to promote his platform of tighter immigration controls that excluded individuals with a criminal past or those who were chronically ill while also suggesting that unemployed immigrants should repatriate.[116] And while Griffith's campaign and its supporters were strongly opposed,[117] the 1964 election in the Smethwick constituency marked a turning point in the way in which race was discussed on the national level in the UK.[118]

During this period, the number of immigrants from Asia, particularly South Asia, was increasing relative to the number of West Indian immigrants; many had been motivated to immigrate in an effort to enter the UK ahead of the 1962 act.[119] It is important to note that these immigrants were not without supporters among the civilian population and political leaders. Opposition to immigration was not universal.[120] However, after the results of the 1964 election, and particularly the outcome in Smethwick, openly supporting 'coloured immigration' became politically detrimental.[121]

One of the people who took notice of this trend was Enoch Powell. In particular he recognized that immigration as a political issue "loosened Labour's traditional hold on the working class voter."[122] He acknowledged that it was a useful issue to use to gain political headway in Wolverhampton, his constituency at the time. Powell continued to develop his racist rhetoric which arguably peaked in 1968, when he delivered the infamous 'Rivers of Blood'

---

[115] Ibid.
[116] Buettner, *op. cit.*,716.
[117] Ibid., 717.
[118] Ibid., 711.
[119] Ibid., 718.
[120] Ibid., 721—723.
[121] Ibid., 728.
[122] Reekes, op. cit., 404.

speech, in which he decried what he considered to be the results of unrestricted Commonwealth immigration, and for which he was removed from the shadow cabinet.[123]

Before his dismissal, though, he and other Conservative members of parliament had argued in favor of additional immigration controls based on a fear of large numbers of Asians—who were being displaced from Africa—coming to the UK. The traction that Tory hardliners appeared to be gaining among the electorate led the Labour government to adopt the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1968, which further limited immigration and excluded those who were not already naturalized citizens of the UK, those who had not gained citizenship through the 1948 law, and those did not have a parent or grandparent who was a citizen of the UK.[124] This law also introduced deportation "for the first time outside of a wartime context."[125]

Immigration controls were tightened again in 1971 by the Conservative government, which changed how employment status was addressed and introduced the concept of *patriality*, which carried over the concept of having at least one grandparent born in the UK from the 1968 act and which added the 'right to abode', which granted those who had it the ability "to live in, and to come and go into and from the UK without let or hindrance".[126] Under this system, 'non-patrial immigrants' did not have full citizenship rights and were only granted "limited right to remain" in the country while 'patrial immigrants' had full citizenship and were able to enter and

---

[123] Panayi, *op. cit.*, 233.
[124] Home Office of the United Kingdom, "Historical background information on nationality Version 1.0," July 21, 2017, 18. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/650994/Background-information-on-nationality-v1.0EXT.pdf and Alyssa Girvan, "The History of British Immigration Policy (1905—2016) Timeline Resource, June 2018," *Refugee History*, an initiative of the University of East Anglia, June 2018, 4. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5748678dcf80a1ffcaf26975/t/5b27e23d8a922dfca10ddeb1/1529340490557/Immigration+Timeline.pdf
[125] Girvan, *op. cit.*, 4.
[126] Home Office, "Historical background," 18.

leave the UK, reside in the country without restriction, and had no restrictions on their employment.[127] Those who entered the UK under false pretenses or overstayed their leave to remain were subject to fines and deportation; immigration officers were granted the ability to "arrest without warrant anyone suspected of breaching these regulations."[128] This meant that those without *patriality* could only "enter and 'live, work and settle in the UK by permission',"[129] which further limited Commonwealth immigrants' ability to settle in the country.

These acts were superseded by the British Nationality Act 1981. It "effectively repealed" the British Nationality Act 1948, which, again, had created a single British citizenship for the UK and the Commonwealth and colonies and created rights to residence and employment for those granted that citizenship.[130] In its place, three categories of citizenship were established. They included British Citizens, British Overseas Citizens, and British Dependent Territories Citizens.[131] Only British Citizens were granted the "automatic right of entry and abode" and it could only be claimed by those who had a "close connection" to the UK, which typically meant that they had been born there or they had at least one parent who was also a British citizen.[132] Between 1948 and 1981, the British government had taken most of the Commonwealth citizens from one end of the citizenship spectrum to the other.

Asylum Seekers: The 1980s Through 2004

Commonwealth immigration was not the only immigration issue the government addressed in the second half of the twentieth century. Between 1973 and 1991, the number of

---

[127] Girvan, *op. cit.*, 5.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Home Office, "Historical background," 18.
[130] Panayi, *op. cit.*, 63—64.
[131] Girvan, *op. cit.*, 5.
[132] Ibid.

people defined as 'asylum seekers' and living in centers established for those who would not immediately be granted entry to the UK increased to over 3,000.[133] This can be attributed to several factors, the most important of which was the disintegration of the Eastern Bloc. Before then, accepting asylum seekers from Eastern Europe was viewed as evidence of "the West's moral superiority over communism."[134] After that period, though, the demographic makeup of asylum seekers shifted; by 2001, the three largest countries of origin for asylum seekers were Pakistan, Iran, and Afghanistan.[135] The view of asylum seekers as Europeans seeking a better life in the West began to give way to the perception of asylum seekers as "ethnic and poor."[136]

Throughout the 1990s, as people fled wars, political and economic instability, natural disasters, and as immigration controls were tightening in the UK, there was a marked increase in the number of individuals applying for asylum.[137] This led the government to define more clearly the distinctions between 'refugees', 'asylum seekers', and 'economic migrants.'[138] This was in part to make it more difficult to establish claims for asylum.[139] An article published in *The Independent* in December 1995 detailed Home Secretary Michael Howard's submission for Parliamentary debate of a 'white list' of countries deemed 'safe.' Residents of those countries were "facing no serious risk of persecution and [were] unlikely to deserve asylum in Britain."[140] Among the countries included in his list were India, Pakistan, Ghana, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Poland,

---

[133] Panayi, *op. cit.*, 213.
[134] Guy Hannan, "The Social Control of Asylum Seeking," (PhD dissertation, University of Surrey, July 2007), 34.
[135] Ibid., 33.
[136] Ibid., 34.
[137] Girvan, *op. cit.*, 6.
[138] Ibid.
[139] Panayi, *op. cit.*, 64.
[140] Stephen Goodwin, Nicholas Timmins, and Heather Mills, "Howard Reveals 'White List' for Asylum-Seekers is Revealed," *The Independent*, December 12, 1995.

and Romania. Howard claimed that by making it more difficult for citizens of these nations to claim rights to asylum, he would not be creating obstacles for "genuine refugees".[141]

Parliament passed legislation to reflect these concerns. The Asylum and Immigration Appeals Act 1993 adopted the United Nations' Refugee Convention as part of British law. The Convention defines a refugee as someone "forced to seek refuge in another country based on 'well-founded fear of persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a political social group, or political opinion'".[142] It is only after 'well-founded fear' has been asserted and sufficiently justified that individuals could be considered a refugee; until that point they would be considered asylum seekers for legal purposes and would have fewer legal protections.[143] This act also enabled the government to "detain asylum seekers pending a decision and set strict time limits for appeals."[144]

The Asylum and Immigration Act 1996 moved to limit the ability for asylum seekers to find employment and "removed welfare benefit rights from those who had put in their claim for asylum after entering the country."[145] It was this version of the law that formally implemented the 'white list' of 'safe' countries from which asylum applications would be rejected, as had been discussed by Home Secretary Howard in the previous year.[146] It is important to note that Poland and Cyprus joined the EU in 2004 and Romania and Bulgaria joined in 2007; all four nations were featured on Howard's 'white list'.

---

[141] Ibid.
[142] Greg Philo, Emma Briant, and Pauline Donald, *Bad News for Refugees*, (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 13—14.
[143] Ibid., 14.
[144] Ibid., 19.
[145] Ibid., 19—20.
[146] Ibid., 20.

The Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 was implemented under Prime Minister Tony Blair's Labour government. While it allowed asylum seekers to disperse and settle nationwide and created a National Asylum Support Agency that would be charged with providing assistance and support to asylum seekers while their claims were active or during the period of appeal, it also "extended the offences of entering the country by deception, and introduced severe penalties for agents who clandestinely brought people into the country."[147] It was meant to be both supportive of those seeking asylum while also more stringently penalizing those who sought to exploit the system.

By 2002, asylum applications reached a peak of 84,130.[148] As a result, the Labour leaders were attacked by Opposition leaders as being weak on border control; the increase in applications was viewed as "'organised abuse' of the asylum system by economic migrants".[149] This, in addition to increased media coverage of the issue, led to Prime Minister Blair focusing on dramatically reducing the total number of "unfounded asylum applications" while also focusing more closely on deportations.[150] This was a direct response to being seen as weak on immigration.

The numbers of asylum seekers coming to the UK, the growing concern about terrorism in a post-9/11 environment, and fears about the criminality of asylum seekers increased the scrutiny under which asylum seekers existed. These concerns were addressed through the UK Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002, which removed asylum seekers' right to work and also removed access to support from the National Asylum Support Service if they "failed to

[147] Ibid., 21.
[148] Ibid., 20.
[149] Ibid.
[150] Ibid., 21—22.

make a claim ‘as soon as reasonably practicable’ after arriving”.[151] This, along with restricted access to welfare benefits from the 1996 law, left many asylum seekers without access to legal income. Additionally, the 2002 act removed the ‘exceptional leave to remain’ category for asylum seekers, which had allowed individuals in certain circumstances to possibly be granted permission to reside in the UK for up to four years.[152]

By February 2003, Prime Minister Blair announced a goal to halve the total number of asylum applications by September of that year. His goal was met, but in 2004 he stated that his government still would be looking to reduce the net total of asylum seekers present in the country.[153] At the same time, Michael Howard—then Opposition leader—proposed to “withdraw from the 1951 UN Convention and send away all genuine refugees beyond a set quota”.[154] These reactions to asylum seekers reflected a belief that they represented both a threat to safety and an economic burden on British citizens.[155]

Blair’s government initially sought to provide more access to support for asylum seekers, as evinced by the 1999 act. By 2002, and certainly by 2004, the position of the government had dramatically shifted. The movement to restrict asylum-based immigration continued under both Conservative and Labour governments after the moral aspect of the East-vs-West dialogue dissolved, in much the same way that the movement to restrict Commonwealth immigration continued under both Conservative and Labour governments after the moral aspect of the racial dialogue dissolved in the 1950s and early 1960s.

---

[151] Ibid., 22—23.
[152] Ibid.
[153] Ibid., 23.
[154] Ibid.
[155] Ibid.

Conclusion

Immigration into the UK has been an issue fraught with controversy. The cases illustrated above highlight particular points of interest for this project. While both the post-war Polish and Commonwealth immigrants faced issues of discrimination, the issues raised to oppose or express concerns about Polish immigrants tended to be economic in nature, including the possibility that Polish workers would suppress wages or take jobs away from British workers once the labor shortage was over. Their alien status and potential links to the USSR and Communist parties also raised concern, but it was a comparatively minor issue. In contrast, Commonwealth immigrants, particularly those born in the West Indies, were viewed as problematic because of their race, despite their protected legal status in the UK.

It is worth noting that the post-war Polish immigration was limited in scope, even though it was larger in scale than Commonwealth immigration during the early 1950s. Poles had ceased immigrating to the UK by 1949, and, in fact, some were still emigrating or repatriating by that date. Some of them were doing so at the encouragement of the UK government. So while there were close to 120,000 Poles residing in the UK, there was little likelihood that their countrymen would continue to immigrate and seek residence.[156] The migration of Poles after the war was constrained by political developments outside of Britain; the British government did not have to act for it to end.

[156] This is not to say that there was not immigration; there was. However, the political restrictions on movement kept the number far below the more than 200,000 that were present in the UK immediately after the war. Keith Sword acknowledges that after the events of 1956, migration became easier and several hundred thousand Poles emigrated; however, only a very small portion of these émigrés settled in Britain. Travel restrictions eased, though, and Poles were able to travel abroad for vacation more easily. Between 1954 and 1958, 19,837 Poles were reported to have visited the UK. See Keith Sword, *Identity in Flux: The Polish Community in Britain* (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies University of London, 1996), 40 for more information.

In contrast, Commonwealth immigration during the post-war period started slowly, peaking in 1961. By 1971, there was a West Indian population of nearly 168,700 in the London metropolitan area alone.[157] As more immigrants of color made their way to the UK during this period, anxiety about their race and miscegenation continued to grow. In response, the government moved to restrict and rescind citizenship rights as well as rights to residence and employment for Commonwealth immigrants.

During the 1990s, as there was a growing discomfort with the number of people seeking asylum in the UK, and the government moved to restrict access to right to asylum. That trend continued through the early years of the 21st century, especially as concerns about terrorism grew.

The pattern the UK government established after World War II, as indicated by the examples above, was to accept immigrants and asylum seekers only to a certain point. After that point, which was different for various groups, public displeasure with the number of immigrants and asylum seekers would lead the government firmly to suggest repatriation or resettlement outside of the UK, restrict entry, or redefine statuses in order to restrict access to rights to settlement and employment. This was only done so long as there was not a way to moralize immigration in such a way that to be unwilling to accept immigrants and asylum seekers would paint the UK in a poor light on the global stage. However, once that moralized aspect would shift or disappear, the government would move to restrict immigration. What is of particular interest here, though, is that in these cases, the UK had the legal competence to institute those restrictions. Problems emerged when those competences themselves were restricted.

---

[157] Lee, *op. cit.*, 15.

CHAPTER II: A CONTENTIOUS RELATIONSHIP WITH EUROPE

The legal rights granted to European Union (EU) and European Economic Area (EEA) immigrants and their families to enter and remain in the UK have been a source of significant tension between the UK and the European Communities. The chapter will begin with a discussion of the framework governing non-EU and non-EEA immigration into the UK. This will outline some of the criteria that establish how the British government has defined what constitutes a desirable immigrant. The chapter will move on to discuss the legal rights established for EU and EEA migrants and how they relate to and highlight the tension between the EU and the UK. Primary focus will be on the rights of EEA workers to enter and remain in the UK, with a secondary focus on the rights of workers' family members to enter and remain in the UK under various provisions. The chapter will then explore the UK's relationship with the European Communities, with a particular focus on the period from World War II through Britain's first, unsuccessful application to the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1961. This period illustrates the contentious relationship that developed between the UK and the European Communities. Additionally, it was during this period that many of the issues that have become points of political conflict between the UK and the European Communities/EU emerged.

