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‘What do they know of England who only England know’: a case for an alternative narrative of the ordinary in 21st century Britain.¹

Abstract
In 2017 it was 20 years since the publication of Assimilating Identities. Racism and Education in Post 1945 Britain (London: Lawrence and Wishart). In this study a narrative was constructed which documented the experiences of Afro-Caribbean and Asian children and families within the English education system. It was a narrative which drew largely on the education archives of the local state. Some use was made of documentary evidence generated within the black community, including oral testimony. In the intervening years there has been a shift in history practice, including history of education, towards a broadening of the source material used in the construction of narratives, most notably the use of visual sources. These years have also seen a growing interest amongst historians of education in looking beyond schooling and investigating the educational experiences associated with other sites of learning: congresses, museums, heritage sites, libraries, community centres etc. This paper aims to bring these two developments – research engagement with the visual and non school sites of learning – into dialogue by revisiting the research agenda which shaped Assimilating Identities and addressing the question twenty years on: ‘What do they know of England who only England know?’

Prologue: July 2016-February 2017

On the 1st July 2016 the Institute of Race Relations [IRR] posted the following comment on its website:

After years and years of struggle against racial hostility to new migrant communities, we are back there again – albeit post Brexit, which, seemingly, has taken the shame out of racism. And now, just like in the 1970s, communities up and down the country are experiencing an upsurge in racist and fascist violence.

It then reported that while Police data suggested that there was an immediate 57% increase in reported incidents of violence against migrants and Black and Asian Britons in the four days after the result of the referendum was announced their own first review of the national picture suggested this figure was a substantial under-estimate. Social media was full of descriptions of hostility and racist abuse across the country with perpetrators taunting ‘passers-by on buses, on the streets, in workplaces, or from the safety of their vehicles, with comments like “get packing”, “white power”, “time for you to leave” or “get out, we voted Leave.”’ The IRR also noted the number of incidents reported to have taken place in schools, where children had been taunted and ridiculed by classmates and of physical assaults and attacks on black and minority ethnic run businesses and cultural centres.² The IRR has since maintained its national monitoring of racist incidents and hate crimes and for first two weeks in February 2017 it reported the following incidents:

---

¹ The author would like to thank the History of Education Society UK and the Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society (AZHES) for the invitation to speak at their joint conference Sight, Sound and Text in the History of Education in 2016 and the anonymous reviewers who provided helpful critical comments on the original paper.

9 February: Police seek information on a racist attack on a 16-year-old boy and girl by a woman who racially abused the pair before punching one of the teenagers ‘a number of times’ on Oxford High Street. (Oxfordshire Guardian, 9 February 2017)

10 February: Police release an appeal for information after a 35-year-old man has his jaw broken in an unprovoked racially aggravated attack by three men in Street, Somerset. (Somerset Live, 10 February 2017)

10 February: John Nimmo is jailed for 27 months at Newcastle crown court after pleading guilty to nine charges involving online racist and antisemitic abuse, to numerous people including Luciana Berger, MP. (Guardian, 10 February 2017)

11 February: Bristol UKIP councillor Philip Winter is condemned for tweeting about ‘darkies’. (The Canary, 13 February 2017)

11 February: New research by HOPE not Hate finds that right-wing bloggers and social media activists in the UK have helped the alt-right movement spread fake news. Download a short version of the report by Joe Mulhall: Going Mainstream: The mainstreaming of anti-Muslim prejudice in Europe and North America here (pdf file, 760kb). (Guardian, 11 February 2017)

12 February: Ukip’s immigration spokesperson, John Bickley, apologises for tweeting a cartoon which suggested that voting for Labour would lead to ‘a jihadi for a neighbour,’ echoing a racist slogan used in Smethwick in the 1964 general election. (Huffington Post, 13 February 2017)

15 February: New figures reveal that hate crimes recorded by regional police forces increased by up to 100 per cent in the months following Brexit. (Independent, 15 February 2017)

15 February: A Dunfermline sheriff’s court orders a 44-year-old man to carry out 200 hours of unpaid work and imposes a six-month restriction of liberty order after he admits glassing a Portuguese tourist in a bar last February. (Dunfermline Press, 15 February 2017).

These are just a handful of the incidents reported, but they give an indication of the continuing nature of the hostility towards migrants and black and Asian Britons. Some political commentators linked this hostility to the various ways that the UK has gone down the road of co-opting its citizens into immigration policing, others blamed it directly on the toxic nature of the referendum debate with its inflammatory rhetoric and the shameless xenophobia of the Leave campaign, a conclusion supported by a United Nations committee. Given

5 See, David Olusoga, ‘It was supposed to be a dialogue about free trade. It morphed into a national feud over immigration,’ The Observer, 26th June, 2016; Gary Younge, ‘How did we end up here,’ The Guardian, 30th June, 2016; ‘Brexit will increase intolerance outside our football grounds, says Kick it Out,’ The Guardian, 9th August, 2016


politicians’ rhetoric there is a new permission to hate immigrants⁷ accompanied by a resurgence of ‘ignorant-and-proud-of-it nationalism’,⁸ and a leaching from the public sphere of ‘compassion.’⁹ There is, as another commentator concluded, ‘a real darkness in this country, a xenophobic, racist sickness of heart that is closer to the surface today than it has been for decades.’¹⁰ There is anger and not argument.¹¹ Closed borders and closed minds as ‘racists have been energised by the victory of racists.’¹²

