

**Manuscript version: Author's Accepted Manuscript**

The version presented in WRAP is the author's accepted manuscript and may differ from the published version or Version of Record.

**Persistent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/139720>

**How to cite:**

Please refer to published version for the most recent bibliographic citation information. If a published version is known of, the repository item page linked to above, will contain details on accessing it.

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions.

Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

Please refer to the repository item page, publisher's statement section, for further information.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk).

**“In 1997 nobody had heard of *Windrush*”:  
The Rise of the ‘Windrush Narrative’ in British Newspapers<sup>1</sup>**

Simon Peplow

*University of Warwick*

[simon.peplow@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:simon.peplow@warwick.ac.uk)

[@simpep](#)

**Abstract:** The arrival of the *Empire Windrush* in 1948 has been cemented as a mythical central symbol for immigration in histories of modern Britain. This article traces the growth and impact of the ‘Windrush-as-origins’ myth through study of its depiction in British newspapers. It demonstrates the contradictions raised and seemingly ignored by such portrayals of migration, as well as the issues caused by the manufactured centrality of this constructed origin story for those who do not neatly fit into a simplistic narrative of the ‘irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain’ since World War II.

**Keywords:** Empire Windrush; ‘Windrush generation’; Black British history; immigration.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Kennetta Perry and Lydia Plath for their thoughts during discussion of the themes raised in this article. I’d also like to thank the anonymous referees who offered valuable and constructive feedback, which undoubtedly strengthened this study.

*'First Windrush was a ship, the HMT Empire Windrush, a troopship taken from Germany in 1945 as a prize of war. Then it was an event: shorthand for the arrival in Britain of immigrants from the Caribbean in 1948. Then, more recently, it was a scandal: shorthand again for the injustices meted out to the Windrush generation by a Home Office set on managing immigration by means of a hostile environment.'*<sup>1</sup>

## Introduction

Describing her 2004 multiple prize-winning novel *Small Island*, which explores postwar Caribbean migration through the stories of four individuals, Andrea Levy explained: 'I want to tell stories from the black and white experience. It is a shared history.'<sup>2</sup> The novel revolves mainly around events in 1948, the year that the HMT *Empire Windrush* brought what has commonly been described as 'the first wave of postwar immigration to the UK'.<sup>3</sup> Amongst others, Hannah Lowe highlighted how *Small Island* 'has become strongly associated with the *Windrush* experience' – due, in part, to Levy's own connection to the ship, as her father had been a passenger on its famed 1948 voyage.<sup>4</sup> But more than that, its story tells of the postwar experience and the hostile reception often faced by those arriving in Britain in the years after World War II – an experience that has come to be epitomised in the British public's mind by images of the so-called 'Windrush generation'. Despite this link, the *Windrush* itself is only actually briefly mentioned twice in the novel.<sup>5</sup>

The 1948 arrival of the *Windrush* has been prominently foregrounded in attempts to include experiences of racialised people in what might similarly be described as a more inclusive 'shared history' of modern Britain. The prevalence of this 'Windrush narrative' has resulted in various commemorations in anniversary years (most notably in 1998), the renaming of Windrush Square in Brixton, and the recent establishment of an annual Windrush Day on 22 June.<sup>6</sup> Perhaps most notably, it is seen in the rhetoric of the 'Windrush generation': terminology used as popular shorthand – particularly following the 2018 scandal which saw individuals targeted by the Home Office's 'hostile environment' policies – to describe Caribbean migrants who arrived in Britain between the late 1940s and early 1970s.<sup>7</sup> However, as Kennetta Hammond Perry outlined, 'While state-centred and commemorative Windrush discourses amplify distinct yet dialogic perspectives that have undoubtedly informed the history of Caribbean migration to Britain, both traverse common ground by situating the landing of the *Windrush* passengers as a symbolic point of origin. As a result, the *Windrush* moment has assumed an iconic stature'.<sup>8</sup> It has become 'the mythical ark of West Indian emigration', the 'symbolic starting point for the postwar emigration from the Caribbean' and even, in Mike and Trevor Phillips' words, 'a symbol for all those occasions when we, or any of the other black people who have become part of the British nation, stepped off our separate gangplanks'.<sup>9</sup> *Windrush* has been popularly portrayed as the beginning of modern immigration to Britain, a representational moment where the nation transitioned from a monoracial society – a narrative, however, that has often worked to suppress longer or more complex histories of racialised people.<sup>10</sup> As a case in point, a letter writer to the *Guardian* in 1997 questioned why a story about novelist Caryl Phillips had been illustrated with a photograph of the *Windrush*, when Phillips' family had migrated to Britain from St Kitts in 1958 – ten years after the *Windrush*'s famed voyage, and four years after the ship had sunk in the Mediterranean Sea.<sup>11</sup>