Rules Governing Immigration

Immigration to the United Kingdom (UK) has been a complex issue over the course of the last seventy years, in part due to the nation's changing relationships with Commonwealth and Dominion states, former colonies, and continental Europe. Its shifting relative position as a world political power also has impacted the areas from which people emigrated and from which they continue to emigrate in order to seek employment, residence, or asylum in the UK.

The emergence of the European Communities and their development into the EU, as well as the UK's membership in the EEA, have served only to further complicate immigration issues. Immigrants from the EU and EEA should now consider both EU and UK immigration law as they enter the UK, due to the Brexit Referendum 'Leave' vote in June 2016.

Part 5 of UK Immigration Rules states that immigrants pursuing work in the UK may seek indefinite leave to remain as a work permit holder, a highly skilled migrant, a representative of overseas newspapers, news agencies and broadcasting agencies, a representative of an overseas business, a domestic worker in a private household, an overseas government employee, a minister of religion, missionary, or member of a religious order, on the grounds of UK ancestry, or as the partner or child of a person who has or has had leave to enter or remain in the UK.[1] Part 6 of the immigration rules states that a person may seek indefinite leave to remain in the UK as a businessman, self-employed person, investor, writer, composer, or artist.[2] Part 6a of these rules outlines the points based system for classifying migrants seeking indefinite leave to remain in the UK. For instance, someone may seek leave to remain as a Tier 1 (Exceptional Talent) migrant, which is defined as "exceptionally talented individuals in the particular fields, who wish to work in the UK. These individuals are…already internationally [recognized] at the highest level as world leaders in their particular field, or…demonstrated exceptional promise and are likely to become world leaders in their particular area."[3] There are more than five other subheadings in Tier 1. There are four total Tiers with each including multiple subheadings.

[1] Home Office Immigration Rules, Part 5 "Persons seeking to enter or remain in the United Kingdom for employment," 2014. https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/immigration-rules (United Kingdom)
[2] Home Office Immigration Rules, Part 6 "Person seeking to enter or remain in the United Kingdom as businessman, self-employed person, investor, writer or composer or artist," 2014. (United Kingdom)
[3] Home Office Immigration Rules, Part 6a "Points based system," 2014: 4. (United Kingdom)

Part 8 of the immigration rules outlines the entry requirements for migrants' family members. Family members are defined as spouses and civil partners, victims of domestic violence, whose marriage or partnership failed during their stay in the UK, fiancé(e)s and proposed civil partners, unmarried and same-sex partners, children, children born in the UK who do not qualify for British citizenship, adopted children, and parents, grandparents, and other dependent relatives.[4]

These sections of law indicate some of the ways in which the British government has defined and legally codified the type of migrant that is desirable in the UK. It is not an exhaustive list. As was the case with Poles after World War II and with Commonwealth immigrants, the system allows for the unification of families after at least one member has been established in the UK. Despite this allowance, significantly, these regulations are more stringent than those that apply to immigrants from the EU and EEA. The British government has sole legal competence[5] to relax or tighten the regulations governing immigration from outside the EU and EEA.

With reference to EU and EEA nationals, for the duration of its membership in the EU, the UK must abide by particular immigration regulations outlined by EU law. For this discussion, it is important to note that the UK is not part of the Schengen Area (Schengen *acquis*) in which EU and EEA nationals are free to move across international borders without visas or passports. As such, the unrestricted movement of EU and EEA nationals is not guaranteed across UK borders. However, according to Section 11.1 of the Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations from 2006, an EEA national "must be admitted to the United Kingdom if he

[4] Home Office Immigration Rules, Part 8 "Family members," 2014. (United Kingdom)
[5] Where 'competence' is defined as the legal right to dictate a policy or regulation.

produces on arrival a national identity card or passport issued by an EEA state."[6] So while movement across UK borders is not as free as it is in the rest of the Schengen Area, EEA nationals are still granted the right to enter the UK because of their status as EEA nationals.

While entry into the UK is guaranteed provided proper documentation, there are restrictions on how long an EEA national is able to stay in residence. Section 13.1 states that, "[a]n EEA national is entitled to reside in the United Kingdom for a period not exceeding three months beginning on the date on which he is admitted to the United Kingdom provided that he holds a valid national identity card or passport issued by an EEA state."[7] An EEA national is permitted to stay in the UK for a period longer than three months so long as he remains a "qualified person," which is defined in Sections 6.1.*a*—*e* of these regulations as "a person who is an EEA national and in the United Kingdom as a jobseeker; a worker; a self-employed person; a self-sufficient person; or a student."[8] A "qualified person," then, is someone from whom there is at least the perception of potential social or economic benefit.

Entry into and stays of residence in the UK also may be granted under EEA immigration regulations to family members of "qualified persons." Sections 12.1.*a*—*b* of these regulations state that

> [a]n entry clearance officer must issue an EEA family permit to a person who applies for one if the person is a family member of an EEA national and the EEA national is residing in the UK in accordance with these Regulations; will be travelling to the United Kingdom within six months of the date of the application and will be an EEA national residing in the United Kingdom in accordance with these Regulations on arrival in the United Kingdom; and the family member will be accompanying the EEA national to the United Kingdom or joining him there and is lawfully resident in an EEA State; or would meet the requirements in the immigration rules (other than those relating to entry clearance) for leave to enter the United Kingdom as the family member of the EEA national or, in the case

[6] The Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2006, Statutory Instruments (S.I.) 2006 No. 1003, http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2006/1003/pdfs/uksi_20061003_en.pdf.
[7] *Ibid*.
[8] *Ibid*.

> of direct descendants or dependent direct relatives in the ascending line of his spouse or his civil partner, as the family member of his spouse or his civil partner, were the EEA national or the spouse or civil partner a person present and settled in the United Kingdom.[9]

So despite the fact that free movement of EEA nationals is restricted by the UK, they and their family members are still guaranteed entry and a right to remain in residence, at least for a brief period, so long they meet the above-mentioned prerequisites.

It is important to note the specific phrasing in both Section11.1 and Section12.1. Section 11.1 states that an EEA national "*must* be admitted" [emphasis mine] and Section12.1 states that a clearance officer "*must* issue an EEA family permit" [emphasis mine]. The language used here is clear; so long as EEA nationals meet all of the prerequisites as outlined in the Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2006, UK officials are obligated to allow them legal entry and allow at least limited stays of residence so long as the UK is a member state of the EU.

The adoption of these regulations in 2006 brought the UK closer to compliance with various EU regulations that had already been adopted—or had been promulgated but not yet formally adopted—by member states. For instance, Article 15, Section 2 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union[10] states that "[e]very citizen of the Union has the freedom to seek employment, to work, to exercise the right of establishment and to provide services in any Member State."[11] Article 45, Section 1 states that "[e]very citizen of the Union has the right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States."[12]

---

[9] *Ibid*.
[10] The Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union was first drafted in 2000; however, this chapter cites the version amended and formalized by the Treaty of Lisbon in 2007. The major difference between the two versions of the document relevant to this chapter is the replacement of the term "Community" with "Union" to describe Member States of the European Union.
[11] European Convention, *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union* (Strasbourg, Germany: EU, 2007), 398.
[12] *Ibid*., 404.

The Charter of Fundamental Rights engages language reminiscent of that found in the UK regulations, but is broader in its scope. British regulations use more specific language because they needed to fit the preexisting UK immigration law framework. However, the fact that the terminology in both of these documents is reminiscent of the other indicates that European legal writing is highly standardized and/or the authors of the UK regulations were purposely evoking similar language in order to highlight the relationship between EU and UK regulations.

This should not be taken to mean that the UK is attempting to become entirely compliant with EU regulations. As stated earlier, the UK has an exemption from being party to the Schengen Agreement, which was adopted as part of the Treaty of Amsterdam. Its exemption states that

> [t]he United Kingdom shall be entitled…to exercise at its frontiers with other Member States such controls on persons seeking to enter the United Kingdom as it may consider necessary for the purpose: of verifying the right to enter the United Kingdom of citizens of States which are Contracting Parties to the Agreement on the European Economic Area and of their [dependents] exercising rights conferred by Community law, as well as citizens of other States on whom such rights have been conferred by an agreement by which the United Kingdom is bound; and of determining whether or not to grant other persons permission to enter the United Kingdom.[13]

The UK's exemption from this agreement has been acknowledged and written into updated treaties despite the fact that it otherwise has become a fundamental part of the legal framework of the EU. This exemption is why specific regulations detailing the rights of EEA nationals to enter, and the conditions associated with their stays of residence in, the UK were written into the 2006 UK immigration regulations. It is not the UK's only exemption.

[13] European Council, *The Treaty of Amsterdam* (Amsterdam, the Netherlands: EU, 1997), 97.

The Treaty on the European Union included provisions regarding the monetary union and member states adopting the euro as currency. The UK secured an exemption from adopting those provisions. It states, "[t]he United Kingdom shall retain its powers in the field of monetary policy according to national law."[14] This exemption has allowed the UK to keep the British Pound Sterling (GBP) as its currency. Denmark is the only other member state that also has an exemption allowing it to retain its own sovereign currency. All other member states have already adopted the euro or are legally required to transition to it as a condition of their membership in the EU.[15]

Formal exemptions, however, are not the only route the UK has to work around EU regulations. The EU acknowledges that it shares competence on certain issues, like social policy, with its member states. Shared competence in social policy is necessary because EU member states have developed markedly different social conditions, cultures, and political structures, although similarities also exist. A homogenized social policy that does not acknowledge the conditions in which member states' societies developed, though, would not likely be able to garner enough support for formal adoption.

Because of this, for issues and policies that fall under shared competence, the EU may write regulations in broad, generic terms and allow individual member states to draft regulations that fit their specific needs. This situation is similar to the one seen with the UK's 2006 immigration regulations except that, in the case of shared competences, member states are expected to craft their own specific regulations by design rather than out of necessity as demanded by an exemption.

---

[14] European Council, *The Treaty on the European Union* (Maastricht, the Netherlands: EU, 1992), no page.
[15] *Ibid*.

For example, Article 34, Section 2 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights states that "[e]veryone residing and moving legally within the European Union is entitled to social security benefits and social advantages in accordance with the rules laid down by Union law and national laws and practices."[16] This is worded in such a way that it anticipates that member states will specify to which benefits and advantages EEA nationals are entitled. This also indicates that member states may limit for which benefits and advantages EEA nationals may apply.

In the UK, the Child Tax credit is one of the available social benefits for which immigrants are able to apply. As of 2015, the baseline amount available was £545 per year; an additional £2,750 was available for each child without disabilities. Children with disabilities are entitled to increased amounts.[17] Because this tax credit is specific to the UK, the British government has retained the right to limit EEA nationals' eligibility, which it has done. EEA nationals may still apply for the tax credit, but, as of July 1, 2014, they must wait three months to do so if they are not working, with a few exceptions.[18]

The three month waiting period is significant. Again, according to the 2006 immigration regulations governing EEA nationals, once they are granted entry to the UK, they are only eligible to stay for three months unless they are a 'qualified person' or on a family permit associated with a 'qualified person.' If they are not 'qualified,' they are no longer eligible to stay. If they do, they are in violation of UK immigration law. Essentially, the UK amended the Child Tax Credit regulations to exclude those people that would not fall under the category of 'qualified person,' and would not be eligible to stay past the initial three-month period granted in

[16] European Convention, *Charter of Fundamental Rights*, 402.
[17] Child Tax Credit, section 2 "What You'll Get," 2014 (United Kingdom). https://www.gov.uk/child-tax-credit/what-youll-get
[18] Child Tax Credit, section 3, "Eligibility," 2014 (United Kingdom). https://www.gov.uk/child-tax-credit/eligibility

the 2006 regulations. As such, EEA nationals who would not provide an immediate and direct economic benefit to the UK are excluded from applying for the Child Tax Credit. It is because the EU shares competence on this issue and its regulations governing social benefits are so broadly written that the UK has the competence to make this amendment to its tax credit regulations.

The Relationship Between the UK and the European Communities

These examples reveal a tension in the UK's relationship with the EU. There are EU policies for which the UK seeks exemptions in an effort to limit ceding its sovereignty on those issues to the EU. The UK has also utilized the broad guidelines established on issues of shared competence to limit the rights of EEA nationals within the UK. At the same time, the UK has amended its immigration law to more closely reflect EU mandates. The UK is moving both towards and away from compliance with EU law, which indicates that the UK has some anxiety about ceding sovereignty.

According to Dølvik and Vesser, this anxiety may be justified. They argue that EU member states' social policies are only 'semi-sovereign' because EU regulations have "eroded their controls over the production and consumption of social policy[.]"[19] The case of the UK amending the Child Tax Credit eligibility guidelines ought to be viewed as an attempt to assert a larger amount of authority over its social policies, even though it was done within the parameters of EU regulations.

Tension between the UK and the EU and its predecessor European Communities in some ways is unsurprising; political tension between the island nation and the continent has existed for

[19] Jon Erik Dølvik and Jelle Visser, "Free Movement, Equal Treatment and Workers' Rights: Can the European Union Solve its Trilemma of Fundamental Principles?" *Industrial Relations Journal* 40 (2009): 495.

centuries. After the end of World War II, however, the nature of that tension changed dramatically. Geir Lundestad argued that "[i]n the first years after [World War II] Britain…had been the leader among the Europeans."[20] This was due to its pre-war global political position as well as its relationship to the United States and Soviet Union. However, as focus in continental Europe shifted towards creating common European economic policies, the UK's sources of influence, which lacked strong ties to the continent, waned.

During the same period, the UK's global political influence also declined. While the Canadian Confederation in 1867 marked the beginning of 'Dominion status' among certain Commonwealth realms that grew to include Australia, Canada, the Irish Free State (through 1937 when it became known as Ireland)[21], Newfoundland (through 1949 when it became a Canadian province), New Zealand, and South Africa.[22] These Dominions were recognized as having legislative independence and therefore a right to self-governance under the Statute of Westminster 1931.[23] However, the partition of India in 1947 that created the independent Dominions of India and Pakistan[24] marked the beginning of a new period during which more British dominions and colonies began asserting their independence, which served to further reduce the UK's global political reach.