The referendum undoubtedly spurred an upsurge in popular racism, but it should never be forgotten that racism and xenophobia in Britain have a long history and that racist abuse and discriminatory practices have been, and are, a structural feature of daily life. This is readily evidenced in the recent Department for Education (DfE) statistics showing the number of primary school pupils being suspended for racist abuse having increased by in a third in five years¹³, in the Bureau of Investigative Journalism report that nearly one in five people stopped by Immigration Enforcement in Britain’s cities are UK nationals¹⁴, in proposed changes to include questions on school children’s nationalities and countries of birth on the annual school census and the sharing of data between the Department for Education (DfE) and the Home Office which the Director of Liberty characterised as turning the DfE into ‘a border control force’¹⁵ and in the Conservative government’s recent Race Disparity Audit (2017).¹⁶

The rise of traditionalism, xenophobia and popular nationalism in the UK has also been paralleled by sustained assault on the concept of multiculturalism, to the extent that it led one commentator to conclude that it is now ‘widely scorned and trivialized’ and ‘excluded from serious analysis and critical conversation’ and that ‘debate has been succeeded by a much more diffuse consideration of social and cultural diversity.’¹⁷ While in education, as the convenors of one recent conference argued, a ‘colonizing’ model is emerging which seeks ‘to replace “incorrect” or “lesser” knowledge with “correct” or “better knowledge,”’ where ‘difference is seen as

---

⁷ Aditya Chakrabortty, ‘After a campaign scarred by bigotry it is now OK to be racist in Britain,’ The Guardian, 28 June 2016; Owen Jones, ‘Bigots feel they’ve a mandate to hate. We have to speak out,’ The Guardian, 15 September, 2016
⁸ Nick Cohen, ‘Theresa May lied and lied again to become PM,’ The Observer, 30th October, 2016.
⁹ Chibundu Onuzo, ‘When is a refugee too old for kindness?’, The Guardian, 22nd October, 2016
¹³ Frances Perraudin, ‘Number of primary pupils suspended for racist abuse has risen by a third in five years,’ The Guardian, 27th December 2016
something to be removed’ and ‘the subaltern (perceived incorrect/lesser) position is replaced with the dominant (perceived correct/better) position.’

Revisiting the Past and Looking to the Present

It is not unusual for practitioners of disciplines to on occasion reflect on the state of their field, charting achievements and assessing prospects for the future, and history of education is no exception. For this author, 2017 marked 20 years since the publication of Assimilating Identities. Racism and Educational Policy in Post 1945 Britain and this anniversary offered a personal departure point for reflecting on the origins of the political and social turbulence associated with ‘Brexit’ Britain and the increased incidence of hostility towards migrants and black and Asian Britons as documented above. Drawing on arguments and analyses about popular and state racism and emergent multiculturalism developed by Sivanandan, Hiro, Hall, Miles, and Gilroy, and education focused work by Carby, Mullard, Dhondy, Troyna and Williams, through its focus on national and local education policy making, attempted to offer a historical and political analysis of how racialised identities had been imagined, constructed, re-worked and developed in post war Britain to the extent that they became a constitutive part of an exclusionary ideology. This ideology, which underpinned the idea of a ‘British way of life’, distinguished between those who were ‘of’ the nation, and those who were, and always would be, ‘outside’ the nation. It embodied a definition of belonging which was articulated by Margaret Thatcher and other Conservatives during the Falklands war: ‘The people of the Falkland Islands, like the people of the United Kingdom, are an island race. Their way of life is British; their allegiance is to the Crown’ and ‘the Falkland Islands are British, the Falkland Islanders are British. They are our own people. With the Falkland Islanders it is family.’ It was a definition of belonging where to be non-white and to be British were mutually exclusive, ‘the Falklanders were British … by language, customs, race … more British indeed than so-called “Black Englishmen” living on British soil.’

18 Decolonizing Teacher Education, University of Exeter, March 10-11, 2017
19 See, for example, Jeroen H. Dekker and Frank Simon (eds.) ‘Shaping the History of Education? The First 50 Years,’ Paedagogica Historica, 50, 6, (2014).
Enoch Powell in the 1960s. *Assimilating Identities* concluded with a reflection on the possibilities of producing a transformative historical narrative of the nation, which would recognise the historical experiences of Britain’s black population, and thus help to bring to an end the enduring post war practices of exclusion and subordination. *Assimilating Identities* drew heavily on parliamentary and local government debates, education reports and files.

In the last twenty years research into the educational histories of immigrant and minority communities has generally remained a minority interest in history of education, a situation which a recent review of the literature described as both ‘peculiar’ and ‘negligent’. These same years have also seen a disciplinary shift towards greater use of visual source material in history of education, a growing interest in the sensory, the material and spatial dimensions of education, and broadening of the focus beyond schooling to include other informal sites of learning. A shift that is captured in both the historiography of history of education in general and in the title of the 2016 History of Education conference: *Sight, Sound and Text in the History of Education*.

In a society where the residues of empire, the experience of decolonisation, immigration, and post-colonial settlement continue to exert an influence and issues around nationality, identity, belonging, plurality, heritage, memory and what it is to be English are vexed questions the present essay aims to address the question posed in its title *What do they know of England who only England know?* The phrase is taken from the first verse of Rudyard Kipling’s 1891 patriotic poem ‘The English Flag.’ It is a phase whose meaning was explored by Powell in the 1960s and was again in use in the immediate aftermath of the vote for Brexit. Here, it will be explored not by interrogating the archives of the national and local state, but instead by focusing on three visual representations of the black experience in late 20th and early 21st century Britain: the television series *Empire Road* (1978–79) and two exhibitions – the *West Indian Front Room* (2005–06) and *By the Rivers of Birminam* (2012). The focus will be on the evidential content and value of these representations and not the aesthetics of dramatisation, museum display or photographic practice and how they relate to a society. The choice of these cultural interventions not only reflect a shift in disciplinary focus, but each in their own way also present

---

23 The term ‘black’ is used inclusively to refer to people of South Asian, African and Caribbean origin. This usage in no way assumes that there is any uniformity between any people so described, except in the sense of reflecting a common experience of racism and discrimination on the basis of their ‘non-white’ colour.