In *Silencing the Past*, Michel-Rolph Trouillot outlined the ‘many ways in which the production of the historical narrative involves the uneven contribution of groups and individuals who have unequal access to the means for such production’ – that, in the production of a historical narrative, there is a simultaneous silencing of history.<sup>12</sup> Similarly, Bill Schwarz, exploring the British Empire’s legacy and how the notion of an imperial history playing a contemporary role in society was rejected and even ridiculed in postwar Britain, described such processes as selective forgetfulness.<sup>13</sup> Some years previously, Paul Gilroy had explored historical narratives and selective silences in his consideration of postcolonial Britain.<sup>14</sup> In this and subsequent work, Gilroy forwards ideas of ‘postcolonial melancholia’, and how a highly selective memory of Britain’s imperial history has repositioned World War II to act as a milestone for British national identity in the absence of Empire.<sup>15</sup> Or, in Paul Williams’ summary:

In melancholic Britain the horror and guilt produced by that violence [of Empire] were mixed in with the pride that imperial exploits were officially accorded in British society, fostering feelings of ambivalence towards the lost Empire. Accordingly, the collective memory of British imperialism is sketchy and weak, and the country has latched on to its success in the Second World War as a substitute moment of greatness.<sup>16</sup>

While Williams, amongst others, noted that Gilroy donates little attention to other potential explanations for the country’s fixation with World War II, the ramifications of such selective memory resulted in the longer history of racialised people’s inclusion in the British Empire being ‘simply erased’, as ‘colonial subjects’ became ‘immigrants’.<sup>17</sup> A focus on World War II, supposedly prior to immigration into Britain ‘beginning’ with *Windrush*, suggests a yearning for a ‘return’ to a supposedly homogenous white British national identity – back to before ‘the dilution of once homogeneous and continuous national stock by alien strains’.<sup>18</sup> This also manifests in how such groups are portrayed and conditionally accepted as ‘legitimate’ within postcolonial Britain. While ‘We are here because you were there’ has been a prominent rallying cry for anti-racist protest – first expressed well before World War II – a selective historical narrative removes this longer relationship and ostensibly renders racialised people as illegitimate and unexplained ‘newcomers’ in modern Britain.<sup>19</sup>

The emblematic significance of the *Windrush* in histories of modern Britain has been repeatedly demonstrated. Amongst others, British broadcaster and former Chair of the Equality and Human Rights Commission and Commission for Racial Equality Trevor Phillips described the ship as being ‘our *Mayflower*’.<sup>20</sup> However, many of the accepted ‘facts’ of the *Windrush* in mainstream histories – that it was the first mass arrival of Caribbean migrants in the postwar years, wherein 492 Jamaican men from Kingston disembarked to set foot on British soil on 21 June 1948 after arrival into Tilbury Docks – have been shown to be incorrect.<sup>21</sup> For instance, several studies have highlighted that the *Windrush* was not the ‘first’ arrival in the postwar years: the S.S. *Ormonde* and *Almanzora* both arrived in Britain in 1947, carrying significant numbers of Caribbean migrants.<sup>22</sup> Moreover, examinations of the *Windrush* passenger log, contemporary newspapers and government documents demonstrate that it actually transported over 1,000 people – men *and* women – including Europeans and Australians, that its passengers did not disembark until the day after its arrival, and that its voyage was much more complex than simple passage for 492 men from Jamaica to Britain.<sup>23</sup> If these ‘facts’ have been repeatedly challenged, why then have they persisted so widely? Matthew Mead convincingly argued that the strength of the ‘Windrush myth’, as well as its pervasiveness, is due to Britain’s need to explain to itself the growing presence of people

previously considered unassimilable within its perceived monoracial white national identity. He opined that the *Windrush* is a ‘culturally imagined moment of arrival which, responding to a real need, serves to mark an authenticating history.’<sup>24</sup> Similarly, Tony Kushner argued that ‘it has been necessary to “tidy” elements of its journey to incorporate all those coming from the ‘New Commonwealth’ after World War II as part of the ‘Windrush generation’.<sup>25</sup> However, this authenticating narrative is based on selective history, omitting racialised people who were in Britain before *Windrush* and downplaying the importance of those arriving at different times or in different ways.<sup>26</sup> As repeatedly demonstrated in the literature, particularly in more recent contributions, ‘Men and women from Africa and the Caribbean worked, resided and agitated in Britain long before the arrival of the *Empire Windrush*.’<sup>27</sup> Further to prominent theories of citizenship and nationalism, such as ‘imagined communities’ and ‘invented traditions’, Raphael Samuel and Paul Thompson argued that ‘myth is a fundamental component of human thought’: that people reshape stories or form structures to make sense of their own experiences and create a meaningful narrative of the past.<sup>28</sup> This has certainly been demonstrated in newspaper coverage of the events considered in this article.