---

[20] Charles S. Maier, ed, *The Cold War in Europe: Era of a Divided Continent* (Princeton, NJ: Markus Weiner Publishers, Inc, 1996): 160.

[21] Ireland left the Commonwealth in 1949 when the Republic of Ireland act came into force. See both The Republic of Ireland Act, 1948 (the Republic of Ireland) http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/1948/act/22/enacted/en/print and W. David McIntyre, *British Decolonization, 1946—1997: When, Why and How Did the British Empire Fall* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998):111—112.

[22] Statute of Westminster, 1931 (United Kingdom). http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1931/4/pdfs/ukpga_19310004_en.pdf

[23] Ibid.

[24] The Dominion of India officially became the Republic of India in 1950 and at that time became a commonwealth republic. The Dominion of Pakistan became the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in 1956 and became a commonwealth republic at that time. Its status as a commonwealth member has changed several times since then; the last time it was reinstated as a member of the commonwealth was 2008.

This diminishing political reach had been a concern from the end of the war, although it was balanced with consideration for the ways in which a federated Europe might mitigate the potential for another global war. Hugo Young pointed out that during this period, regardless of what British politicians' personal opinions and preferences concerning federation may have been, the threat and fear of war guaranteed that they considered the merits of federation as a preventative measure. However, the Czechoslovak coup d'état in 1948 indicated to Western powers that the Soviet Union could not be counted on as a partner for world peace. This convinced Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin that while a federated Europe might be helpful in securing peace, it would be more effective to more closely ally with the United States of America (US) and seek the consolidation of the US military presence in Europe.[25] This became Bevin's "overarching objective" and was ultimately realized through signing the North Atlantic Treaty and creation of NATO in April 1949.[26]

That is not to say that closer alliance with the US meant that discussion of a federated Europe was abandoned, but a closer relationship with the US did mean that the possibility of allying more closely with continental Europe became less attractive than it had been before. And it continued to be the case that Prime Minister Clement Atlee's post-war Labour government did not look favorably upon the continent; members of the cabinet viewed continental powers as weak, and "Foreign Office documents of the period…refer to the danger of Britain 'chaining itself to a corpse'"[27] should it seek to join a federated Europe.

Despite this, in early 1948, Bevin addressed the House of Commons and called for the creation of a 'Western Union' that would seek further political and economic cooperation among

---

[25] Hugo Young, *This Blessed Plot: Britain and Europe from Churchill to Blair* (London: Papermac, 1999): 29—30.
[26] Ibid., 30.
[27] Ibid., 32.

the UK, France, and the Benelux countries; such a body would need to include the UK, which would not be able to consider its security entirely separately from the continent's.[28] Precisely what this 'Western Union' would entail was not discussed in depth; this was due in part to Bevin himself not knowing what it would entail. Considerations for Britain's political and economic relationships with the Commonwealth would need to be made, but there was value in increasing European strength in an effort to indicate that it would not be submissive to either the US or the Soviet Union.[29] By May 1949, Bevin supported a plan to consolidate western power that would see the US play a key role in the defense of the UK, the Commonwealth, and the continent. Under this scheme, the UK would act as a link between the US, the Commonwealth, and the continent while using the continent and the Commonwealth to mitigate American domination of the other parties.[30]

This was a period of some political confusion, vagueness, and purposeful ambiguity. New power structures were emerging in the post-war world, and the UK was not sure exactly what its place among them would be. However, the government acted on the assumption that the UK was and would continue to be a world power.[31] At the same time, economic concerns, stemming largely from the devastation of the war, could not be ignored, and they were acknowledged as a potential threat to the British political position.[32] While these economic issues were causes for anxiety, there was concern that accepting the terms of the Marshall Plan, offered as economic relief and as a measure to help European trade recover, might create more long term damage than benefit. The hesitation stemmed from its emphasis on the creation of a free trade

---

[28] Ibid,. 32—33.
[29] Ibid., 33.
[30] John W. Young, *Britain and European Unity 1945—1999* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000): 23.
[31] Hugo Young, *op. cit.*, 33.
[32] Ibid.

area in Europe and the worry that a common European market would severely undermine or potentially collapse the Commonwealth and the sterling area. [33]

Economically, Prime Minister Atlee's government saw the value in the plan and the development of a Common Market; however, it also acknowledged that such a development would likely necessitate weakening its economic relationships with the Commonwealth, which potentially would lead to the collapse of the UK as a world power.[34] Additionally, Bevin made it clear that any Common Market must be agreed to by and regulated among sovereign governments. This meant that the UK would not be willing to cede power to a supranational political body in Europe and that it did not support other nations' concessions of authority to a supranational political body.[35]

When the establishment of the Council of Europe was being discussed in 1948, the delegation sent by the UK argued for, and was granted, a compromise that left the council with "no power and rather little influence"[36] Atlee's government was seeking to stymie the development of a supranational European political body. British concern about the cessation of any political or economic sovereignty cannot be overstated. When the Council first officially met in Strasbourg in August 1949, delegates from Atlee's Labour government

> simply killed off the Assembly's initiatives. They refused to surrender the veto which Bevin and the Foreign Office had made sure they kept, ignored the demand for a political authority and even tried to prevent the Assembly discussing any matter that fell within the functions of any other international body such as the OEEC [Organisation for European Economic Co-operation] or the United Nations. Of Strasbourg's grand aspirations, only a Commission and Court of Human Rights, enforcing a European Convention, were eventually permitted to have an existence that endured. [37]

---

[33] Ibid., 37
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid., 37—38.
[36] Ibid., 42.
[37] Ibid., 43.

Atlee's delegates were effectively asserting their influence in an attempt to control the ways in which Europe began to federate. However, by May 1950, French foreign minister Robert Schuman announced a plan to combine coal and steel production in France and Western Germany, as well as any other nation that chose to join, under a common High Authority. This turned out to be a watershed moment for the relationship between the UK and the continent, and specifically the UK's relationship with France with reference to European federation. This is because the Schuman Plan did not necessitate UK membership in the agreement; other nations were willing to join the initiative, and it had support from the US, which was still hoping for European integration to develop.[38] The result was that France emerged as a political leader on the continent, which indicated that federation could continue without British support.

There has been some debate about whether or not France purposely excluded the UK from the Schuman Plan or whether it was the UK that rejected the plan; the reality was somewhere in between.[39] The UK's position on surrendering sovereignty to supranational authorities was established by 1948. Ceding control of its steel and coal industries was viewed as a "potentially far-reaching surrender of sovereignty"[40] and as such would not be supported. N. Piers Ludlow asserted that, in addition to being unwilling to cede sovereignty over its steel and coal industries, the UK was not inclined to support the 'experiment' of federation because its "hope of a Europe protected and [stabilized] by an American guarantee had been attained"[41] by the creation of NATO.[42] Additionally, it was not experiencing the same economic pressures that

[38] John Young, *op. cit.*, 27—28.
[39] Ibid., 30—31.
[40] Ibid., 31.
[41] N. Piers Ludlow, *Dealing with Britain: The Six and the First UK Application to the EEC* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997): 17.
[42] Ibid.

the continental countries were, because of its relationships with the Commonwealth and the US.[43]

What emerged by the end of 1950 was a picture of the UK debating the nature of its relationship with continental Europe. Atlee's Labour government was loath to attach itself to the continent in a way that would surrender any sovereignty, and in the years immediately following the war had been able to halt any efforts from the continent to create any meaningfully empowered supranational organizations. At the same time, British politicians understood the value of a united Europe in terms of economic benefit, political safeguard against potential future war, and also because the US was exerting political and economic pressure in support of integration. Because UK leadership took the position that it was a world leader and not simply a European leader, and because it was not experiencing the same economic constraints as the rest of Europe, it chose to not join the Schuman Plan. However, that did not mean that the UK did not see the importance of not isolating itself. In an effort to not alienate France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg (the Six) and to not upset the US, the UK's policy became to wait for the Six to establish the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and later seek association with it.[44] As a result, when the Treaty of Paris was signed in 1951 to establish the ECSC, the UK was not among the signatories.

When Winston Churchill again became Prime Minister in October 1951, his focus was on global issues. The further development of the Cold War and the Korean War took precedence over developing deeper ties with the continent. Churchill's Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden—who would succeed Churchill as Prime Minister in 1955—was also not particularly concerned with further developing a British-led federated Europe. He did not think that federation as it was

[43] Ibid.
[44] John Young, *op. cit.*, 32.

expressed through the Schuman Plan would be successful in the long term and that the UK joining such a federation would be impossible because it would violate part of the core identity of the UK as a nation.[45]

When the Spaak Committee convened in the summer of 1955, the two major points of discussion that emerged focused on the creation of a European organization for atomic energy and the creation of a Common Market.[46] The UK was unenthusiastic about the development of either project. There were concerns not only about the impact of a Common Market on its relationship with the Commonwealth, as there had been when discussion of a Common Market was brought up in the late 1940s, but also about making the UK economy more vulnerable to fluctuating economic conditions on the continent.[47] British officials proposed an alternative to the Common Market that focused on the development of a free trade area, the specifics of which were to be discussed and developed at a later date. They also opposed the idea of joining an atomic energy organization out of fear of disrupting their relationship with the US with reference to nuclear matters in addition to concerns about increasing the likelihood of nuclear proliferation.[48]

British opposition to the initiatives undertaken by the Spaak Committee marked another turning point in the UK's relationship with Europe. Where in earlier discussions and negotiations, the UK had developed a policy predicated on non-involvement and goodwill, it now seemed to be actively opposed to the efforts of the Six to more closely federate Europe.[49] This became problematic for the UK. Despite its opposition and its efforts to create alternatives

---

[45] Hugo Young, *op. cit*., 72—74.
[46] Alan S. Milward, *The European Rescue of the Nation-State*, 2nd ed. (New York: Routledge, 2000): 206—216.
[47] John W. Young, *op. cit.*, 42.
[48] Ibid., 43—44.
[49] Ibid., 44—45.

to the projects discussed by the committee, in May 1956 the leaders of the ECSC drew up two treaties based on the Spaak Committee's reports. One was for the creation of the European Atomic Energy Committee (Euratom) and the other was for the creation of a European customs union, the European Economic Community (EEC).[50] Formally signed in 1957 and coming into force in 1958, the document creating these bodies became known as the Treaty of Rome.[51]

Outside of creating these two communities, the Treaty of Rome had two political outcomes relevant to this discussion. The first was that it further established France as the leading political power on the continent. Despite its misgivings about the creation of a Common Market, France was able to negotiate provisions that allowed for produce from French colonial holdings to enter the EEC without tariffs and additionally allowed them access to development aid funds through the European Development Fund.[52] These negotiations and their outcomes highlighted the role that France was to play in the politics of the Six; it was a position that Charles de Gaulle would use in the coming years to block the first British applications for membership in the communities.[53]

The second issue that the ratification of the Treaty of Rome highlighted was the nature of the relationship between the UK and the US. Since the Marshall Plan had been enacted, the US made it clear that it supported European federation. The Eisenhower administration had continued with this position and supported "all European efforts to achieve unity…as worthwhile in themselves".[54] Prime Minister Eden was aware that he would have to justify the UK's stance

---

[50] Ibid.
[51] They are sometimes also referred to as the Treaties of Rome.
[52] Ludlow, *op. cit.*, 21.
[53] Ibid., 22.
[54] Mark Gilbert, "Partners and Rivals: Assessing the American Role," in *European Union History: Themes and Debates*, eds. Wolfram Kaiser and Antonio Varsori (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010): 175.

against the positions supported by the Spaak Committee, and strongly worded correspondence was drafted to make the British position clear.[55] This was in addition to comments made by the British delegation to the OEEC in November 1955 highlighting the need to steer the continent away from economic division.[56] Because the government under Eden felt that a Common Market would be counter to the economic interests of the UK, the creation of such a union would not be supported by the UK. This placed the UK at odds with the position of the US on European federation.

Adding to the tension between the UK and US during this period was the development of the Suez Crisis. In July 1956, Egyptian President Gamal Abdal Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal to fund a dam at Aswan on the Nile River. In order to maintain international control of the dam, the UK and France decided on a plan to use political alliances as a pretext to become involved with the canal and wrest control of it back from Egypt. In late October 1956, Israel, a French ally, invaded Egypt, though it stopped short of the canal in order to avoid bringing Jordan into the fray as an Egyptian supporter and triggering a British defense of Jordan, which would counter the Franco-Israeli alliance. On October 30, the British and French issued an ultimatum to Egypt and Israel to accept a ceasefire. The ultimatum was ignored, which led to British and French military landings at Port Said in early November.

These events had been planned in advance. Early discussions concerning European intervention in Egypt began in May 1956.[57] The day after the canal was nationalized in July, Guy Mollet spoke with Anthony Eden about using the event as the pretext for action against Egypt,

---

[55] Hugo Young, *op. cit.*, 98.
[56] John Young, *op. cit*., 44.
[57] Ralph Dietl, "Suez 1956: A European Intervention?" *Journal of Contemporary History* 43, no. 2 (2008): 271.

using the justification that it was a threat to Israeli security.[58] France and Israel began developing military plans in late July; by early August the UK had developed its own strategy for intervention. By mid-October, the French presented their plans to the British and on the 22nd and 24th of that month, the French, the British, and the Israelis met in Sèvres to discuss their next steps. On the 29th, Israel invaded the Sinai Peninsula. [59] However, because of swift backlash against the Franco-British military operations—partly from the US, which ardently opposed their actions—the operations stopped before taking the canal.[60]

The Suez Crisis had several important outcomes. The first was that it made it clear that the UK could not succeed as a power without the support of the US, which damaged the British global political position.[61] The second outcome was that the UK damaged its relationship with the Commonwealth, because it "breached conventions of consultation".[62] This marked a major turning point in British decolonization, with it being referred to as "the terminal calamity of Empire".[63] After the Suez Crisis, British decolonization became a more pressing political priority and rapidly accelerated.[64] The third outcome was that Anthony Eden resigned his Prime Ministerial position in January 1957 and Harold Macmillan assumed the office.[65]

The fourth outcome was that, in addition to the UK's political and military weakness being highlighted to the world, so were French political and military weaknesses. While the Suez Crisis was not the only reason that the French were willing to sign the Treaty of Rome, it was critical in shifting internal French debate towards supporting the creation of the EEC, despite

---

[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid., 271—272.
[60] W. David McIntyre, *op. cit.*, 43.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Hugo Young, *op. cit.*, 99.
[64] W. David McIntyre, *op. cit*., 44—77.
[65] Ibid., 44.

misgivings about the Common Market, and provided an impetus for France to negotiate more strongly for its colonial holdings. [66]

The Suez Crisis, then, represented a strong and very visible indication of the decline in the UK's position both globally and in Europe. It became clear that it was no longer independently a major power; the US, and additionally the Soviet Union, had assumed the position as leading global powers. It also allowed France to better position itself as a major force within continental Europe under the Treaty of Rome. The UK had become a bit of an odd man out both in global and regional politics and influence.