26 See below.
the unmediated ‘voice’ of black and Asian Britons, are indicative of the importance of agency in cultural production, and evidence and project the natural evolving possibilities associated with Britain being ‘a truly multicultural society, the foremost in Europe, and its exemplar ‘in the face of the continued ‘logics of racial thought.’ 27

Empire Road, BBC Television 1978-79

The representation of Briton’s black and Asian communities on popular television in the 1960s and 1970s was determined by white programme-makers. Popular sitcoms featuring black and Asian characters such as Love Thy Neighbour (ITV 1972-76), Mind Your Language (ITV 1977-79) and Mixed Blessings (LWT 1978-80) were generally played for laughs. The first serious attempt on television to go beyond the ‘humour’ inherent in prejudice was The Fosters (ITV, 1976-77)28. It focused on a black British family in South London and the storylines featured everyday family issues such as inter-generational conflict, health and employment. The scripts were based on the popular US series Good Times, but the series achieved limited success and ‘was criticised for failing to capture authentically black British lives.’29 It was followed in 1978 by Empire Road which was written by the British Guyanese Michael Abbensetts and drew on his knowledge of Birmingham for both dramatic situations and characters. Set in the fictional inner city area of Thornley, but visually recognisable as part of Birmingham, the drama was structured around the Bennett family, who lived in the symbolically named ‘Empire Road’, and the activities of Everton Bennett, a successful shopkeeper, landlord, and local ‘Godfader’ to his neighbourhood community30. The characters in Empire Road were, as Paul Long writes,

... variously ‘villainous, virtuous, likeable, clever, witty, stupid, exploited, vain, strong, weak and sinful. They were individuals who struggled with work, with school and with life in general as well as enjoying its rewards, expressing their hopes and desires. 31

Norman Beaton, who played Everton Bennett, reflecting back on the programme nearly a decade later commented:

It would be dangerous to espouse the view that the only interesting black people inhabit the ghetto ... black people come from every stratum of society ... In an article by Rosalind Carne in the Guardian in 1982, Michael Abbensetts admitted that his ‘life does not revolve around white hostility and confrontations with the police.’ When Abbensetts ... creates a character like Everton Bennett in Empire Road ... he is saying that the middle-class, well heeled people in my play are people I know

---

30 Some of the episodes can be found at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9QZUVVvPgU as can The Fosters https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mhhy_Htg4sO and Love Thy Neighbour https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B1dakp4FT0w
about. Their lives are full of conflict. It is not however the ghetto of bricks and stones and petrol bombs. It is an essentially middle-class conflict of thwarted ambition, or the search for truth, identity or reality. This is no less valid an area of conflict than the young West Indian or British black trying to deal with his own crisis in the battle-scarred ghetto. It is ... the other side of the coin.

*Empire Road* was variously described in the press at the time as ‘the Black *Coronation Street*’ ([Daily Mail](#)), as ‘the first drama series that black people can watch on television without feeling embarrassed or angry’ ([Time Out](#)) and involving ‘a whole range of material nothing to do with blacks or whites, just about people’ ([The Guardian](#)). Despite these positive comments *Empire Road* ran for just two seasons, a victim of internal BBC politics, lack of promotion, and poor viewing figures. Beaton, described the second series, which included episodes directed by the Trinidadian Horace Ové, as a ‘black soap written by a black man, directed by a black man, with a black cast. It was wonderful,’ and was devastated when it was cancelled. Schaffer, rightly concludes, that in *Empire Road* black Britons ‘were no longer extraordinary strangers but core parts of British communities.’ The combination of drama, comedy and tragedy and its urban location gave *Empire Road* both an air of realism and contemporary resonance in its representation of black urban lives. That said, for the black actors in *Empire Road* involvement was both a challenge and a burden, a challenge in terms of responsibility to accurately represent black Britain to the majority white audience, and the burden of always being seen as ‘black’ before they were seen as actors, a situation which in the decade that followed also increasingly affected black visual artists working in the fields of painting, photography and film.


The exhibition *The West Indian Front Room* explored the ‘essence of homes’ created by post war immigrants from the Caribbean and at the centre was an installation by the writer and curator Michael McMillan which presented his vision of a typical West Indian front room drawn from memories of his parents’ home in East London and those of his relatives in the 1960s and 1970s. The front room was a place in which the family’s

33 Quoted in Long, ‘Representing Race and Place,’276; Schaffer, *The Vision of a Nation*, 256-257.
34 Long, ‘Representing Race and Place,’276
35 Schaffer, *The Vision of a Nation*, 261
36 Ian Grosvenor and Kevin Myers, ‘Questioning difference: bodies, (re-)presentation and the development of ‘multicultural Britain,’ *Paedagogica Historica* 53, 6 (2017)
37 See Michael McMillan, *The Front Room. Migrant Aesthetics* (Black Dog Publishing, 2009) which includes images, interviews and essays relating to the exhibition. McMillan’s previous projects included *The Black Chair: an installation and exhibition rediscovering the West Indian Front Room*, shown at High Wycombe Museum
most treasured possessions were kept and the exhibition explored the symbolism of particular objects and the relationship between objects and identity. As McMillan remembered:

You weren’t allowed in this room unless there were guests, but its Sunday, Jim Reeves’s ‘The Distant Drums’ is blaring out of the ‘Bluespot’ radiogram and big people are chatting news from back home. Mum is drinking Babycham. I pass her the plastic pineapple ice bucket and listen quiet as a lamb, my skin sticking to the plastic covering on the PVC imitation leather settee. I smell of rice and peas and the paraffin heater competing with the air freshener and polish from the drinks cabinet filled with glasses that are never used. I touch the painted glass fish and plastic flowers on fanciful sugar-starched crochet on a gold-rimmed fake marble coffee table. A blue-eyed Jesus looks down at me from The Last Supper on floral wallpaper saying ‘cleanliness is next to godliness’. Sunshine beams through pressed lace curtains onto the colourful patterned carpet. The front room looked so good, that it didn’t matter how poor we were, we were decent people ... I know now that it is part of who I am and unconsciously I recreate a similar shrine in my own home today.

Visitors were encouraged to linger ‘in the room’, listen to interviews with first and second generation black Britons of Afro-Caribbean descent and look at displays of photographs from different domestic interiors (SEE Figs 1-2). The exhibition encouraged audiences to engage with the layers of meanings to be found in these domestic interiors and the ways in which they reflected ‘personal, social, cultural and historical dynamics in everyday practices’ 38 Although the front rooms generally displayed the same materiality being furnished with the same pieces of furniture - the paraffin heater, the radiogram, glass cabinet, drinks trolley, artificial flowers, floral wallpaper and carpets, crocheted doilies and elaborate lace net curtains 39 - it was also a private space of cultural creativity. Individual families expressed their aesthetic sensibility in their arrangement of their personal possessions, which signified as Stuart Hall writes, ‘something special and different because they are individual to this family and grounded in history and memory which the objects somehow preserve and translate to another life.’ 40 It was also a room, as McMillan remembered, into which you were invited, a room where there was a code of behaviour. This code had to be respected and respectability came from ‘being validated by the outside world.’ 41 In just over three months the exhibition attracted 35,000 visitors.

‘By the Rivers of Birminam’, 2012

Insert Fig 3 ‘Children in Charleville Road, Handsworth, 1991,’ Birmingham City Archives, copyright Vanley Burke

In 2012 the Midland Arts Centre in Birmingham brought together 100 photographs taken by Vanley Burke between 1968 and 2011 to present a visual history of five decades of black people’s lives as they struggled to
establish themselves in the local inner city area of Handsworth and other area nearby. As with all photographs his work freezes individual moments, but they remain accessible to memory. There are moments that are personal, familial, domestic and public. Images in the exhibition portrayed black subjects at work, in church, on the street and at home, there were images of smiling faces and others showing the grief of loss. There were photographs of young and old, elderly black men playing dominoes in a pub and young men setting up sound systems outdoors and in clubs. Individual portraits were displayed next to crowded Carnival scenes, all black religious congregations next to black youth in a playground (see Fig 3). If a viewer looked closely they could visually piece together a history of black fashion, from the trilby hats of the Windrush generation to the woollen tams of Rastafarians, and from the adoption of ‘Afro-styles’ to ‘rude boy’ styling. Photograph after photograph in the exhibition challenged the negative images of black Britons found in the mainstream media. Commenting on his practice Burke said, ‘I didn’t want to express positivity, just what I saw. I didn’t think in positive-negative when I photographed, I still don’t ... I wanted to document life as it is lived. Document it as I’ve seen.’ For Burke taking photographs was, and remains, about his community and about the ability to:

see something others may be unable to see, in terms of the value. Then show people. They need to see their contribution to this community. I mean, they have been contributing to this thing from the 50s and it’s gone beyond, but there is no reference anywhere. It’s about having themselves reflected, they are so desperate to see themselves. But this will be there, it isn’t going anywhere.

Burke’s photographs bring visibility to the everyday. They locate time and secure ‘dimensions of the black experience that had been previously neglected or sidelined’, dimensions that were in danger of being lost without his lens. They are generous, imbued with compassion and full of respect for his subjects. Each of his photographs invites the viewer to engage in an act of renewal, of ‘seeing’ and connecting with everyday reality. Over the last forty years, since his first exhibition in 1975, his photographs of his community have been displayed in schools, community centres, churches, barber shops and public houses as well as galleries. In 2017, Birmingham Museums Trust purchased 100 hundred photographs by Burke as part of their ‘Collecting Birmingham’ project.

‘What do they know of England who only England know?’

On 23 April 1961 Enoch Powell, MP and Minister of Health, gave a speech on the subject of England to The Royal Society of St George, and began:

There was a saying, not heard today so often as formerly "What do they know of England who only England know?"

It is a saying which dates. It has a period aroma, like Kipling’s "Recessional" or the state rooms at Osborne. That phase is ended, so plainly ended, that even the generation born at its zenith, for whom

43 Pete James, ‘Home from Home: The Vanley Burke Archive’ in At Home with Vanley Burke (Birmingham: Ikon, 2015): 32.
45 See Grosvenor and Kevin Myers, ‘Questioning difference’
the realisation is the hardest, no longer deceive themselves as to the fact. That power and that glory have vanished, as surely, if not as tracelessly, as the imperial fleet from the waters of Spithead.