This article considers the depiction of the *Windrush* in British newspaper reporting, often deployed as a figurative representation of the exact point when Britain ‘became multi-racial’. This consists of examining newspaper coverage of three significant events: the fiftieth anniversary in 1998 of the *Windrush*’s ‘iconic’ voyage; the 2012 London Olympics, which saw a representation of the *Windrush* included in the opening ceremony; and the 2018 ‘Windrush scandal’ concerning people who were – as a result of notorious Home Office ‘hostile environment’ policies – wrongly detained, denied access to benefits or medical care, lost their jobs or homes, threatened with deportation, and, in a number of cases, actually deported. Although a narrow focus on these events raises questions about how such discourses existed before and between them, they have been chosen as illustrative occasions where press discussion of the *Windrush* has been most evident.

Similarly, the concentration on newspapers was chosen to maintain consistent analysis of the three events. Whereas the rise of social media has arguably led to the ‘democratisation of the news’, as more people are able to contribute to and shape news production, studies have suggested that newspapers and their editors to some extent ‘retain their “traditional gate-keeping role”’, reflecting concerns about distribution of misinformation.<sup>29</sup> It has also often been argued, further to a comparative lack of press regulation contrasted with radio and television allowing for the ‘rise and rise of the brutally “honest” columnist’, that the British press ‘set the agenda’ as media broadcasters follow their lead.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, while newspapers are far from the only information sources through which discourses of race and immigration are shaped in Britain, demonstrated below through discussion of other mediums, the perceived traditional significance of the British press also goes some way to suggesting ideas of ‘legitimisation’ within public discourse. Opposed to internet sources unstrained by space, limited newspaper pages can only contain those issues deemed significant enough to be worthy of attention.<sup>31</sup>

The national newspapers selected for this study aimed to span audiences and the political spectrum. Five were broadsheets (including their respective Sunday ‘sister papers’): *The Times/Sunday Times*, generally considered moderately conservative; the *Daily Telegraph/Sunday Telegraph*, consistently right-wing and generally anti-immigration; the *Guardian/Observer*, noted for more liberal views; the *Financial Times*, a ‘global business

publication' generally pro free markets and the European Union; and the *Independent*, which claims freedom from political influence/affiliation. In addition, four tabloids were surveyed: the *Daily Mail/Mail on Sunday*, mid-market right-wing conservative newspapers; the *Daily Express/Sunday Express*, mid-markets known for strong right-wing and anti-immigration/anti-European Union stances; the *Sun*, the highest circulation tabloid with traditionally strong right-wing and anti-immigration views; and the *Daily Mirror*, the second highest circulation tabloid that has traditionally supported the Labour Party.

This approach allows for some clear lines of argument. Firstly, it explores how *Windrush* has been consistently portrayed as the 'first' arrival to a historically monoracial Britain, as seen in this archetypal description from the *Sun*: 'the first foreigners sailed in from the West Indies aboard the MV *Empire Windrush*. It was the earliest mass migration to Britain of modern times and the start of our multi-cultural society.'<sup>32</sup> The persistence of this 'Windrush myth' – erasing the presence of racialised people in Britain before 1948 by situating *Windrush* as a symbolic moment of arrival – has played a role in diminishing or overlooking these longer histories. As Kushner argued, 'the diversity of non-white movement to Britain – both before and after 1948 – has been hidden by the focus on West Indian migration'.<sup>33</sup> Several commentators attempted to highlight a pre-*Windrush* history in the newspaper coverage considered here, but this often appeared as individual letters, interviews, or book reviews, rather than sustained depictions. For instance, interventions in press discourse such as Stuart Hall's in the *Financial Times* – a book review of Mike and Trevor Phillips' *Windrush* – added historical context by acknowledging *Windrush* as a 'symbolic moment... [and] a key episode in the closing of the British imperial adventure'.<sup>34</sup> However, as demonstrated by other studies, the impact of contributions such as letters or individual articles on a newspaper's readership are often 'weak in comparison' with their general editorial lines.<sup>35</sup>

Secondly, building on work by (amongst others) Kushner and Perry, this article problematises the 'feel-good' *Windrush* story as 'a battle against adversity [for arrivals] that was eventually successful, leading to an intensified sense of national belonging' – narratives of the 'irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain', most notably forwarded in the subtitle of Mike and Trevor Phillips's 1998 book.<sup>36</sup> To the present day, newspaper reporting has repeatedly portrayed the *Windrush*'s arrival as the point when 'The seeds of multicultural Britain were duly sewn'.<sup>37</sup> A large proportion of the newspapers examined proclaimed that the situation had unquestionably improved for racialised Britons in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, since their 'first arrival' in 1948. This builds on typical representations that racialised people in Britain, despite enduring a somewhat challenging start to life in the 'mother country', had in just fifty years been accepted by a generally tolerant and welcoming island. While some voices attempted to question this simplistic narrative of progression, it wasn't until the 2018 'Windrush scandal' that such ideas were more roundly criticised – although, even this was presented by many observers in British newspapers as merely a temporary blip in the country's history of 'tolerance and acceptance'.