This decline in global power led to serious discussion and debate about the UK joining the EEC, Euratom, and the ECSC[67] as a means to mitigate its decline in influence. However, Opposition leaders argued that joining would mean a cessation of sovereignty. Milward contended that, "[t]he counter-argument to the view that the [UK] would be surrendering both parliamentary sovereignty and national sovereignty by signing the Treaty of Rome was that to hold its place as the greatest of the non-superpowers those surrenders were necessary."[68] Furthermore, he argued that "[t]he argument was irresistible for a nation that less than a century earlier had been the world's largest economy and where now the economic discussion was all about 'decline.'"[69] His argument was that despite there being reservations about the sovereignty issue, generally, the British people believed that the benefits of joining the European Communities outweighed the loss of some of that sovereignty. They understood that joining

---

[66] Frances M. B. Lynch, "Restoring France: the road to integration," in *The Frontier of National Sovereignty: History and theory 1945—1992*, by Alan S. Milward, et al (New York: Routledge, 1993): 59.
[67] These communities became known as the Three Pillars of the European Union and were officially subsumed by the European Union in 2009 under the Treaty of Lisbon.
[68] Alan S. Milward, *Politics and Economics and the History of the European Union* (New York: Routledge, 2005): 20.
[69] *Ibid*.

meant they, on occasion, would have to submit to the demands of the French and West Germans, among others and that the UK would not consistently be driving policy. However, they also understood that in order to maintain relevance and a presence in global politics, they would have to be willing to accept those facts.

That is not to say that the issue of sovereignty was completely ignored in favor of joining. Indeed, it was hotly debated. Milward pointed out that the leader of the Labour Party in 1961, Hugh Gaitskell, referred to the possibility of joining as the "end of a thousand years of history."[70] Despite this, the UK first decided to apply for full for membership in the European Communities in that year. At the time, Prime Minister Macmillan acknowledged that British influence in the world would diminish further if the UK joined the Communities. And while the development of new alliances would limit the UK's role in international affairs, it would be able to connect North America and Europe and in so doing preserve its role in global affairs to some extent, though not in its entirety.[71]

By this point, the UK's position with reference to the European Communities was largely established. Consistently, it viewed itself as separate from the continent, but integral to its economic and political success. It also viewed itself as playing a special role as an ambassador for Europe to the rest of the world. It should be part of the Communities, but provided with special consideration because of its global position, despite its diminishment after the war. This tension continued through its first applications to the Communities, especially to the EEC, which were both blocked by Charles de Gaulle, in 1963[72] and in 1967,[73] on the grounds that British

[70] *Ibid*., 23.
[71] Ludlow, *op. cit.*, 37.
[72] Hugo Young, *op. cit.*, 132.
[73] Ibid., 196—198.

membership to the EEC would cause significant economic upheaval that would do more damage than good to the other member states.[74]

Ultimately, the UK joined the European Communities in 1973, after de Gaulle had left power in France and had passed away. However, that these issues were debated at the time indicates that the tension between wanting to maintain sovereignty and wanting to enjoy the political and economic benefits of the European Communities began well before the UK had joined. It continued well after the UK joined, as well.[75]

In 1974, the Labour Party sought to renegotiate more favorable terms for the UK to maintain its membership in the EEC. Helmut Schmidt, German Chancellor at the time, commented on the issue at a Labour Party conference saying, "[a]ll I really want to say—even at the risk of a walk-out—is that your comrades on the Continent want you to stay, and you will please have to weigh this…Your comrades on the Continent believe that it is in their interests as well as yours, too."[76] That the debate about the terms of membership and future of the UK in the European Communities was serious enough to evoke a response from other European leaders indicates that this issue was being taken seriously in both the UK and abroad.

The pro-European group "Britain in Europe" published a pamphlet at this time and argued that leaving the European Communities would be disastrous for the UK. It stated, "If we left we would not go back to the world as it was when we joined, still less to the old world of Britain's imperial heyday."[77] It implied that those arguing for a departure were doing so, at least

---

[74] See Hugo Young., *op. cit.* 196 and Ludlow *op. cit.*, 46.
[75] And it continues now, given the relationship between the UK and the EU especially with reference to secure favorable terms for the UK's exit from the EU and Prime Minister Theresa May's and Prime Minister Boris Johnson's inability to secure terms that the House of Commons are happy with.
[76] Helmut Schmitt, "We Need the British," in *The Pro-European Reader*, eds. Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 69.
[77] Britain in Europe, "Why You Should Vote Yes," in *The Pro-European Reader*, eds. Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 72.

in part, on a platform that included returning the UK to its former position of prestige. "Britain in Europe" further argued the point and stated

> [t]hat is why so much of the argument about sovereignty is a false one. It's not a matter of dry legal theory. The real test is how can we protect our own interests and exercise British influence in the world. The best way is to work with our friends and neighbours. If we came out, the [European Communities] would go on taking decisions which affect us vitally—but we should have no say in them. We would cling to the shadow of British sovereignty while its substance flies out of the window.[78]

The argument, then, was that leaving the European Communities would destroy any global relevance the UK had left, because it would no longer have a say in issues that directly and deeply impacted it. A partial loss of sovereignty ought to be more acceptable than the proposed alternative. Again, this illustrates that anxiety about the loss of sovereignty consistently has been an issue with the UK's membership in the EU and its predecessor communities.

The UK has not spent the entire duration of its membership debating whether or not to leave, though. In a speech in Bruges in 1988, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher stated, "Britain does not dream of some cosy, isolated existence on the fringes of the European Community. Our destiny is in Europe, as part of the Community."[79] Prime Minister John Major, in a speech in Bonn in 1991, stated that his "aims for Britain in the Community can be simply stated. I want us to be where we belong—at the very heart of Europe, working with our partners in building the future."[80] These statements indicate a shift in British leadership's approach to its role with regard to the European Communities.

---

[78] *Ibid*., 73.
[79] Margaret Thatcher, "Our Destiny is in Europe," in *The Pro-European Reader*, eds. Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 94.
[80] John Major, "Britain at the Heart of Europe," in *The Pro-European Reader*, eds. Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 113—114.

By the 1980s and early 1990s, discussion about the relationship between the UK and the European Communities had been reframed. Where earlier discussions had centered on whether or not the loss of some British sovereignty was acceptable or justified by membership, Thatcher's and Major's statements indicate that leadership in Britain had come to understand that the UK was well entrenched as an EU member. Focus was no longer on the issue of absolute sovereignty, but rather on working out the extent to which the UK would play a leading role in the EU moving forward.

Both Prime Minsters' statements indicate that they wanted to increase the UK's political influence within the European Communities' power structure, and therefore increase the UK's political weight and prestige in the world, though the sentiment was more clearly conveyed by Major. He wanted the UK to be at the heart of Europe—at the center and as its focus. Thatcher alluded to the same thing by saying that a UK on the fringes of Europe no longer would be acceptable. An increased role in the Communities was necessary. This echoes Milward's argument about the British people understanding that joining would be the only way to maintain or regain political prestige in the post-war world. After spending two decades expressing anxiety about losing sovereignty, focus had shifted to a discussion on what was the best way to use the UK's position in the Communities advantageously.

Linda Colley echoed these sentiments by drawing historical parallels to British imperialism. She stated, "Britain…could not attempt a global strategy without first consolidating its position in Europe. It had first and foremost to be a European power, because otherwise it could not be powerful anywhere else…Britain is a set of islands, but it has rarely been able to be insular."[81] According to this argument, figuring out how to use the UK's role in the European

[81] Linda Colley, "Britain as Europe," in *The Pro-European Reader*, eds. Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 223.

Communities to increase its global political power was an extension of historical trends. The UK needed to have a powerful and consistent role in relation to the continent to become an imperial power; it therefore needed to play a powerful and consistent role in the EU to maintain its position of political privilege in the world.

Conclusion

This does not mean that the argument about sovereignty completely gave way to the issue of the nature of the UK's role in the EU. Anthony Giddens commented on the debate about the role of European integration as a means to create a new, federated political state in the same vein as the United States. He argued that "the EU is not a state at all, and will never become one. It is (or now should be seen as) a new form of supranational authority, characterized by a voluntary sharing of aspects of sovereignty."[82] He continued on to say that, "the EU is seeking to help transform sovereignty in a newly interdependent world."[83] He argued that the nature of the debate about sovereignty needed to change because the way the nations of the world interact has changed. Despite this, the debate about sovereignty largely has not shifted. Indeed, it was the sovereignty issue that has pushed British membership in the EU to the brink which resulted from Prime Minister David Cameron calling for a Referendum on membership, as will be discussed in the following chapter.

Integrating into a larger European framework was particularly difficult for the UK, which simultaneously viewed itself as being part of the broader political body of Europe, while also being separate from it. This is due in part to the fact that, while the UK understood its role as a member of Europe, it developed a deeper European identity during the period leading up to 1961

---

[82] Anthony Giddens, "A Third Way for the European Union?" in *The Pro-European Reader*, eds. Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard (New York: Palgrave, 2002), 165.
[83] *Ibid*., 166.

while it also viewed itself as having a special position globally. That special global position theoretically would have allowed it to behave as Europe's ambassador to the world through its relationship with the Commonwealth and its relationship with the US. The idea was that the UK would be able to be the intermediary between Europe and the rest of the world.

The political and economic concessions the UK requested from the European Communities and EU—some of which will be discussed in the following chapter— and those that it obtained, such as exclusion from the Schengen Agreement and the adoption of the euro, indicate that it has continued to view itself as both politically part of and separate from the continent through the 1990s. However, after the A8 accession in 2004, and certainly by the time of the Referendum on membership in June 2016, the sovereignty issue had once again become the overriding focus of debate with reference to the UK's relationship with the EU. The dualistic nature of the UK's European identity had shifted to become focused on being separate from the continent rather than being a part of it.

CHAPTER III: ‘THE PLUMBER’ BECOMES A PROBLEM 2004—2014

After the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dissolution of Communism in Poland, Polish migration patterns changed to reflect easing restrictions on movement and the expansion of economic opportunities at home and abroad. When Poland was admitted to the European Union (EU) in 2004 as a member of the Accession 8 (A8), those migration patterns shifted, as Polish workers sought to utilize the ‘free movement of persons’ afforded to EU citizens. The United Kingdom was one of three EU member states that did not restrict access to its labor market by A8 immigrants. As a result, Poles began to immigrate to Britain in numbers larger than had been anticipated. The British press’s portrayal of these immigrants largely was framed negatively, though the community was not without its supporters. This chapter will examine demographic information about the British press and the Polish immigrant community. It will then examine the ways in which Polish immigrants were portrayed in the British newspapers with particular consideration being given to *The Times*, *The Sunday Times*, the *Financial Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, the *Independent*, the *Independent on Sunday*, and the *Daily Mail* between 2004 and 2014.

Demographic Background

These titles were chosen in order to present a wide range of political beliefs, authorial backgrounds and viewpoints, and biases. Each newspaper listed above has been found to have tendency to support particular social and political positions, though those positions have not remained static. During the 2005 General Election, editorial endorsements in *The Times*, the *Guardian*, and the *Financial Times* were found to support Labour to varying degrees; the *Telegraph*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, the *Daily Mail*, and *The Sunday Times* were found to support Conservatives to varying degrees; and the *Independent* and the *Independent on Sunday* were

found to support the Liberal Democrats.[1] During the 2010 General Election, editorial endorsements in *The Times*, *The Sunday Times*, the *Telegraph*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, the *Daily Mail*, and the *Financial Times* were found to support Conservatives to varying degrees; the *Guardian* and the *Independent* were found to support Liberal Democrats; and the *Independent on Sunday* was found to have no discernable bias.[2]

For the most part, the British press behaves as a partisan political actor.[3] That does not imply, however, that these titles promoted or published only articles and information that aligned with the above mentioned political affiliations. Biases and opinions differed and fell across the political spectrum depending on the author for any particular article or editorial as well as on the events occurring during the time of publication.