... So we today, at the heart of a vanished empire, amid the fragments of demolished glory, seem to find, like one of her own oak trees, standing and growing, the sap still rising from her ancient roots to meet the spring, England herself.

Perhaps, after all, we know most of England "who only England know."

It was the task of his generation to return to the past, the past before Empire and identify ‘what it is that binds us together ... the clue that leads through a thousand years ... the secret of this charmed life of England’ and ‘know how to hold it fast.’ Powell continued,

So the continuity of her existence was unbroken when the looser connections which had linked her with distant continents and strange races fell away. Thus our generation is one which comes home again from years of distant wandering. We discover affinities with earlier generations of English who felt no country but this to be their own. We discover affinities with earlier generations of English who felt there was this deep, this providential difference between our empire and those others, that the nationhood of the mother country remained unaltered through it all.

For Powell ‘the deepest instinct of the Englishman ... is for continuity’ and from ‘this continuous life of a united people ... spring, as from the soil of England, all that is peculiar in the gifts and the achievements of the English nation.’

Powell’s speech with it references to an ‘unaltered’ English identity and nation, to landscape and history, and to ‘strange races’ and ‘providential difference’, was given at a time when the Conservative Government was moving to a position ‘that something should be done’ to restrict the entry of Asian and black British subjects and a commitment to introduce statutory controls on Commonwealth immigration was announced the following October. Throughout the remainder of the 1960s Powell continued to address the Island story, but increasingly connected this story with the threat to the English identity and nation posed by Commonwealth immigration and his rhetoric changed as he claimed to be speaking for ‘ordinary, decent, sensible people.’ In a now infamous passage from a speech in 1968, he reported:

A week or two ago I fell into conversation with a constituent, a middle aged, quite ordinary working man employed in one of our nationalised industries. After a sentence or two about the weather, he suddenly said “I if I had the money to go, I wouldn’t stay in this country ... in fifteen or twenty years time the black man will have the whip-hand over the white man.”

Powell continued ‘I simply do not have the right to shrug my shoulders ... What he is saying, thousands and hundreds of thousands are saying and thinking’ who ‘for reasons they could not comprehend ... they found themselves made strangers in their own country,’ a ‘transformation to which there is no parallel in a thousand years of English history.’ In a rhetorical flourish he concluded, ‘We must be mad, literally made, as a nation to

47 Shamit Saggar, Race and British Politics (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf 1992), 73.
be permitting ... the future growth of an immigrant-descended population. It is like watching a nation busily engaged in heaping up its own funeral pyre. ’ Powell then turned his attention to the ‘dangerous delusion’ of integration, because immigrants ‘never conceived or intended such a thing, they had ‘vested interests in the preservation and sharpening of racial and religious differences, with a view to the exercise of actual domination, first over fellow-immigrants and then over the rest of the population.’ ‘Communalism,’ quoting a Minster in the then Labour Government, ‘is a canker ... to be strongly condemned.’ The ‘immigrant communities’ were organising, agitating and campaigning ‘against their fellow-citizens ... to overawe and dominate the rest.’ In a final rhetorical flourish he concluded that the state was ‘blind to realities’, that ‘not to speak, would be the great betrayal, for as he look ahead, he was ‘filled with foreboding. Like the Roman, I seem to see “the River Tiber foaming with much blood.”’ 49

Powell’s public statements on immigration made headline news, generated vociferous letters of support, and led to token strikes and demonstrations of support with workers reported in the national press, declaring ‘Mr Powell spoke his mid. He spoke for us all. He made me feel proud to be British,’ and:

At last the Englishman has had some guts. This is as important as Dunkirk. We are becoming second-class citizens in our own country. Immigrants have been brought here to undercut our wages in times of crisis. When there is vast unemployment in this country, immigrants will compete with you for your jobs. 50

Powell himself was castigated in Parliament and ostracised by his party. Finally, in early 1969 Powell was questioned in depth in an extended television interview on the popular current affairs programme Frost on Friday about his immigration speeches and their impact. In one exchange David Frost asked Powell about the ‘incendiary atmosphere’ resulting from his speeches and Powell replied:

You accuse me of throwing the match on to the heap. Now the heap of gunpowder in this case is the pent up fear and anxiety for the future of the native population, which sees ... the extending of the numbers and area of immigrants. Now I want to ask you; what is the match ...? Not a politician who forces the whole of the country to see what is happening, who speaks what thousands of people in these areas concerned are saying to themselves, who answers their question: why does nobody speak to us? Are we alone? Are we trapped?

Pushed by Frost to condemn racist incidents following his speeches and particularly one where ‘... thugs were shouting: “Coloured people want burning. They’re taking over. Enoch was right,“ Powell replied ‘I am not going to start condemning the behaviour of people who are condemned by their behaviour ...’ and continued in this vein for several exchanges with until pushed again about angry demonstrations in support of his statements, Powell replied:

50 Ibid., 12, 13
I’ll just put one point to you, to remind you, and that is of the Notting Hill riots, and of the Dudley riots, which occurred years before my name was ever heard of in this connection. I think we ought to bear that in mind as a matter of proportion. 

Powell’s Island story was one of continuity and homogeneity, of soil and blood; the same ideas and language which circulated as part of his political legacy in the 1980s. His vision of the nation rejected multiculturalism. Immigrants with their distinctive customs and beliefs were inassimilable. For Powell, England and Britain were interchangeable categories and he spoke for all those who were driven to despair, those whose voices were not heard by Government. In short, he spoke for the ordinary, the decent and the working white population.