In attempting to uncover when the '*Windrush* narrative' began to be popularised, an admittedly crude search was conducted of digitised archives and Google Ngram Viewer – an online search engine described as charting the frequency of terms used in printed sources, populated from 5 million sources scanned into Google Books.<sup>38</sup> The earliest located reference was a 1953 article by sociologist Michael Banton, discussing 'recent migration' trends, which declared: 'The wave of passenger migration may be said to have started with the arrival of S.S. *Empire Windrush* in June 1948, bringing 492 passengers from the West Indies (mostly

Jamaicans).’ This demonstrates how early the significance of *Windrush* and its central ‘facts’ took hold.<sup>39</sup> However, the same basic search methodology also showed that the phrase ‘Windrush generation’ did not appear until Edward Pilkington’s 1988 exploration of the Notting Hill racist riots of 1958, before its usage subsequently increased around the fiftieth anniversary in 1998.<sup>40</sup>

A *Windrush* commemoration appeared in 1988 to mark its fortieth anniversary. Onyekachi Wambu, editor of Black British weekly newspaper *The Voice*, collaborated with Lambeth Council and the South London Press to publish *Forty Winters On* – its name a reference to those who commented in 1948 that postwar migrants would only last one cold winter in Britain.<sup>41</sup> Despite this booklet receiving relatively little attention, it stimulated a movement to attract greater public awareness. Wambu explained this as being in part due to ‘a changing of the guard... many of the people who came over in the first wave were beginning to die off or return home... we had to make sense of what had happened’.<sup>42</sup> Mike Phillips, writer and journalist who in 1998 produced the *Windrush* BBC television series and accompanying book with his brother Trevor, later proclaimed that ‘In 1997 nobody had heard of Windrush.’<sup>43</sup> While such generalisations are undoubtedly overstated, it is certainly the case that at that point it was not yet the recognisable term that it would become. Public knowledge of the *Windrush* grew significantly in 1998 due to the fiftieth anniversary commemorations – demonstrated by Prince Charles, who admitted having ‘little idea of what the name Windrush signified’ prior to making a speech marking its anniversary.<sup>44</sup> Explanations for this increased interest have ranged from the success of grassroots campaigns and organisations such as the Windrush Foundation, New Labour’s attempts to ‘rebrand’ Britain as a diverse multicultural nation, a generally increased public interest in history, and the simple fact of a fiftieth anniversary being more noteworthy than previous milestones.<sup>45</sup> Nonetheless, despite the nationwide attention received in 1998 and efforts to demonstrate its importance in modern British history, some commentators – such as Christopher Dunkley in the *Financial Times* – still noted that ‘No doubt many white people will feel that [it] is an occasion largely of interest to black people.’<sup>46</sup> This was despite the general message of newspaper reportage declaring that, following the *Windrush*’s arrival in 1948, ‘Britain would never be the same again’.<sup>47</sup>

### *Windrush* 1998

The fiftieth anniversary of the *Windrush*’s arrival produced a range of commemorations in 1998. One such publication included an introduction from editor Onyekachi Wambu describing how ‘the landing of the *SS Empire Windrush* at Tilbury Docks on 21 June 1948 began a process which has steadily and radically transformed Britain’.<sup>48</sup> Similarly, brothers Mike and Trevor Phillips produced a four-part television series for the BBC and accompanying book, both entitled *Windrush*. Barbara Korte and Eva Ulrike Pirker described their ‘unprecedented’ impact, which ‘turned the ship’s name into the designation of a whole generation and a household term of British history’. Although they note that *Windrush*’s ‘original broadcasting slot was not the prime of primetime’, the press attention the series received helped amplify its audience and significance.<sup>49</sup> Lowe likewise outlined how the series ‘marked an important stage in the process of overthrowing the white monocultural image of Britain. This process involved the notable vision, dedication and agency of black activists, historians and artists’.<sup>50</sup> Indeed, while acknowledging that Black people had lived in Britain for centuries before the *Windrush*’s 1948 arrival, Trevor Phillips believed that a series closely linked with

commemoration of this event 'would be the chance to start putting a little of that history on the map'.<sup>51</sup>