Excluding the *Financial Times*[4] these newspapers represented a readership base of 11,304,000 subscribers in the second half of 2004—after Poland acceded to the EU—and 14,071,000 subscribers for the entire year 2014.[5]

---

[1]Dominic Wring and David Deacon, "Patterns of press partisanship in the 2010 General Election," *British Politics* 5, no. 4 (December 2010), "Press partisanship in recent General Elections," table 1: 444.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Ibid., 437.
[4] Readership data for *Financial Times* is available yearly for 2006 to 2013 from the *Statista* database. See National Readership Surveys, "Average issue readership of The Financial Times in the United Kingdom (UK) from 2006 to 2013 (in 1,000s)," Chart, January 31, 2014, Statista, Accessed December 18, 2018, https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288105/readership-trend-of-the-financial-times-newspaper-uk/.
[5] Totals taken from *Statista* database. See National Readership Surveys, "Average issue readership of The Guardian in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in million readers)," Chart, February 27, 2017, Statista, Accessed December 18, 2018, https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288110/readership-trend-of-the-guardian-newspaper-uk/; National Readership Surveys, "Average issue readership of The Independent in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2015 (in 1,000 readers)," Chart, February 27, 2016, Statista, Accessed December 18, 2018, https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288114/readership-trend-of-the-independent-newspaper-uk/; National Readership Surveys, "Average issue readership of The Independent on Sunday in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2015 (in 1,000 readers)," Chart, February 27, 2016, Statista, Accessed December 18, 2018, https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288137/readership-trend-of-the-independent-on-sunday-newspaper-uk/; National Readership Surveys, "Average issue readership of The Sunday Times in the United Kingdom

The UK does not mandate registration of migration, which complicates its measurement.[6] The Worker Registration Scheme, the UK Census, and National Insurance Numbers have been used to track migration, among other measures, but each of these data sets leaves out critical information points, although they can be used to provide general demographic information about migrants.[7] For example, the Workers' Registration Scheme had 700,000 Polish migrants registered to it in 2011, but that number does not include unregistered immigrants or those who were self-employed.[8] This data indicate the migrants in question were typically "young…without dependents and employed in overwhelmingly low-skilled jobs, and the largest proportion of them worked for labour agencies."[9]

National Insurance Numbers (NINo) provide a useful measure, because they indicate "that an individual is highly likely to be employed, or seeking employment."[10] NINo allocation data indicate that in the five year period from 2004 to 2009, "allocations to Polish nationals

---

(UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in million readers)," Chart, February 27, 2017, Statista, Accessed December 18, 2018, https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288202/readership-trend-of-the-sunday-times-newspaper-uk/; National Readership Surveys, "Circulation of The Daily Mail in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in 1,000 copies)," Chart, February 27, 2017, Statista, Accessed December 18, 2018, https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288261/circulation-trend-of-the-daily-mail-newspaper-uk/; National Readership Surveys, "Circulation of the Sunday Telegraph in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in 1,000 copies)," Chart, February 27, 2017, Statista, Accessed December 18, 2018, https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288304/circulation-trend-of-the-sunday-telegraph-newspaper-united-kingdom-uk/; National Readership Surveys, "Circulation of The Times in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in 1,000 copies)," Chart, February 27, 2017, Statista, Accessed December 18, 2018, https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288283/circulation-trend-of-the-times-newspaper-uk/

[6] Catherine Harris, Dominique Moran, and John R. Bryson, "EU Accession Migration: National Insurance Number Allocations and the Geographies of Polish Labour Immigration to the UK," *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 103, no. 2 (October 21, 2011): 210.

[7] Ibid., 211—212.

[8] Ian Fitzgerald and Rafal Smoczynski, "Anti-Polish Migrant Moral Panic in the UK: Rethinking Employment Insecurities and Moral Regulation," *Czech Sociological Review* 51, no. 3 (2015): 340.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Harris et al. *op. cit.*, 213.

peaked between January and March 2007 at 81,000, accounting for 70 per cent of the total" [11] for the A8 accession states during that period. For the first quarter 2009, the number of allocations dropped to 31,000.[12] The data also indicate that London, the South East, the East of England, the North West, and the West Midlands had the highest concentration of NINo registrations allocated to Polish nationals from 2002 through 2009.[13]

During the period 2006 to 2009, Polish immigrants interviewed about their experiences in the UK indicated that there was a lack of positive reception to their presence. Respondents from Trowbridge noted an increased concern about reports of violence and general negativity directed at Poles that included vehicles being damaged, attempts to have legally residing Polish migrants evicted from their homes, a pointed lack of interaction between British locals and migrants, and general condescension aimed at migrants.[14] In 2009, a representative of the Federation of Poles in Britain noted a 20% increase in reports from the British media of "racist incidents" targeting Poles between 2007 and 2008.[15] This is despite the fact that estimates from the Institute for Public Policy Research indicated that half of the A8 migrants who arrived beginning in 2004 had left by 2008.[16] It should be noted that many of those returns were likely planned from the outset, as a 2009 survey of migrants who returned to Poland found that 76% had intended to do so when they initially traveled to the UK.[17]

---

[11] Ibid., 214.
[12] Ibid., 214—215.
[13] Ibid., "NiNo registrations to Polish nationals entering the UK by Government Office Region," Figure 2, 217.
[14] Anne White, *Polish Families and Migration Since EU Accession* (Portland, OR: The Policy Press, 2011), 147—148.
[15] Ibid., 147.
[16] Ibid., 199.
[17] Ibid.

It may be that part of the reason that the Polish immigrant population grew so quickly, despite return migration, was the extant Polish community established after the end of World War II. Anne White asserted, though, that "[t]he assumption that ethnic communities will display solidarity is one which is often made, yet deeply problematic."[18] In particular, Polish immigrants in the UK expressed the belief that they would not be able to count on support from other members of the Polish immigrant community, both new and extant.[19] The idea that "Poles are like wolves to one another" was not uncommon and, in part, may be attributable to a general wariness of others on the part of the Poles both in Poland and abroad. [20] In this way, new Polish immigrants' expectations for active help from the Polish community in the UK were limited.

So while it is the case that pre-established immigration networks existed and that such communities were able to provide a sense of comfort to new Polish immigrants, there were also other factors that impacted the experience of the new immigrants and whether or not they were likely to remain.[21] In the case of Trowbridge, in addition to an extant Polish community, new immigrants were also encouraged to settle because of the presence of factories that relied heavily upon migrant labor and utilized recruitment agencies that would bring in Polish migrants.[22] In other areas, like Bath, a pre-existing Polish community did not exist to welcome or support new immigrants, so other factors were at play in their settling in the region.[23]

The increase in the Polish immigrant population led to tensions about their role in British society. Oftentimes, they were framed negatively by the British press and in particular framed in

[18] White, *op. cit.*, 185.
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ibid.
[21] Ibid., 183.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Ibid., 184.

such a way as to portray them as an economic threat.[24] A *Financial Times*/Harris Poll indicated that "47% of British respondents felt that A8 migrants constituted a negative factor for the economy (with only 19% thinking they were a positive factor)".[25] Polish immigrants likely have been perceived and portrayed in this way because "since 2004, [they] have.... become a statistically significant ethnic minority population, and…one of the fastest growing migrant populations in the country."[26] Citizenship in the EU has provided rights and opportunities to Polish nationals that translated into economic migration, and the volume of that migration has taken "them from a state of marginality into a visible public and political sphere."[27] The result has been that the Polish immigrant community became a population increasingly decried as a threat to the wellbeing of British citizens.

In part, it was the visibility of the Polish community that led to immigration becoming a noted point of discussion in the British press in the lead-up to the 2010 General Election, along with welfare, debt, and the perceived failures of the Blair- and Brown-led Labour governments. It was one of the issues that led to several of the newspapers changing their endorsements to Conservative.[28] Because Poland's status as an EU member state grants free movement of workers within other member states to its citizens, the extent to which the British government could regulate their entry was limited after the decision to allow migration immediately following the 2004 accession. Despite this, concerns about the volume of immigrants led to

---

[24] Ariel Spigelman, "The Depiction of Polish Migrants in the United Kingdom by the British Press After Poland's Accession to the European Union," *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 33 (2013): 98.
[25] Fitzgerald and Smoczynski, *op. cit*., 341.
[26] Kathy Burrell, *Polish Migration to the UK in the 'New' European Union: After 2004* (London: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2009), 7.
[27] Michal P. Garapich, "The Migration Industry and Civil Society: Polish Immigrants in the United Kingdom Before and Ater EU Enlargement," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34, no. 5(July 2008): 748.
[28] Wring and Deacon, *op. cit*., 441.

increasing political pressure on the British government to somehow limit or more closely regulate immigration and contributed to the Conservative victory in 2010.[29]

Representation of Poles in Print Media

At least as early as November 2004, *The Sunday Times* published news articles discussing the influx of arriving Polish immigrants. One such article stated, "[w]hen the EU was enlarged in May to include Poland—and nine other countries—the British government estimated that no more than 13,000 immigrants a year would move from the new member states to the UK. Figures showed last week that 91,000 immigrants have already registered—more than half of them from Poland."[30] It goes on to state that there "is no sign of an end to the influx, with tens of thousands more expected to arrive in the next few months."[31] Within six months of the enlargement, print media was expressing anxiety about the number of immigrants coming to the UK from the A8. Significantly, Polish immigrants were being cited as coming in conspicuously large numbers that exceeded initial expectations.

The last line in that article was a quote from a Pole who had spent time in the UK before the A8 accession who stated, "[g]oing back to work in Britain is my dream, and [since] now we can do so legally there is no stopping me."[32] Given the data presented earlier in the article, this line could be understood as threatening. Here, *The Sunday Times* described a situation in which there were already larger numbers of immigrants entering the UK than anticipated, and, because of the legal framework governing the free movement of peoples and their right to seek employment within EU member states, there was nothing that the UK could do to stop them

---

[29] Harris, et al., *op. cit.*, 214.
[30] Mark Franchetti and Tom Pattinson, "Working in Britain Pays Family Dividend to Poles Apart" *The Sunday Times*, November 14, 2004.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid.

from coming or even reduce the speed of their inward flow. It established a discourse in which the UK was a passive political actor lacking the agency to define and decide political issues such as immigration quotas. This particular point emerged repeatedly as an area of concern in the news articles during the period between 2004 and 2014.

An article in the *Guardian* explained that the reason so many Poles were coming to Britain was that earlier waves of Polish immigration had already established a strong community. It stated, "the existence of so many Polish social groups and businesses (especially building firms) has helped new Polish economic migrants to find it easier than other ethnic groups to live and work in Britain."[33] While it was the case that a Polish community was in existence and well established at the end of World War II, the inclusion of this explanation indicated that even by early 2005, UK citizens were seeking explanations for the situation, indicating there was social anxiety concerning the numbers of Polish immigrants seeking employment in the UK. Again, the article framed the British role in this scenario as passive; according to the author, there was nothing that British officials had done specifically to attract Polish immigrants, perhaps with the exception of allowing the Polish community to establish itself in the late 1940s. It ignored the active political decision not to limit Polish immigration in 2004. In this representation, the British were political players being acted upon by EU regulations and politicians; they had no agency in the situation and therefore no responsibility for it.

The parenthetical commentary further clarified the role that Polish immigrants were being cast as playing. It stated that building/construction firms specifically had been helpful to these immigrants. The implication here was that they had been finding work as unskilled

[33] Stuart Jeffries, "G2: Workers of the world: More than 73,000 people from Poland have signed up to work in Britain in the past year. And they are doing the jobs we don't want to—plumbing, cleaning, building and driving. Stuart Jeffries reports," *Guardian*, March 9, 2005, 1.

laborers; the perception would be that they were working in low-wage fields. Polish immigrants' lack of skills was emphasized, and this created an impression that they were contributing little beyond able bodies to British society.

This belief became clearer and better established as other authors contended with and elucidated their positions in additional articles. One from the *Daily Mail* summed up how this impression became problematic in the discourse about immigration by noting that "Sir Andrew Green, chairman of MigrationWatch said: 'It sounds like musical chairs. *But the danger is that low-paid British workers will be the ones left standing*."[34][Emphasis mine]

While the *Daily Mail* has a reputation for sensationalizing news, this statement provides a clear example of how A8 immigration was being framed negatively. According to the narrative being constructed, there were more immigrants than anticipated, the British could not control their entry into the country, and they were providing unskilled labor and in so doing taking work away from low-paid British labor. This narrative constructed a scenario in which these immigrants presented an economic threat to the UK, rather than a boon.

The constructed narrative does not state that immigrants represented only an economic threat, though. One article's lead stated, "[t]here are now so many Polish children in British schools that they should teach Polish history and culture, according to the Polish Ambassador."[35] Here, a Polish politician seemingly felt justified in trying to assert influence in changing British school curricula and in so doing inject Polish topics into British schools. The implication was that Polish immigrants were so numerous that they threatened the cultural integrity of the UK.

---

[34] Come Here Instead, Poland Tells Bulgarians," *Daily Mail*, October 26, 2006.
[35] Anthony Browne, "Polish 'Needs to Be Taught in Schools,'" *The Times*, February 10, 2007.

Another article argued that Polish immigrant women, "often from strict Roman Catholic backgrounds…have on average four times more sex than they would at home."[36] It also asserted that they are also "three times more likely to exchange sex for accommodation, cleaning or cooking in the UK than they would be at home" in part because "the 'newness' of the UK makes Polish women feel more liberated," while the article also "attribut[es] a rise in promiscuity to the availability of abortion."[37] Polish immigrant women's sex lives became a point of public interest and of public discourse. They were being set apart from the general female population because of their ethnic background and religion, which cast them as an 'other' in British society. They were being exoticized as women seeking a release from their conservative backgrounds and portrayed as being promiscuous when provided the opportunity.

While migration networks played a role in the distribution of Polish migrants in the UK,[38] not all immigrants were guaranteed access to them, which increased their vulnerability as a population. In framing female Polish immigrants in this way, it detracted from discussion of the fact that they do represent a vulnerable population, especially if they did not have access to those networks. Instead of commenting on issues of sexual exploitation, the author implied that Polish women were treating sex as a de facto form of currency. It shifted blame for that exchange to the immigrant women while diminishing the role that those exploiting them for sexual favors played in the exchange.

The article went on to say that "Agnieszka Kolek, a London-based artist who was recently voted Polish Woman of the Year, believes that Polish women do not have to move

---

[36] Katie Gibbons, "Polish women 'have four times more sex in Britain,'" *The Times*, September 28, 2013.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Jadwiga Gałka, "Areas of Concentration and an Analysis of Factors Affecting the Distribution of Polish Immigrants in Great Britain Since Poland's Accession to the European Union," *Prace Geograficzne* no. 130 (2012): 36.

abroad to become liberated. 'They come here to study, work and make careers,' she said."[39] It is especially troubling in this section that Kolek expresses very clearly that Polish women come to Britain for reasons other than developing a different understanding of their sexual identities, but the author's lead in to her quote was that Kolek does not think that Polish women need go abroad to be 'liberated'. That her comment was led into with that phrasing made it appear as though the author was attempting to reframe Kolek's comments to refer to immigrant women's sex lives, drawing focus back to that issue, while not addressing Kolek's point. It sensationalized the story in a way that increases the likelihood that Polish women would continue to be exoticized because of their 'othered' status and theoretical promiscuity.