**Disrupting the Island story**

The ‘racial antipathies’ unleashed by Powell’s intervention into debates in the 1960s about Britain’s past, present and future positioned Powell as ‘touchstone for speaking about race and nation,’ but the purity of Powell’s England and its ‘unaltered’ identity so central to his Island story does not accord with history. In recent year’s research into the history of the black and Asian presence in Britain and the impact of Britain’s imperial and Empire histories have questioned the dominant, unified, homogenised and linear narrative of Britain’s island story and its unaltered identity. Much of this work has been driven by local activism where research has been going on in local community centres, adult education classrooms, and libraries and has been circulating through temporary exhibitions, small publishing enterprises and word of mouth. It is work which captures the local experiences of migration and settlement, it is the work ‘of politicised groups striving to understand their own histories through their own research and interpretation’ and it involved a process, as Stuart Hall wrote some 20 years ago, which ‘transformed’ lives:

The subjects of the local, of the margin, can only come into representation by ... recovering their own hidden histories. They have to ... retell the story from the bottom up ... These are the hidden histories

---

51 Ibid., 111,118
53 Similar sentiments were expressed by John Major during the early 1990s when he reassured the Conservative party in the face of growing Euro-scepticism that Britain would always remain Britain as the party was firmly connected with Britain’s past and ‘a continuous thread’ of traditions, values and beliefs: see Grosvenor, *Assimilating Identities*, 192-94. Powell was aware that his version of Britain’s island story was based on myth as he stated in a later speech: ‘All history is myth. It is a pattern which men weave out of the materials of the past ...what I am saying is that a nation lives by its myths ... the greatest task of the statement therefore it to offer his people good myths and save them from harmful myths’ quoted in Jonathan Rutherford, *Forever England. Reflections on Masculinity and Empire* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1997) 125.
of the majority, which had never been told ... the speaking of a past that previously had no language.

Representation is not simply a manifestation of power, but ‘an integral part of social processes of differentiation, exclusion, incorporation, and rule’ and once recognised history can be reframed, re-imagined and redefined by the struggle of the margins to come into representation. It is work which while documenting black political agency and mobilisation around inequalities and discrimination has also recorded the ‘ordinary,’ the matter-of-fact and the humdrum elements in people’s lives being lived. An ordinariness captured in sight and sound. Empire Road shared experiences of place and habit and the characters interacted ‘much more like the real-life Empire Roads all over Britain where blacks and whites live side by side without the kind of fuss so often highlighted by TV.’ It presented, to borrow Schaffer’s phrase, the ‘struggle for the Ordinary,’ through storylines which involved ‘the natural treatment of black people, and their natural involvement, in natural situations.’ The programme brought out the interiority and integrity of the characters portrayed. The objects in the West Indian Front Room presented the sensory fullness of the domestic interior creatively furnished by the Windrush generation. Burke’s photographs in By the Rivers of Bburninam intimately document the everyday and his subjects were, as Hall perfectly observed, ‘absorbed in their lives, their activities, their troubles, sorrows, joys, celebrations, griefs, struggles and resistances.’ Collectively, looked at from the vantage point of the now they each in their own way function as a window onto lives past, and they bear witness to the habits, practices and occasions which in their ordinariness bound people together. It is an ordinariness which acts as a challenge to all those soothsayers who predicted that the black and Asian presence in Britain would result in ‘anomie, alienation, delinquency and worse.’ It is an ordinariness which acts as a counterweight to the idea ‘that black lives are only significant when they are the object of, or battling against racism.’ It is an ordinariness which audiences in their homes, in galleries, online and in print could see, reflect upon and remember. Of course it is also an ‘ordinariness’ that Powell did not recognise in his particular vision of England and his mythic Island story.

56 Stuart Hall, ‘The Local and the Global: Globalisation and Ethnicity’ in A. McCintock, A. Mufti and E. Shobar, (eds.) Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, National and Postcolonial Perspectives (Minneapolis, 1997) 183-84.
58 In more recent years much of this work has been supported by the Heritage Lottery Fund.
60 Mike Phillips, Daily Mail, October 28th 1978 quoted in Schaffer, Vision of the Nation, 258
61 The words are those of the dramatist Ted Willis spoken in 1971 when he described the representation of black and Asian communities on television as ‘profoundly complacent, smug and even offensive,’ quoted in Schaffer, Vision of the Nation, 235
65 See, McMillan, The Front Room. Migrant Aesthetics; Lynda Morris, Vanley Burke By the Rivers of Birminam (Birmingham: Midland Arts Centre, 2012); and Michael Abbensetts, Empire Road (St Albans: Granada Publishing 1979)
Emily Jacir and Susan Buck-Morss have written of the practice ‘of preserving only “our” past that provides a continuous, linear trajectory for imagining “our” future’ and certainly such re-imagining as described above when presented has received a hostile reception from English policymakers and the press. Four examples exemplify this: two from Birmingham in 1972 and two from the recent present. In 1972 concerns were raised by members of Birmingham Education Committee and local head teachers about the teaching of ‘culturally relevant’ history at a Saturday school run by the Afro-Caribbean Self Help Organisation, with one Councillor declaring ‘I’ve interviewed these people ... [and] it came out loud and clear that their intention was to teach the supremacy of the black.’ The question of teaching a ‘culturally relevant’ history also surfaced in the mainstream when a Black Studies course which emphasised African history and black identity was taught at the William Murdoch School in Handsworth. Complaints were made about the course’s content and impact on pupils and the Chief Education Officer intervened to close the course. Forty years later The Mail on Sunday under the editorial by-line ‘Education? No, ludicrous propaganda’ roundly condemned a new GCSE History syllabus as ‘designed to foster an ultra-Leftist view of immigration.’ Developed by the Black and Asian Studies Association it reported that the course was explicitly designed to banish a supposed ‘white, male dominated view of history,’ that students were to be taught that ‘some of our nation’s earliest inhabitants were Africans who arrived here long before the English,’ and that ‘some of Britain’s most eminent thinkers’ were ‘outraged’ that ‘once again political correctness’ was ‘distorting our history and the education of our children.’ One eminent thinker commented: ‘This seems to be aimed more at indoctrination than education. It is dangerous because a cohesive society depends on an authentic shared view of history.’ In 2017 the Cambridge classics professor, Mary Beard was vilified and abused online when she endorsed the accuracy of a BBC cartoon which presented a father in Roman Britain ‘as dark skinned.’ The response to her intervention led the historian David Olusaga to write: ‘It has been ugly. Two weeks of full on, culture wars inspired, anti-intellectualism, a fortnight of alternative facts-facts, dog-white racism and shameless misogyny.’ What, indeed, do they know of England who only England know?