However, the impact of the Phillips's *Windrush* series meant that its underlying narrative became embedded into popular memory, a narrative shaped by its producers: 'Before we created it, nobody had a coherent story. I made the story up. History is about fact, but it is also about narration. I created a narrative that had coherence.'<sup>52</sup> Various newspaper pieces or interviews saw the Phillips brothers noting that *Windrush* was not the beginning of a Black British history, but simultaneously downplaying previous experiences through their focus on constructing a narrative beginning with World War II. A key illustration of this can be found in a *Guardian* article publicising the series, in which the Phillips brothers initially state: 'People think of the passengers who came to Britain on the Empire Windrush 50 years ago as the first group of West Indians to arrive. They were not.' Nevertheless, their subsequent discussion of a pre-*Windrush* history only extends back a few years to Black soldiers stationed in Britain during World War II.<sup>53</sup> The absence from their narrative of a more extensive history of Britain's relationship with racialised people, both within and outside of the imperial metropole, did little to counteract perceptions of the *Windrush* as a starting point. Instead, it encouraged paradoxical media descriptions of the *Windrush* as a moment of arrival occurring *after* racialised people had already played a key role in British life. This contradiction is typified by Martin Phillips's interviews with 'Windrush veterans' in the *Sun*, which declared that 'the first foreigners sailed in from the West Indies aboard the MV *Empire Windrush*' before noting that his interviewees had served in Britain during World War II – where some had remained prior to the *Windrush*'s arrival.<sup>54</sup> However, such incongruous details are overlooked to fit the 'Windrush-as-origins' narrative.

Low characterised the 1998 commemorations as contributing to the rise of inaccuracies and problematic narratives about the *Windrush*.<sup>55</sup> Certainly, numerous examples from 1998 demonstrate how press coverage of 'the 50th anniversary of that seminal passage' cemented a 'Windrush-as-origins' narrative: 'It was a low-key beginning to a momentous piece of history. The ship inching its way up the Thames to its mooring in East London was the *Empire Windrush*, and on board were the first Caribbean immigrants to make their home here.'<sup>56</sup> Even journalists who acknowledged that 'Immigrants have come to Britain in successive waves' nonetheless painted 1948 as something distinct: 'For black and Asian immigrants it has been tough: numbers were relatively large and colour makes people visibly different'.<sup>57</sup> This was phrased even more starkly in the *Independent* by Arthur Torrington, co-founder of the Windrush Foundation: 'The nation remained monocultural until June 1948.'<sup>58</sup> This demonstrates how longer histories of racialised Britons did not fit the common *Windrush* narrative, which thus perpetuated its 1948 journey as a recent moment of arrival. Marginalising other accounts, such as Lilian M. Badin's letter in the *Daily Mail* recounting her family history in Britain since her Barbadian father served in the British armed forces during World War I, this has had an ongoing impact on ideas of 'belonging' within Britain.<sup>59</sup> As Jeffrey Green, author of *Black Edwardians*, summarised: 'There has been a grand deception: the emphasis is that black people in Britain are migrants – an emphasis that the Windrush celebrations have not diminished.'<sup>60</sup>

A secondary impact of commemorative events in 1998 was characterisations of the 'irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain'. This depiction, the prominent subtitle of the Phillips brothers' book, was further reflected in newspaper reviews of its accompanying television series: '*Windrush* emphasises the comparative smoothness of Britain's acceptance of mass

immigration by newcomers from different cultures over what is in historical terms an astonishingly short space of time'.<sup>61</sup> In such portrayals, the racial injustices and 'obstacles' faced by earlier migrants – often depicted as 'pioneers' – had been successfully 'overcome' by 1998.<sup>62</sup> Relatedly, Kushner detailed how Black Britons have slowly 'become part of the narrative of the Second World War' due to disproportionate focus on *Windrush* arrivals 'who had bravely and loyally fought for the "mother country" [but] were then coldly rejected by it after the war's conclusion': 'in a new context – that of constructing a comfortable multiculturalism – the myth of the *Windrush* is now firmly established'.<sup>63</sup> Certainly, press coverage from 1998 heavily forwarded interpretations that, while those arriving in 1948 faced discrimination from unenlightened Britons, the situation was much happier fifty years later. For instance, Matthew Brace in the *Independent* declared: 'The first West Indian migrants who arrived on the "*Empire Windrush*" overcame racism and poverty to prosper'.<sup>64</sup> Similarly, writing in *The Times*, Nicholas Wood charted this representation of progress through the life of Euton Christian, who had gone from living 'in abject poverty in a one-room wooden hut in Kingston, Jamaica', to being a Post Office middle manager who became the first Black Justice of the Peace in Manchester.<sup>65</sup> Moreover, Arthur Torrington suggested that the degree to which Britain had 'become a multi-cultural, multi-racial society... would have been unthinkable in June 1948'.<sup>66</sup> Interestingly, the *Mail on Sunday*, sister paper to notoriously anti-immigration *Daily Mail*, framed such celebrations around familiar tropes of 'British values' – but, opposed to others who often eulogised Britain's perceived inherent and historic tolerance, journalist Stan Hay actually attributed those principles to 'the development of a multi-cultural Britain [which] has benefited our nation – not just in the obvious fields of sport and music – but also in helping us to loosen up and be more tolerant'.<sup>67</sup>