Their sex lives were not the only issue concerning Poles' private lives upon which the tabloids and broadsheets reported. There have also been religious elements that added to British anxiety about Polish immigration. One article stated that a new and "fierce debate over the growing influence of the Catholic Church was sparked…when research revealed that churchgoing Catholics now outstrip the number of practising Anglicans."[40] It went on to say that the study "did not...take into account the recent wave of Polish immigration which is likely to widen still further the gap between active members of the two denominations. Some estimates put the number of Poles arriving in Britain at up to 100,000 [in 2007], 85 per cent of whom are Catholic."[41] Polish immigrants were changing the religious demographics in Britain by increasing the numbers of parishioners and, ostensibly, the influence of the Catholic Church. That created conflict with centuries of tradition in the UK, which, if nothing else, was powerfully symbolic. This put Polish immigrants at odds with the general British population and society

[39] Gibbons, *op. cit.*
[40] Jonathan Brown, "New Wave of Poles Bolsters 'Catholic Britain,'" the *Independent*, December 24, 2007.
[41] Ibid.

and, yet again, threatened the perceived cultural integrity of a particular, conservative, idealized Britain.

Another way this sense of threat from Polish immigrants was expressed was in the discourse surrounding language. In one of his columns, Giles Coren openly mocked Polish immigrants' ability to speak English in response to the news that Polish had become the second most commonly spoken language in England, ahead of Welsh.[42] In it, he affected stereotypically broken English and commented, "[s]o today I am celebrate Polish is become number two language entire of England not count Wales by write whole opinion column topical observation of week's news for first time in actual Polish language."[43] The tone of this commentary was dismissive and derogatory. It cast Poles as less intelligent for their perceived inability to speak grammatically correct English. It did not account for those Poles who do speak grammatically correct English and it did not account for the level of experience and education, formal or informal, necessary for those who have even basic communicative competence in English as a second language.

Coren ended this particular piece with an accusation of broad-based antisemitism among Poles by saying, "[w]hy is make mouthy meal apology? In Poland man who not like Jews simple thrown them down well with pitchfork still alive, drink vodka, big laugh ha ha, then is fill in concrete and dance grave. And is not then afterwards say like scaredy cat coward 'I am sorry for the unintended offence.'"[44] Not only was this a bold accusation to make considering the rise of antisemitic activity across Europe; it also implies that Coren sought both to offend with his commentary and to assert his lack of concern about the public reception for his position. Coren

[42] Giles Coren,"Today I am make first column in Polski," *The Times*, February 2, 2013.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.

wrote for and published this column in *The Times* and not in a paper known for more sensationalistic takes on news like the *Daily Mail* or the *Sun*; anti-Polish rhetoric had achieved at least some level of legitimacy and acceptance within British society.

The Times did print a collection of reactions to Coren's piece several days after it was published. The article's title—"Reactions to Giles Coren's column last week have been both numerous and dedicated in their defence of Polish people"[45] —seemingly implied that *The Times* received a significant number of responses regarding Coren's piece and that they were largely pro-Pole; however, editors chose to publish only two of the responses. Leading members of the Polish community in Britain authored the first response. They pointed out that Coren's piece was offensive to the Polish community and its supporters in Britain. They stated that it had been "not only an affront to the many good, hard-working and honest people in the Polish community…but also to the countless Britons who call Poles their friends."[46] It drew attention to the positive relationships that Poles in Britain had developed with their local communities. It was also a brief and effective reminder that Polish immigrants were involved in the daily lives of British people and did not exist in a state physically or socially removed from them.

Former ambassador Witold Sobków authored the second response that *The Times* chose to print. He stated that Coren's "column made fun of how Polish immigrants speak English. He forgets that those Poles whom he derides build British roads and homes, serve British customers in restaurants and hotels, drive British cars, strengthen British banks and agencies in the City, treat British patients, pay taxes here and contribute to pension funds of the British citizens."[47] This response drew attention to the variety of social services and economic benefits that Polish

[45] "Reactions to Giles Coren's column last week have been both numerous and dedicated in their defence of Polish people," *The Times*, February 5, 2013.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.

immigrants provide for Britain. In so doing, it addressed the fear of Poles as an economic threat by acknowledging their economic contributions to taxes and pensions. He also addressed the stereotype that Poles work predominantly in positions that employ low-level, unskilled labor by highlighting their role in British healthcare. His response complements the one authored by leaders of the Polish community, pointing out the positive impacts that Polish immigrants have had in the UK, both socially and economically.

By publishing these responses, *The Times* indicated that it was aware that Coren's piece had been inflammatory; however, it missed an important social opportunity to highlight that there were members of the British community who had not been supportive of Coren's piece, either. By not publishing responses from the British community, the editors made it seem as though there was no negative response from it regarding the article's content, which was likely not the case. It left only the Poles, who have been systematically 'othered' in British society, to defend themselves.

This was not the only case of pro-Polish sentiment being limited to those who could be considered part of the Polish community. In one edition of the letters to the editor in the *Daily Telegraph*, it published a letter from a man whose Polish immigrant grandfather died serving Britain in World War I. The point he stressed was that "Poles were settling into British society in large numbers long before the Second World War."[48] Polish immigration, according to him, has long been part of British life; immigration since accession was a continuation of that rather than an entirely new phenomenon, and he was not wrong, as discussed in the first chapter. Though many immigrant communities have established themselves in the UK, Polish immigration was a known phenomenon, particularly in the post-World War II period.

---

[48] "The long history of Polish immigration and integration in British life: Letters to the Editor," *The Daily Telegraph*, February 2, 2013.

Responses that reported negative sentiment about Polish immigrants and the immigration situation indicated that problems were arising from the ways in which Poles and other immigrants were changing British life. They expressed concern about immigrants' abilities to integrate in society and about the racial and ethnic tensions increased immigration was stoking. One expressed disappointment that Prime Minister Tony Blair had been given an award by the Polish government, and the author asserted that he hoped Labour would not come to power again. Blair's award had highlighted the perception of Labour pandering to migrants and migrant communities.[49] It should be noted these responses were authored by people with no clear ties to the Polish community in Britain.

Again, by publishing pro-Polish comments only from authors with ties to the Polish community and publishing anti-immigrant comments only from authors with no clear ties to the community, *The Times* made it seem as though there was a line of division regarding support for the community. The subtle narrative that was presented was that only Poles, or those with close ties to them, supported the Polish immigrant community. The ethnically British did not. But that was not necessarily reflective of how or from where support for the community actually arose.

Not all discussion of the Poles in Britain was framed in a negative tone. In fact, many articles discussed the positive attributes of Polish immigrants. Alexandra Frech's research suggests that this was most often the case when immigrants were being anecdotally discussed.[50] One such type of article focused on the successes of individual Polish immigrants. For example, one article discussed the success of a Polish cleaner who was also a talented pianist. The author noted that the "extraordinary story of how the 28-year-old Polish immigrant suddenly hit the big

[49] Ibid.
[50] Alexandra Frech, "'Mass Migration', Crime and 'Decent People': The Portrayal of Polish Migrants in British Newspapers," *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism* (2008): 10.

time has been compared to the plot of a rags-to-riches Hollywood movie."[51] The young man was overheard on a webcam playing the piano at the end of his cleaning shift; the audience took note of his skill and began to suggest him to friends and colleagues. He has been asked to play for soundtracks and charities since then.[52] The author commented that "[t]he only sour note in Mr Kudajczyk's tale is that the news that a Polish cleaner was giving concert performances dredged up some of the usual anti-immigrant comments."[53] So even when immigrant's accomplishments are being highlighted positively and celebrated, they were still subject to critical and negative commentary on the basis of their status as immigrants.

Another common 'positive' take on Polish immigrants focused on their work ethic. One article noted that the stereotype of the Polish plumber had proliferated throughout the UK, and that there was "very good feedback from employers in this country—they are surprised at how hard Poles work and they do not argue or question what they are asked to do. They do not have hang-ups about doing jobs that are beneath them."[54] This sentiment was echoed in other articles with another one citing a business owner who stated he viewed "the Poles as a good thing. They're good quality people, often with degrees. They're far more dedicated. They arrive on time and are prepared to put in extra effort" in comparison to British workers, who, by his account, "think they deserve something better."[55]

---

[51] Andy McSmith, "From a cleaner to a concert pianist, the Polish immigrant who hit the right note in Britain," *The Independent*, December 7, 2007.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Fiona Barton, "The NEW Britons; (1) Since joining the EU, Poles have come here in the hundreds of thousands. Critics say they deprive Britons of jobs and houses. Economists say they are adding Pounds 300m a year to the economy and keeping interest rates down. Starting today, in this major investigative series, the Mail sets out to discover the truth (2) SPECIAL REPORT," *Daily Mail*, May 17, 2006.
[55] Jeff Randall, "Why making taxes simpler should not mean bigger bills Jeff Randall finds a Birmingham engineering firm wrapped up in red tape but appreciating the benefits of Polish immigrants," *The Daily Telegraph*, October 31, 2007.

In these cases, the Poles were being portrayed positively, but it should be noted that this emphasis on their work ethic also alludes to a certain level of exploitability. The emphasis was on what can be extracted from them—more work and longer hours with a better disposition than could be found among British workers. They became a means to an end, rather than an end in and of themselves. While at first glance this might have been viewed as a positive portrayal, it becomes clear it was also a patronizing one.

Additionally, it highlighted how Polish workers were viewed as being willing to undercut unskilled British laborer. By being willing to work harder and for less money, Polish laborers displaced British laborers. This relates back to discussion about Polish immigration as an economic threat. Even as Poles were being discussed 'positively,' their perceived negative impact on British workers was being subtly emphasized.

Another example of this 'positivity' came from discussion of the Poles with reference to circular migration. These types of articles discussed how Polish immigrants came to the UK in an effort to secure a better life, but had no intention of staying. One school headmaster commented on the Polish immigrants in his community noting that

> [t]hese communities have not come here to bleed the system. They don't claim benefits and when they go home for holidays, they go to the dentist and the doctor in Poland. They believe they are going back in five years' time. They are paying tax and national insurance in order to secure a future. Coming here is a means to an end.[56]

What emerged from these types of commentary was a portrayal of the Polish immigrant as someone who sought an improved station in life, but did not scrounge. They gave to the system through their dedication and hard work, but did not take more than they needed out of it. Eventually they went home. They were placed on a pedestal and used to draw a comparison to

[56] Barton, *op. cit.*

British workers, who were considered less reliable and a drain on the social welfare systems in the longer term.

In these portrayals, Polish immigrants existed as a nebulous entity. They were problematic in their numbers and demands on education and welfare systems. At the same time, they were a positive force within the economy and willing to take on 'undesirable' jobs and work longer hours than their British counterparts. Because they existed as both a problematic and as a positive force in Britain, their agency was diminished and what resulted was that Polish immigrants were used by multiple parties as a means to achieve multiple goals.[57] That is, different facets of their immigrant identity were used to push particular social and political agendas.

Political Response and Reaction in Print Media

Discussion of Polish immigrants in political news articles provided additional and often conflicting context and examples with regard to this issue. It is worth noting that in politically oriented articles, the Polish community in Britain was more likely to be discussed either in more neutral or ostensibly positive terms, rather than simply being framed negatively. There was also more likely to be discussion of immigration as a broader issue and not focused solely on the Polish community.

One common theme in these politically oriented articles was addressing public concern about Polish immigration. In response to a question about whether or not Poles were still coming to Britain, one article stated, "[t]he numbers [of Polish immigrants] declined sharply in the recession. In the final quarter of 2009 there were 28,000 new registrations under the [worker

[57] Joshua Hoops, Ryan J. Thomas, and Jolanta A. Drzewiecka, "Polish 'Pawns' between nationalism and neoliberalism in British newspaper coverage of post-European enlargement polish immigration," *Journalism* 17, no. 6(2015): 736.

registration scheme], compared with 52,000 in the same period of 2007."[58] This helped to put the situation in a different perspective. Polish immigration was not something that would continue on a massive scale; the flood had receded. Numbers were down from their peak, which meant that movement into Britain had been slowing down.

This article also pointed out that Professor John Salt, now a Professor Emeritus of Geography at University College London, originally estimated anticipated post-A8 Polish immigration using information about how immigration patterns changed when Spain and Portugal joined the EU. The estimate assumed that all other EU member states would not restrict entry of A8 nationals.[59] The fact that this article pointed out that the original estimates were not well informed is profoundly important to this discussion. It indicated that the British simply did not have enough information to make an accurate estimate and it reframed the focus and responsibility for this specific problem on the British. It was not that there were more Polish immigrants coming than had been expected so much as the British did not really know how many to expect in the first place. The problem was that the estimate had been wrong; the problem was not the number of immigrants coming to the UK.

In addition to this, an article in the *Financial Times* quoted Labour Party leaders as acknowledging that they ought to have taken a different approach to immigration when the A8 acceded. Ed Balls, a former Labour shadow chancellor, was quoted as saying, "[Labour] should have adopted tougher controls on migration from eastern Europe."[60] This was a significant comment because British politicians were willingly accepting some amount of responsibility for the fact that there had been more immigration from the A8 than expected. Immigration did not

---

[58] Alan Travis, "Campaign 2010: Poles Apart: The truth about Polish immigration," *Guardian*, April 30, 2010.
[59] Ibid.
[60]Helen Warrell, "Balls admits Labour 'mistakes' on immigration," *Financial Times*, September 26, 2011.

exceed expectations simply because of the EU and the immigrants themselves; there were also British missteps at fault. Labour leaders, then, were willing to acknowledge that they had some agency in the situation rather than their government being solely a passive actor, even though they did so in retrospect.

This is particularly significant given Labour's position on immigration in the late 1990s and early 2000s. When Tony Blair became Prime Minister in 1997 under the banner of 'New Labour', he and his party "wanted to put forward the appearance of being a progressive, modernising and reforming government."[61] With regard to economic migration policy in particular, Blair's Labour governments dramatically shifted their focus away from control and restriction—which had dominated migration policy in the preceding decades—to what was referred to as 'managing migration'.[62] This was done ostensibly to benefit the British economy by helping the UK adapt to a rapidly changing and increasingly interdependent global economy.[63] This, along with John Salt's underestimation of the number of Poles that would seek employment in the UK, led the Labour government to decide not to restrict Polish immigration immediately after the A8 accession. As a result of this policy, official figures from the Office of National Statistics indicate that net migration more than tripled between 1997 and 2006.[64]

It is important to note here, though, that this liberalization of economic migration policy did not apply to asylum seekers—as discussed previously—so it should not be taken as evidence that Labour's immigration policy reflected a complete departure from earlier immigration policy. Neither should it be overlooked that by aligning economic migration directly with the interests of

---

[61] Alex Balch, "Labour and Epistemic Communities: The Case of 'Managed Migration' in the UK," *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 11, no. 4(November 1, 2009): 615.
[62] Ibid., 616.
[63] Ibid., 617.
[64] Ibid., 616.

the national economy, Labour's more open immigration policy demonstrated a commodification of migrant labor,[65] which positioned migrant laborers as a means to an end and removed some of their agency as social, cultural, and economic contributors and actors in the UK.