---
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69 ‘Education? No, Ludicrous Propaganda,’ The Mail on Sunday, January 10th 2016. For more detail see ‘GSCE pupils to be taught that the nations earliest inhabitants were Africans,’ http://www.dailymail.co.uk/home/index.html 9th January, 2016. The ‘outraged’ eminent thinkers were V. S. Naipaul, Sir Roy Strong, Anthony Beevor, Alan Smithers, and Chris McGovern.
70 David Olusoga, ‘Black people have had a presence in our history for centuries. Get over it,’ The Observer 13th August, 2017.
71 At the time of writing Lola Olufemi has been the target of racist and sexist abuse following a report in the Daily Telegraph in which she was named and pictured as being one of the authors of an open letter criticising the lack of black and and minority ethnic authors on the University of Cambridge’s English course, see Nadia Khomami and Holly Watt, ‘Coverage of call to decolonise English course made student “target” for abuse,’ The Guardian, 27 October 2017, 9.
John Berger wrote in *Ways of Seeing*, ‘The way we see things is affected by what we know and what we believe. The relation between what we see and what we know is never settled.’ Part of this reluctance to accept alternative narratives maybe a by-product of disciplinary practice. Within the discipline of History ‘surprisingly little has been written’ about migration and settlement and it remains only ‘a peripheral area of academic concern.’

Further, Marc Depaepe has referred to the formal and informal rules, values and norms of history writing; rules, values and norms which in reality operate to privilege particular narratives of national pasts, and marginalize or neglect other possible narratives. In Sociology the dominant focus has been on documenting, analysing and reporting the nature and workings of racism and xenophobia in society. ‘Race concepts, ideas and propositions’ have become so widespread and so powerful in Britain that, as Myers tellingly writes, it has ‘proved difficult for historians and sociologists to resist the temptation to deploy them entirely descriptively’ and in doing so ‘they have contributed to a commonsense understanding that races, and relations between them, exist as independent and objective realities.’ Further, words such as identity, culture and community litter social science texts, but these words are not without their problems when used. ‘Community’, for example, is problematic as a term of analysis because it has through use become reified; dividing society into ‘seemingly homogenous collectives defined by ethnicity, class, education or religion and so forth’ and this artificial idea of community reinforces presumed differences between ‘us’, the white middle class, and the ‘rest’. The issue of language can be pushed further. In 2000 a European Union funded project *Migration, Work and Identity* brought together seven museums of labour history to present ‘a history of people in Europe told in museums’. The drive behind this initiative was captured in a speech by Rainer Ohliger:

---


The image of Europe’s Self is, despite historically different experiences, still determined by national paradigms and modes of interpretation. This leaves little room for the representation of border-transcending phenomena such as migration or processes resulting from migration. Migrants are written into [the] national memories … of European nations as Others … They are seldom portrayed as part of the Self.  

While the concept of the ‘Other’ is inextricably linked to the idea of the ‘Self’ when applied to social groups it becomes as equally problematic as a term of analysis as ‘community’. The ‘Other’ in this context is constructed as an opposite and the act of ‘Othering’, the delineation of commonalities and differences between self and others, the bringing into being of individual and collective identities, always functions as a manifestation of power relations. ‘Othering’ is sedimented in racialising codes of representation, produces knowledge that shapes perceptions and practices and has consequences for those so named, so imagined. In other words, when we seek to explain the past or the present through the use of such language, the mere fact of telling ‘can function as a way of pointing the finger’ and reinforcing boundaries of difference. Such boundaries are also emphasised when we speak of ‘diversity’, as again to have meaning it is dependent on the process of ‘Othering,’ the identification of a normative or neutral point from which ‘Others’ can be so identified, named and assigned as ‘diverse.’ Repetition helps to authenticate and legitimise ideas. As part of our practice as historians we need to be conscious about the fixity of the descriptors we use; and we need to interrogate the changing meanings attached to the given lexicon of analysis and comment. ‘You cannot’, as Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah write, ‘liberate people unless you liberate the language in which you talk about them.’ In other words through our practice we reinforce the notion of difference, which in turn helps to sustain an exclusive narrative of belonging and ‘the resulting condition of “historylessness” to quote Paul Gilroy, ‘has been a measure of black marginality.’ Of course, this is not to argue for less research on racism and xenophobia, far from it, but rather to not lose sight of the ‘ordinary’. Neither Empire Road nor By the Rivers of Burnnam (see Fig. 4) ignored the ever present impact of racism on daily life; indeed, when the ‘ordinary’ is placed alongside the former the very fact of its attainment becomes ‘extraordinary.’