Even vocal commentator on racial injustices Yasmin Alibhai-Brown marked the fiftieth anniversary as an occasion to 'praise the surprising successes of multicultural Britain', albeit with some significant qualifications:

There are too many cases of racial violence; too many deaths in custody of black men; too many excluded ethnic communities. But fifty years ago the picture was very different and we would not have had, within a single year, three British prime ministers, the Queen and Prince Charles describing this country as a proud multicultural nation. That must count for something.<sup>68</sup>

Other dissenting voices in the British press, somewhat drowned out by sweeping narratives of progress, also attempted to highlight the continued racism within contemporary Britain – often without agreeing with Alibhai-Brown that this anniversary was nonetheless a time for celebration.<sup>69</sup> A main lens through which ideas of progress were questioned in 1998 was the ongoing investigation into the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence and subsequent ineffectual police investigation, which would later see the Metropolitan Police branded as 'institutionally racist' by the Macpherson public inquiry.<sup>70</sup> While Simon Buckby in the *Financial Times* portrayed the Lawrence case as revelatory in contemporary Britain, due to reasoning that 'Overt racial conflict largely seemed a thing of the past', other voices highlighted continued experiences proving otherwise.<sup>71</sup> Summarising such arguments in the *Observer* in 2000, Stuart Hall concluded that 'As the coincidence of the *Windrush* celebrations and the Stephen Lawrence inquiry showed, it is perfectly possible for multiculturalism and racism to coexist'.<sup>72</sup>

Interestingly, the Phillips' *Windrush* book entirely omitted Lawrence's murder and subsequent public inquiry. In a particularly revealing interview, Mike Phillips explained this

absence by indicating that its inclusion would have 'skew[ed] the nature of the broad sweep of what is happening historically'.<sup>73</sup> While he elsewhere somewhat proudly proclaimed his 'creation' of the narrative which comprised their *Windrush* story, it is clear that their account was shaped to indicate an 'irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain' and aspects complicating this were downplayed or simply absent. When Trevor Phillips did later discuss Lawrence in the *Observer*, he portrayed Lawrence as representing 'those in the black community who are the true heirs of the first immigrants of the Windrush generation. They arrived with no overt political agenda other than playing their part in the reconstruction of post-war Britain.'<sup>74</sup> Phillips later bemoaned that the opportunity presented by the *Windrush* fiftieth anniversary to include Black British experiences in the nation's history had not been properly seized.<sup>75</sup> While the Phillips brothers repeatedly stated their motivation to write Black people into the history of modern Britain, theirs was a determinedly focussed and restricted narrative.

Following broadcast of the *Windrush* series, the BBC were forced to apologise after criticism from Simon Heffer, biographer of infamous politician Enoch Powell. Writing in the *Daily Mail*, Heffer accused the programme of 'contemptible disregard for the truth' by misrepresenting Powell's views on immigration – specifically, by suggesting that Powell had travelled to the West Indies whilst Minister for Health to encourage migration to Britain and recruit workers for the National Health Service.<sup>76</sup> In the same newspaper one month previously, Heffer had railed against New Labour's attempts to promote Britain as a multicultural society. Rather, he suggested that what should be celebrated was 'the extraordinary tolerance of the indigenous population', concluding: 'We also have 53 million people here who are white, Christian and have been brought up in a predominantly Anglo-Saxon culture. That is the country we know, and most of us want to keep it that way. It is an important part of what makes this island race British.'<sup>77</sup> Despite its fiftieth anniversaries in 1998 placing *Windrush* in a much more prominent position in modern Britain, such sentiments demonstrate the perceived boundaries of 'Britishness' and how the 'irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain' was still being resisted.