That is, when Labour came to power in 1997, it sought to present itself as a progressive, more welcoming government. While it arguably did have that effect for economic migrants, it did not for other groups of migrants, including asylum seekers. Where migrants seeking asylum were problematic, economic migration was considered a boon. And despite large numbers of economic migrants entering the UK after Labour came to power, "there was little political discussion of [economic migration] prior to European enlargement …[and] [p]olicy itself was almost entirely focused on asylum."[66] That changed after the A8 accession and the influx of Polish immigrants. By 2011, politicians acknowledged and reacted to public opinion about the realities of economic migration and acknowledged that the response to it had not been as positive or accepting as they had hoped it would be while the policy was being crafted in the late 1990s. As the public's position on economic migration soured, so, too, did politicians' positions on it, even if only in retrospect.

An article in the *Daily Mail* was somewhat blunter in assigning blame for the numbers of immigrants and asserted that "[Conservative] Opposition politicians…laid the blame for the astonishing immigration merry-go-round at the door of the UK Government, which completely miscalculated the demand for UK jobs when it opened its doors to the Eastern European countries who joined the EU in 2004."[67] Published in 2006, the article implied that the UK had

---

[65] Ibid., 617.
[66] Gareth Mulvaney, "When Policy Creates Politics: the Problematizing of Immigration and the Consequences for Refugee Integration in the UK," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23, no. 4(December 2010): 440.
[67] "Come here instead, Poland tells Bulgarians," *Daily Mail*, October 26, 2006.

partial agency with regard to immigration, but that it was limited to the then-incumbent Labour Party. The narrative developed here was that the Opposition did not have agency and it and its constituents were being acted upon without appropriate representation.

These acknowledgements of British agency do not indicate that Polish immigrants were not still being framed negatively, however. The *Financial Times* article that cited Ed Balls went on to quote Ed Milliband, former Labour Party Leader, as saying "I think what people were worried about in relation to Polish immigration in particular was that they were seeing their wages, their living standards driven down."[68] He specified Polish immigrants in this instance, rather than addressing a broad discussion of the labor market or acknowledging the possibility that the economic downturn that began in 2008 impacted wages and the standard of living, as well. Again, Polish immigrants were being portrayed as an economic threat, despite the fact that the economic downturn resulted in a sharp decrease in the Polish immigrant population[69] and despite the fact that Labour had been keen on increasing economic migration prior to the A8 accession.

A tendency to disregard potential other causes for economic and social problems in favor of placing blame on Polish immigrants resulted in anxiety about immigration.[70] This anxiety was once again resurrected in early 2013 in response to the end of immigration restrictions placed on Romanian and Bulgarian migrants. Political rhetoric turned back to estimates of the number of immigrants that Britain could expect to receive, as even more Eastern Europeans turned their sights toward opportunities to be found in the west. However, after the failure of predicting the

[68] Warrell, *op. cit.*
[69] Spigelman, *op. cit.*, 101.
[70] Ibid., 100.

number of migrants in 2004–again, due to having a lack of relevant information–political leaders hesitated to release estimates regarding the volume Romanian and Bulgarian immigration.

A justification for this was put forth by former Conservative MP and Communities Secretary Eric Pickles. He argued that this was done to avoid a "scare story."[71] This avoidance does not seem to be nearly as important as it was portrayed, though, because he went on to say that migrants coming into the UK would "cause problems not just in terms of the housing market but also on the social housing market."[72] Such phrasing does not seem focused on the alleviation of fear. Rather, it stoked fear and cast Polish immigrants as a threat to housing security.

In addition to Pickles, Prime Minister David Cameron also rejected the opportunity to share Balkan immigration estimates with the British public, claiming a lack of trust in the accuracy of the estimates for his reticence. This might have been the case given the situation with early Polish immigration predictions; however, it was also possible that the consistent negative framing of Polish immigration in the preceding years made any number of immigrants coming from Eastern Europe or the Balkans a problematic issue for politicians. This would be especially problematic given that the attention that had been focused on immigration had been one cause of newspapers shifting their political endorsements.

It is also important to consider how this discussion indicated a level of anxiety about non-Polish immigrants coming to Britain. Concern about other immigrant groups suggested that there were broader social issues at play rather than an issue solely with the Polish immigrant community. The fact this concern was being expressed about immigrants from other EU member

[71] Stephen Glover, "Are ministers too scared to say what they know about the next wave of migrants?" *Daily Mail*, January 17, 2013.
[72] Ibid.

states was also significant; concern was being focused on immigrants that were protected by the EU's right of free movement of workers.

During the lead up to the 2015 general elections, political discussion naturally increased. News articles from this period indicate that the way Polish immigrants were discussed again shifted. Where earlier articles framed Polish immigration as a problem itself, articles from this period tended to portray Polish immigration as indicative of a larger problem. One such example was the discussion surrounding child benefits.

Prime Minister Cameron argued that "EU treaties should be rewritten to prevent migrants working in Britain claiming child benefit."[73] The child benefit is essentially a stipend paid from British taxpayer revenue to individuals who are responsible for children under sixteen. Since EU workers were legally entitled to the same welfare benefits as British nationals so as long as Britain is a member state, there had been some noted displeasure that these credits were being paid out for children not residing in Britain. Because of this, a sense that taxpayers in the UK were being forced to provide welfare benefits to children living in Poland while their parents worked in Britain developed. [74] Cameron indicated that he wanted to see the treaties requiring those credits to apply to EU workers change. This was likely due to the fact that during this period, immigration overtook the economy as voters' largest concern in most polls.[75]

One option discussed to address the issue of child benefits was "to demand from Brussels a so-called emergency brake on the number of migrants from particular EU countries."[76] One additional proposal would have seen "an annual cap on the number of national insurance

[73] Phillipe Naughton, "Poland hits back at Cameron on child benefit cut," *The Times*, January 7, 2014.
[74] Bruno Waterfield, "Poland attacks David Cameron plan to ban Polish and EU migrants from claiming child benefit," *Telegraph*, January 6, 2014.
[75] Francis Elliot, "No 10 seeks emergency brake on immigration," *The Times*, October 16, 2014.
[76] Ibid.

numbers given to low-skilled immigrants from Europe."[77] Given that an affiliation between Polish immigrants and unskilled labor had already been established by the press, this statement would be understood as applying to them.[78] The British government was discussing seeking an additional exemption from certain parts of EU law in order to have more competence relating to immigration.

When Angela Merkel made it clear that there was no "possibility of Germany supporting any limitations on the freedom of movement, [which was] a potentially terminal intervention from Britain's key ally,"[79] Cameron was expected to "call for a ban on EU migrants claiming in-work benefits such as tax credits when they first move to Britain."[80] So, while he was still attempting to find a way to legitimize temporary EU migration quotas,[81] Cameron was preparing to reduce the attractiveness of Britain as a destination for EU migrants by limiting their ability to claim benefits. At the same time, it was reported that he was being "advised to signal that he [was] prepared to leave the EU if he [did] not get his way."[82]

The way this issue was framed is significant. Certainly, parts of the British population had taken issue with the fact that Poles were sending their child benefits to Poland, thereby removing that money from the British economy. However, the government was not seeking just to block Poles from receiving that credit. They were seeking to regain the ability to decide who was eligible for those benefits. This was an issue being expressed in terms of benefits, but

---

[77] Tim Shipman, "PM Threatens quotas for EU workers," *The Sunday Times*, October 19, 2014.
[78] This is not to say that it would not also apply to other groups like Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants, but that the link with Polish immigrants was particularly well established by that point.
[79] Bojan Pancevski and Tim Shipman, "Merkel: I will block PM on immigrants," *The Sunday Times*, October 26, 2014.
[80] Tim Shipman and Marie Woolf, "PM: I'll ban benefits for EU migrants," *The Sunday Times*, November 23, 2014.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid.

focusing only on that would ignore the issue of sovereignty that underlies this problem. Immigration became such a point of contention that Cameron became willing to take the UK out of the EU over it.

One columnist put it bluntly: "Britain wants controlled immigration, but we won't get it if we stay in the EU."[83] The problem, then, was that Britain did not have the competence to make these decisions alone anymore. Another article explained, "[p]olitics is as much about psychology as policy. That's worth remembering when it comes to government immigration policy. There is often a mismatch between general hostility and specific compassion."[84] Immigrants, on a personal level, were not the issue. The hostility stemmed from the policy level, which, again, Britain could no longer define on its own with regard to EU workers.

Conclusion

This exploration of the ways in which the British press has addressed Polish immigrants since 2004 reveals several trends. In the period directly following the accession of the A8, press portrayals of Polish immigrants were overwhelmingly negative. Stereotypes of Polish immigrants as unskilled laborers who sought to come to Britain to make easy money and take jobs from low-wage earning British citizens developed and became prominent. Additionally, discussion of the personal lives of Polish immigrant women entered into the public forum and 'otherized' and 'exoticized' them, reducing them to objects for public consumption. Press portrayals also used fear-mongering tactics when discussing the number of Polish schoolchildren being educated at home. Concerns about the possibility of Polish immigrants forcing British children to change how and what they learned in school were also expressed.

---

[83] Camilla Cavendish, I'm following our leader on border control—right out of the EU if need be," *The Times*, November 30, 2014.
[84] Rachel Sylvester, "Voters dislike the abstract idea of immigration. But when real people are involved their views change dramatically," *The Times*, April 1, 2014.

These issues were exacerbated by the fact that Polish immigration was repeatedly portrayed as being out of control, which in the most literal sense it was. This was because, as a member state, the UK no longer had the competence to limit the movement of EU migrants seeking employment. However, the general portrayal was one of vast waves of immigrants seeking to find a better life in Britain, but in doing so they risked destroying the established way of life in Britain.

This rhetoric was likely aggravated by the economic downturn that began in 2008. However, alternative possibilities for social concerns were frequently overlooked in favor of placing blame on Polish immigrants. The general social discourse on Polish immigrants presented in the press remained largely negative, however, except for letters to the editor and articles by members of the Polish community in the UK or those who could claim Polish heritage.

When political discourse in the press was taken into account, though, a slightly different understanding of what had been causing Britain's political problems emerged. The political discourse did not refute or otherwise challenge claims that the volume of Polish immigrants were problematic for both social and economic reasons. What differentiated this political discourse from the general social discourse was the underlying cause of the problem. The general social discourse maintained that the problem came from the Polish immigrants themselves; it focused on the argument that they simply should not be in Britain. The political discourse, in contrast, maintained that the presence of such a large number of Polish immigrants in Britain was indicative of a larger problem associated with a weak British government that did not have control over its borders with the EU. This is an extremely important distinction. The political

discourse drew out the argument that the Polish immigrants themselves were not the problem; the issue was that the British government could not limit how many there were.

The fact that Polish immigrants themselves were not presented as the overarching problem in this debate was also highlighted by the discussion about immigrants from EU member states that acceded after the A8—particularly Romania and Bulgaria. Anxiety about the number of people who could potentially migrate to Britain from those nations was repeatedly expressed and Polish immigrants were compared favorably because of their ability to adapt more easily to British society.

This portrayal indicates there was cognitive dissonance in British thought regarding the Poles. They have been presented as struggling to adapt and integrate into British society while also having their ability to contribute and assimilate to British society compared favorably to anticipated Balkan immigrants' and their presumed inability to contribute and assimilate in the same way. Which depiction dominated depended on the objectives of an article's author. Again, the Poles were being utilized as a means to an end, and in so doing—even if they were ostensibly portrayed positively—their agency was diminished in order to achieve a particular political end.

However, Poles were predominantly portrayed negatively, both socially and politically. The focus of this negative framing was on the impact that they had on the economy and on uncomfortable disruptions in the cultural status quo. During the course of the decade following accession, though, the narrative shifted to indicate that anxiety arose from EU immigration as a whole rather than Polish immigration specifically. But because "Poles account[ed] for the largest migrant group setting up home in Britain"[85] they were among the most visible migrant groups in the country. They also happened to be one of the immigrant groups whose ability to come to the

[85] Richard Ford, "Poles lead march of east European migrants," *The Times*, December 2, 2014.

UK was protected by EU law, and discourse about their immigration was framed in those terms. This discourse about Polish immigrants, then, was ultimately a discourse about British anxiety regarding the loss of sovereignty to the EU, rather than about the Polish immigrants themselves.

CONCLUSION

The influx of Polish immigrants in the UK after the A8 accession highlights the interaction of several lines of historical continuity and points of historical rupture in the recent history of Britain. In the first chapter, the ways in which Britain has addressed immigration since 1945 was addressed. The post-war Polish community that settled in the UK was a bit of an outlier. Because the movement of Poles into the UK was temporally limited, British politicians did not have to act to stymie their flow; the fall of the Iron Curtain and the rise of communism in Poland effectively ended migrant outflow until the end of the 1950s. Even still, there was frustration on the part of UK citizens about the number of Poles residing in the country and there was pressure from the government on the immigrants to either repatriate or settle elsewhere in the Commonwealth or in the US.

By the mid-1950s, discussion of the Poles as an immigrant community had diminished in favor of discussion concerning Commonwealth immigrants. Because the latter had been granted citizenship rights in 1948 and because there was an economic need in Britain for labor, Commonwealth immigrants began to settle there in large numbers. Because the majority of these immigrants were not white, race played a role in the ways in which their presence was framed and discussed. However, because of the political situation in which the UK found itself during the period—namely as a declining power in an increasingly bi-polar world—British politicians were loath to address the growing white discontent on the policy level. It was not until racial tensions began to bubble over and after it became evident that the Commonwealth would not play as significant role in the future of the UK as had been assumed in the immediate post-war period that action was taken. When it was, it severely restricted the number of Commonwealth immigrants that would be granted the right to live and work freely in the UK.

Discomfort with immigrants came to the fore again in the 1990s as discussion about the numbers of political refugees and asylum seekers increased, from places like the former Eastern Bloc. The number of asylum seekers and refugees was much smaller than either of the previously addressed immigrant movements; however, the British government moved to more narrowly define those who could be counted as refugees, rather than as asylum seekers, limit what welfare benefits asylum seekers would have access to, and limit the countries from which they could come.