Insert Fig 4 ‘Africa Liberation Day, Handsworth, 1977, ‘Birmingham City Archives, copyright Vanley Burke

Looking back from the present

Kipling’s ‘What do they know of England who only England Know?’ was employed in John Lanchester’s article ‘Brexit Blues,’ but reformulated as ‘What do they know of the UK who only London know? as he tried to explain the outcome of the EU referendum. For Lanchester the Britain that went to the ballot box was both a

80 Rainer Ohliger, ‘Towards a European Migration Museum.’ Unpublished paper given at the Conference on Migration, Work and Identity, 22-23 November 2001. The museums were in Austria, Denmark, Germany, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom
country with an internationalised economy, with high skill levels located in particular areas of the UK and where EU immigrants were net contributors to the UK’s finances, but at the same time was a also country ‘where to be born in many places ... [was] to suffer an irreversible lifelong defeat – a truncation of opportunity, of education, of access to power, of life expectancy,’ where work was ‘unsatisfying, insecure and low-paid’, and cumulatively failed to ‘offer a sense of identity or community or self-worth,’ and instead generated a sense of loss, of not being heard, of not understanding either how the world worked or one’s place in it.’ The primary reality of Britain, he concluded was ‘not so much class as geography. Geography is destiny. And for much of the country, not a happy destiny.’  

Birmingham as a city voted by a small margin to leave the EU, but all of the inner wards, the wards generally associated with Asian and black British subjects all voted to remain. Is it a coincidence that in the 1980s these were the very wards where Birmingham’s Multicultural Education Service was most active in terms of curriculum intervention and is it further evidence regarding Lanchester’s argument about the significance of place. The Multicultural Education Service has long since disappeared as a consequence of changing education policies and funding at both national and local levels, but these wards remain centres of local activism in seeking out hidden histories of migration and settlement. As the historical geographer Doreen Massey observed, ‘The identity of places is very much bound up with the histories which are told of them, how these histories are told, and which memory turns out to be dominant.’

One of the authors of the 1972 account of the difficulties faced by the Afro-Caribbean Self Help Organisation was the black activist Bernard Coard. Published in the journal *Race Today*, it included another local story that mirrored that of ASHO, the difficulties faced in the 1950s by the Birmingham Polish Supplementary School in the face of local authority hostility. The article ended with the advice of the school’s headmistress to persist and let time demonstrate what can be achieved. In one of the most important books on education published in the last ten years *Radical Education and the Common School* (2011) Michael Fielding and Peter Moss introduced the idea of ‘critical case studies of possibilities’ and a challenge to engage with the past to progress social alternatives in education. Fielding and Moss were talking of state schooling, but their idea of critical case studies of possibilities is equally relevant here. The story of Birmingham in 1972 suggests the importance of another history, one of ‘common cause’, of solidarity and collective action.

---
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John Berger commented in 2016: ‘What two different people will have in common will always, in all cases, be larger than what differentiates them. And yet for dozens of different reasons circumstances blind people to that.’

At a time of increasing popular nationalism in the UK and reported rapidly growing ethnic separatism in British cities we need to build an alternative narrative of the nation which includes the history of the ‘ordinary’ as argued for here, alongside the history of black political agency in the face of racism, but we also need to seek out the sights, sounds and texts of those other elements in the coalition of voices that have come together in the past to challenge racism and social injustice. We need to uncover the stories of collective action and to excavate alternative cultural memories as an act of resistance ‘across ethnicities, eschewing petty nationalism; and eventually, forging new anti-racist struggles.’ As the black British cultural curator and activist Colin Prescod affirmed in his keynote Archives, race, class and rage at the annual conference of the Archives and Records Association in 2016:

So note, please, that I’ve not been talking about merely being acknowledged in the record(s). the journey that I’ve framed my remarks around continues to be connected with rage against ‘othering’; rage against ‘White-washing the record, rage against systemic, institutionalised denial; rage against continuing, intransient, irritating deliberating, distracting and destructive racism. This is rage about the necessity of transformation, a million miles from mere toleration. This is rage about making the curatorial interventions into curative interventions. Archives have become a site of struggle.

Transformation and the stripping out the discourse of ‘difference’ will not be easy. The idea of a distinctive immutable community rooted in a specific place, unified and held in common across time is not only embedded in Powell’s Island story, Thatcherism and New Right Discourse, but is at the heart of the contemporary defence of neoliberalism and depictions of multiculturalism as anachronistic, outmoded, divisive and a force for fostering white resentment.

Commentators across the political spectrum have argued that Britain is becoming ‘too diverse,’ and that ‘we’ live ‘among stranger citizens,’ strangers with their own ‘rooted’ cultural identities that undermine and threaten to erode our ‘common culture,’ while the promotion of multiculturalism privileged the needs of minorities over the needs, desires and traditions of ordinary people.

Not only Powell’s vision of the future made manifest, but also the context for the 2016 cry to ‘take

90 John Berger quoted by Kate Kellaway, ‘If I’m a storyteller it’s because I listen, The Observer, 30th October, 2016.
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back control.’ Narratives shape our lives. Looking back over the last twenty years it may be the case as Tony Benn wrote, ‘Every generation must fight the same battles again and again. There’s no final victory and there’s no final defeat,’ but this should not dissuade us from the task of surfacing these alternative narratives of the nation and generating solidarity with one another.'
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