## 2012 Olympics Opening Ceremony

During the build-up to the 2012 London Olympics, speculation was rife in British newspapers about the content of its opening ceremony. The rumoured inclusion of a so-called 'history parade' was noted by *The Sunday Times* as signalling 'a hard truths night at the Olympics' – suggesting the presence of more inclusive and critical histories of modern Britain. In the article, the opening ceremony's director Danny Boyle – an 'avowed leftwinger' – was quoted as declaring: 'It's not a naive show. We're trying to show the best of us, but we're also trying to show many different things about our country.'<sup>78</sup> One of the aspects deemed worthy of inclusion in this vision of Britain was a representation of the *Windrush*'s 1948 arrival, an event by this time generally located within mainstream histories of modern Britain – further aided, in addition to its fiftieth anniversary, by New Labour's promotion of its multicultural policies, such as including the *Windrush* in a 2006 list of '12 national icons'.<sup>79</sup> Viewed by an estimated worldwide television audience of 900 million, the 2012 Olympics Opening Ceremony was subsequently dissected at length in the nation's press. A recurring response, particularly concerning the inclusion of *Windrush* imagery, were descriptions of Britain as a diverse multiracial and multicultural nation. Reviews stressed the country's 'enduring tolerance', notably described by Trevor Phillips as 'the quintessential British quality'.<sup>80</sup> Similarly, as with

*Windrush*'s fiftieth anniversary, the opening ceremony was portrayed as an illustration of just how far the country had progressed in accepting its multiracial character.<sup>81</sup> A visible representation of this was Boyle's decision to include campaigner Doreen Lawrence, mother of Stephen Lawrence, prominently in the opening ceremony, leading the group that carried the Olympic flag towards the climax of the ceremony. As Lawrence herself stated, 'I saw it as an opportunity to represent the community as a whole, so people can see that we are a part of society, and not just on the fringe.'<sup>82</sup> Trevor Phillips, noting the importance of 'myth-making' in shaping ideas of a British national identity, concluded that the opening ceremony had 'created a new myth about a Britain made rich and vibrant by its diversity'.<sup>83</sup> In the making of this myth, the *Windrush* narrative was again a central pillar; a representation clearly demarcating the moment when Britain's 'Green and Pleasant Land' transformed into the 'Pandemonium' of a modern multicultural nation (to use the titles of sections from the opening ceremony).

The *Windrush*'s centrality in this 'new myth about Britain' was emphasised by the absence of a historical account demonstrating previous interactions of racialised people with Britain. Some newspaper commentators noted how the ceremony glossed over Britain's imperial history until the arrival of the *Windrush*, seemingly rendering the sudden appearance of West Indian migrants on British soil as unexplained and incomprehensible:

Undoing imperial amnesia will enable us to flesh out Britain's 'island story' towards a more honest account of how Britain came to be what it is today. Unlike Danny Boyle's interesting 'people's history' Olympics extravaganza, it would remind us that this country's multicultural history did not begin a few decades ago with the *Empire Windrush* but is also tied to the dislocations of empire.<sup>84</sup>

While some observers countered that an Olympics opening ceremony was not the appropriate means to criticise colonialism, such absences made the symbolic arrival of the *Windrush* even more stark in this retelling of British history. Illustrative of the broader 'Windrush-as-origins' narrative, representations that portray its 1948 voyage as the first interaction between racialised people and Britain omits a key explanation of why many made that trip – i.e., a much longer imperial history. The absence of Empire in the opening ceremony's historical representation of Britain also faced criticism from other quarters, including those considering the British Empire to be a source of pride. Denouncing the ceremony as 'Marxist propaganda', *Daily Mail* columnist Stephen Glover complained that it contained 'no references to the achievements of the Empire which, for all its many defects, succeeded in spreading British culture and technology... to more than a quarter of the globe'. He continued to criticise the ceremony's depictions of 'immigration as a uniformly liberating force', believing that 'most people (including many immigrants)' opposed recent mass immigration 'undermining some communities'.<sup>85</sup> Again, these are sentiments that question interpretations of an unambiguous 'irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain'.

The most infamous response to the opening ceremony came from Conservative MP Aidan Burley, who would in 2014 step down following controversy caused by his role in a stag party that involved Nazi uniforms, salutes and chants.<sup>86</sup> In 2012, the *Daily Telegraph* reported that Burley's comments about the opening ceremony had made him 'a minor hate-figure on Twitter'. As it was unfolding, Burley tweeted that it was 'The most leftie opening ceremony I have ever seen – more than Beijing, the capital of a communist state!', subsequently referring to it as 'leftie multi-cultural crap'.<sup>87</sup> His comments were widely condemned, with criticisms

from Conservative Prime Minister David Cameron and London Mayor Boris Johnson, as well as former London Mayor Ken Livingstone who tellingly accused Burley of living ‘in the Britain from 50 years ago’ – further replicating ideas of ‘irresistible’ progress.<sup>88</sup> Burley later claimed that his tweets had been ‘misunderstood’, and that he had been ‘talking about the way it was handled in the show, not multiculturalism itself’.<sup>89</sup> However, in vociferously calling for a return to what he considered to be more traditional symbols of ‘Britishness’ – the Royal Air Force Aerobatic Team (commonly known as the Red Arrows), William Shakespeare, and rock group the Rolling Stones – and denigrating other aspects of modern Britain as ‘leftie multicultural crap’, Burley clearly demonstrated his view on what should be included within mainstream representations of British national identity.