This discussion established that there existed in the UK a level of discomfort with immigrants and that when public discomfort about an immigrant community becomes acute, the British government tends to move to reduce the number of immigrants present in the country or limit further immigration from that community. Where that point of discomfort lies is variable and depends on issues like the state of the British economy and race.

The second chapter discussed the expectations and limitations to legal competences places on the UK as a member of the European Communities and later the European Union (EU). The most important of these related to the free movement of workers within and among member states as established in the Treaty of Rome. Because this principle was established before the UK entered the communities, it was not possible for it to seek exemptions in the same way it sought exemptions from joining the Eurozone and assenting to the Schengen Agreement.

The second half of this chapter established that the UK historically has had a contentious relationship with the European communities and the EU. In particular, it highlighted that one of the major issues that has served as a point of dissent among British politicians with regard to the UK joining the European communities was the ceding of sovereignty and legal competences to a supranational authority. It was not until it became evident that the UK would not be able to count

on its relationship with the Commonwealth and the US to maintain its global position that its first application to the communities was submitted.

This discussion established that there has been a contentious relationship between the UK and the European Communities/EU from their inception in the late 1940s. One particular point of anxiety on the part of the British was ceding legal competence to a supranational authority. This, coupled with immigration, as discussed in the first chapter, establishes the major conflict explored in the third chapter.

When Poland acceded to the EU in 2004, Polish workers began to migrate to the UK to find work. Because the UK was one of only three states that had not moved to limit Polish immigration in the period immediately following accession, Poles came in numbers much larger than the UK had estimated and expected. This triggered publicly discussed discomfort with the Poles as an immigrant group, as evinced by their portrayal in British print media. However, because Poland had become an EU member state, the UK was not able to limit the number of Polish immigrants seeking employment and their ability to access to welfare benefits, both of which are established rights of EU citizens.

While the discussion of Polish immigrants initially focused mainly on British discomfort with having such a large immigrant population, it eventually transformed into a discussion about the discomfort of having such a large immigrant population from the EU. The expected number of immigrants from other acceding Eastern European member states began to be discussed with reference to the large numbers of Poles, who were already settled in the country. Eventually, the conversation shifted to the UK's discomfort with its membership in and relationship to the EU.

This means that these two lines of historical continuity—discomfort with immigrant groups and a contentious relationship with the European Communities/EU—intersected in the

form of Polish immigrants after 2004. In so doing, they created a major point of rupture; the British government could not limit the number of Polish workers seeking employment as it historically has done because of its limited legal competence with reference to EU immigration. The only way the UK could limit immigration by EU citizens was by seeking an exemption to the free movement of workers or by leaving the EU. This brings us to the Brexit referendum held in June 2016.

This thesis helps to elucidate the role that the Poles played in the development of this rupture. What emerges from this research is that it was not the ethnic or economic identity of the Poles that became their predominant feature; it was their political identity and membership in the EU that became significant. The rupture occurs not between the Polish immigrant community and the UK but between the UK and the EU.

To now, there has been a dearth of research about the Polish immigrant community between the mid-1950s and 2004. Further research in this area would clarify whether or not the extant Polish immigrant community played a more significant role in the volume of post-accession Polish immigration than has been understood to point.

It would also be beneficial to look further into the discussion of the Poles as asylum seekers in the 1990s. It is not insignificant that Poland was on Michael Howard's list of 'white-listed' countries. It may be the case that some of the discomfort expressed about Polish immigrants in the post-accession period was carried over from discomfort with Poles seeking asylum after the collapse of the Communist regime.

Overall, what has emerged from this discussion is that British discomfort with the post-accession Polish community is more accurately described as an example of discomfort with the EU. The likelihood is that had the UK been able to place restrictions on the number of Poles

entering the nation after 2006, it would have done so, and that likely would have put pressure on immigrants that had settled before restrictions came into force to repatriate. That is what the UK has done historically with immigrant groups with which it became uncomfortable. It is possible that another EU immigrant group might have become the point of rupture between the UK and the EU, and the additional research suggested above would help to clarify the role that the Poles as Poles rather than Poles as EU members played in that rupture. But when the UK joined the European Communities in January 1973, and joined with the understanding that it did not have an exemption to the free movement of workers as laid out in the Treaty of Rome, the basis for the rupture that began in 2004 was established.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Newspapers Consulted:

The Times
The Sunday Times
Financial Times
Guardian
Daily Telegraph
Sunday Telegraph
Daily Mail
Independent
Independent on Sunday

Balch, Alex. "Labour and Epistemic Communities: The Case of 'Managed Migration' in the UK." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 11, no. 4(November 1, 2009): 613—633.

Brzenk, Eleanor. "The Distribution of Polish Immigrants in Great Britain." PhD dissertation, Northwestern University, 1957.

Buettner, Elizabeth. "'This is Staffordshire not Alabama': Racial Geographies of Commonwealth Immigration in Early 1960s Britain." *The Journal of Imperial Commonwealth History* 42, no. 4(October 2014): 710—740.

Burrell, Kathy *Polish Migration to the UK in the 'New' European Union: After 2004*. London: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2009

Dean, Dennis. "The Conservative government and the 1961 Commonwealth Immigration Act: inside the story." *Race and Class* 35, no. 2(October 1993): 57—74.

Dean, D.W. "Conservative Governments and the Restriction of Commonwealth Immigration in the 1950s: The Problems of Constraint." *The Historical Journal* 35, no. 1(March 1992): 171—194.

Dietl, Ralph. "Suez 1956: A European Intervention?" *Journal of Contemporary History* 43, no. 2(2008): 259—278.

Dølvik, Jon E., and Jelle Visser. "Free Movement, Equal Treatment and Workers' Rights: Can the European Union Solve its Trilemma of Fundamental Principles?" *Industrial Relations Journal* 40, no. 6(2009): 491—509.

European Council. *Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union*. Strasbourg, Germany: EU, 2007.

European Council. *The Treaty of Amsterdam*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: EU, 1997.

European Council. *The Treaty on the European Union*. Maastricht, the Netherlands: EU, 1992. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:OJ.C_.1992.191.01.0001.01.ENG

European Council. *The Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union*. Lisbon, Portugal: EU, 2007.

Fitzgerald, Ian and Rafal Smoczynski. "Anti-Polish Migrant Moral Panic in the UK: Rethinking Employment Insecurities and Moral Regulation." *Czech Sociological Review* 51, no. 3 (2015): 339—361.

Frech, Alexandra "'Mass Migration', Crime and 'Decent People': The Portrayal of Polish Migrants in British Newspapers," *Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism* (2008).

Garapich, Michal P. "The Migration Industry and Civil Society: Polish Immigrants in the United Kingdom Before and After EU Enlargement." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34, no. 5(July 2008): 735—752.

Gałka, Jadwiga. "Areas of Concentration and an Analysis of Factors Affecting the Distribution of Polish Immigrants in Great Britain Since Poland's Accession to the European Union." *Prace Geograficzne* no. 130(2012): 29—41.

Gilbert, Mark. "Partners and Rivals: Assessing the American Role." In *European Union History: Themes and Debates*, edited by Wolfram Kaiser and Antonio Varsori, 169—189. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.

Gilroy, Paul. "Blacks and Crime in Postwar Britain." In *Writing Black Britain 1948—1998: an Interdisciplinary Anthology*, edited by James Procter, 71—78. New York: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Girvan, Alyssa. "The History of British Immigration Policy (1905—2016) Timeline Resource, June 2018." Refugee History, an initiative of the University of East Anglia. Last modified June 2018. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5748678dcf80a1ffcaf26975/t/5b27e23d8a922dfca10ddeb1/1529340490557/Immigration+Timeline.pdf.

Hall, Stuart. "Introduction: Who Needs Identity?" In *Questions of Cultural* Identity, edited by Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay, 1—17. London: SAGE Publications, 1996.

Hannan, Guy. "The Social Control of Asylum Seeking." PhD Dissertation, University of Surrey, July 2007.

Harris, Catherine, Dominique Moran, and John R. Bryson. "EU Accession Migration: National Insurance Number Allocations and the Geographies of Polish Labour Immigration to the

UK." *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 103, no. 2(October 21, 2011): 209—221.

Home Office of the United Kingdom. "Historical background information on nationality Version 1.0." July 21, 2017. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/650994/Background-information-on-nationality-v1.0EXT.pdf.

Hoops, Joshua, Ryan J. Thomas, and Jolanta A. Drzewiecka. "Polish 'Pawns' between nationalism and neoliberalism in British newspaper coverage of post-European enlargement polish immigration." *Journalism* 17, no. 6(2015): 727—743.

Huxley, Elspeth. *Back Streets New Worlds: A Look at Immigrants in Britain*. New York: William Morrow and Company, 1965.

James, Robert Rhodes, ed. *Churchill Speaks: Winston S. Churchill in Peace and War. Collected Speeches, 1897—1963*. New York: Atheneum, 1981.

Lee, Trevor R. *Race and Residence: The Concentration and Dispersal of Immigrants in London*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).

Ludlow, N. Piers. *Dealing with Britain: The Six and the First UK Application to the EEC*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Luthra, Mohan. *Britain's Black Population: Social Change, Public Policy, and Agenda*. Brookfield, Vermont: Arena, 1997.

Lynch, Frances M.B. "Restoring France: the Road to Integration." In *The Frontier of National Sovereignty: History and Theory 1945—1992*, by Alan S. Milward, et al., 59—87. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Maier, Charles S., ed. *The Cold War in Europe: Era of a Divided Continent*. 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Markus Weiner Publishers, Inc., 1996.

McGilvray, Evan. "General Stanisław Maczek and Post-war Britain." In *The Poles in Britain 1940—2000: From Betrayal to Assimilation*, edited by Peter D. Stachura, 59—68. New York: Frank Cass Publishers, 2004.

McIntyre, W. David. *British Decolonization, 1946—1997: When, Why and How Did the British Empire Fall*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1998.

Milward, Alan S. *The European Rescue of the Nation-State*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Milward, Alan S. *Politics and Economics in the History of the European Union*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Mulvaney, Gareth. “When Policy Creates Politics: the Problematizing of Immigration and the Consequences for Refugee Integration in the UK.” *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23, no. 4(December 2010): 437—462.

National Readership Surveys. "Average issue readership of The Financial Times in the United Kingdom (UK) from 2006 to 2013 (in 1,000s)." Chart. January 31, 2014. Statista. Accessed December 18, 2018. https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288105/readership-trend-of-the-financial-times-newspaper-uk/

National Readership Surveys. "Average issue readership of The Guardian in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in million readers)." Chart. February 27, 2017. Statista. Accessed December 18, 2018. https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288110/readership-trend-of-the-guardian-newspaper-uk/

National Readership Surveys. "Average issue readership of The Independent in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2015 (in 1,000 readers)." Chart. February 27, 2016. Statista. Accessed December 18, 2018. https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288114/readership-trend-of-the-independent-newspaper-uk/

National Readership Surveys. "Average issue readership of The Independent on Sunday in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2015 (in 1,000 readers)." Chart. February 27, 2016. Statista. Accessed December 18, 2018. https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288137/readership-trend-of-the-independent-on-sunday-newspaper-uk/

National Readership Surveys. "Average issue readership of The Sunday Times in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in million readers)." Chart. February 27, 2017. Statista. Accessed December 18, 2018. https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288202/readership-trend-of-the-sunday-times-newspaper-uk/

National Readership Surveys. "Circulation of The Daily Mail in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in 1,000 copies)." Chart. February 27, 2017. Statista. Accessed December 18, 2018. https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288261/circulation-trend-of-the-daily-mail-newspaper-uk/

National Readership Surveys. "Circulation of the Sunday Telegraph in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in 1,000 copies)." Chart. February 27, 2017. Statista. Accessed December 18, 2018. https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288304/circulation-trend-of-the-sunday-telegraph-newspaper-united-kingdom-uk/

National Readership Surveys. "Circulation of The Times in the United Kingdom (UK) from 1st half 2003 to 2nd half 2016 (in 1,000 copies)." Chart. February 27, 2017. Statista. Accessed December 18, 2018. https://www-statista-com.ezproxy.bgsu.edu/statistics/288283/circulation-trend-of-the-times-newspaper-uk/

Panayi, Panikos. *An Immigration History of Britain: Multicultural Racism since 1800*. Harlow, Great Britain: Pearson Longman, 2010.

Paul, Kathleen. *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Philo, Greg, Emma Briant, and Pauline Donald. *Bad News for Refugees*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Reekes, Andrew. "The West Midland and Powell's Birmingham Speech." *The Political Quarterly* 89, no. 3(July—September 2018): 400—408.

Robbins, Keith. *Great Britain: Identities, Institutions and the Idea of Britishness*. London: Longman Pearson, 1998.

Schmitt, Helmut. "We Need the British." In *The Pro-European Reader* edited by Dick Leonard and Mark Leonard, 67—70. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Searle, Kevin. "'Mixing of the unmixbles': the 1949 Causeway Green 'riots' in Birmingham." *Race and Class* 54, no. 3 (2013): 44—64.

Spigelman, Ariel. "The Depiction of Polish Migrants in the United Kingdom by the British Press After Poland's Accession to the European Union." *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* 33 (2013): 98—113.

Sword, Keith. *Identity in Flux: The Polish Community in Britain*. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies University of London, 1996.

Sword, Keith. *The Formation of the Polish Community in Great Britain 1939—1950*. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies University of London, 1989.

Webster, Wendy. *Englishness and Empire 1939—1960*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

White, Anne. *Polish Families and Migration Since EU Accession*. Portland, OR: The Policy Press, 2011.

Wring, Dominic, and David Deacon. "Patterns of press partisanship in the 2010 General Election." *British Politics* 5, no. 4 (December 2010): 436—454.

Young, Hugo. *This Blessed Plot: Britain and Europe from Churchill to Blair*. London: Papermac, 1999.

Young, John W. *Britain and European Unity 1945—1999*. 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Zubrzycki, Jerzy. *Polish Immigrants in Britain: A Study of Adjustment*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956.

Zubrzycki, Jerzy. *Soldiers and Peasants: the Sociology of Polish Migration, a Lecture*. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies University of London, 1988.