### The 2018 ‘Windrush scandal’

In the years following the 2012 Olympics, its opening ceremony was referenced as an important aspirational or enlightening moment for the nation: a potential blueprint for the country’s direction in the twenty-first century as ‘the last great festival of multicultural Britain’.<sup>90</sup> It was even used by some journalists as a retort to manifestations of attitudes seemingly suggesting a yearning for Britain to ‘return’ to a monoracial society: ‘We need to take our country back. Not to some all-white, 1950s fantasy world that never existed, but to that inspirational evening in 2012. When Danny Boyle made us realise that Britain’s greatest assets are its tolerance, diversity, defiance of oppression and desire to embrace.’<sup>91</sup>

In 2013, on the sixty-fifth anniversary of the *Windrush*’s celebrated arrival, Prime Minister David Cameron praised the ‘fortitude’ of the ‘Windrush generation’ and announced that, ‘while some social issues still need to be tackled, I strongly believe that our country today is an overwhelmingly fair and tolerant one’.<sup>92</sup> However, Cameron’s Conservative Government were at the same time rolling out a set of policies that have come to be known as the ‘hostile environment’. This label came from an interview Home Secretary Theresa May gave with the *Daily Telegraph* on 25 May 2012, in which she declared that ‘The aim is to create here in Britain a really hostile environment for illegal migration’.<sup>93</sup> In a context of austerity politics, the Conservatives’ 2010 election manifesto promise to reduce immigration to the ‘tens of thousands’, and a surge of support for UKIP, May’s time in the Home Office was characterised by the actions of an ‘almost obsessively determined’ figure – in the judgement of the *Guardian*’s Simon Hattenstone.<sup>94</sup> The ‘hostile environment’ policies introduced compulsory checks on access to basic services, such as housing, employment, and healthcare, in an attempt to disrupt the lives of ‘illegal immigrants’ and force them to ‘voluntarily leave’ Britain.<sup>95</sup> May also proclaimed, during the second reading in the House of Commons of what was to become the Immigration Act 2014, that government policy would allow them to ‘deport first and hear appeals later’.<sup>96</sup> The ramifications of these policies and approaches were embodied by those caught up in what was popularly termed the ‘Windrush scandal’, which came to light in 2018 following a sustained campaign that included a number of articles in the *Guardian*. Despite having their rights guaranteed by the 1971 Immigration Act, new immigration laws forced many Black Britons to prove their continuous residence since 1973. The Home Office had not kept records of those granted indefinite leave to remain in the 1970s and, prior to the revelations forcing a change in approach, it also had not used central tax or pension records to confirm continuous residence – instead requiring individuals to provide four pieces of self-documented independent evidence, such as payslips or bank statements,

for every year they had been in the country. This understandably proved logistically impossible for numerous people who, for instance, had not thought it necessary to retain such documentation. An unknown number of people living in the UK were wrongly threatened with deportation, made redundant, and deprived benefits or medical care – in at least 164 cases, people were even wrongly detained or deported, and no fewer than 11 people died as a result. By October 2018, the total number of potential cases reported to the Home Office exceeded 5,000, and they had conducted an official review of 11,800.<sup>97</sup>

One of the main themes typifying press coverage of the 2018 ‘Windrush scandal’ was that these revelations questioned underlying beliefs of a tolerant, welcoming Britain. Newspapers reported that the scandal ‘calls into question the thing we talk about so much nowadays: “British values”’.<sup>98</sup> Or, in a *Sunday Telegraph* editorial more sympathetic to the authorities, that ‘in trying to enforce British law the Government has, ironically, betrayed some of the core and historic British values it was meant to be safeguarding’.<sup>99</sup> In the context of ongoing negotiations following the 2016 European Referendum membership result, the *Financial Times* summed up the reaction repeatedly expressed:

This is not who we are. Britain is supposed to be a tolerant and welcoming society. This is not how hard-working people, who devoted their lives to the wellbeing of the nation, should be treated. Today the world is looking to see the degree to which the UK will remain open after leaving the EU. The treatment of the Windrush families is hardly encouraging.<sup>100</sup>

The strength of such self-perceptions resulted in press coverage depicting a government out of step with the British public: a ‘decent lot’ who ‘value fairness’ and have ‘always welcomed immigrants to these shores’.<sup>101</sup> Right-wing newspapers made similar accusations and even called for resignations of senior politicians – despite blame also being levelled against them, due to xenophobic news reportage.<sup>102</sup> Faced with critical newspaper coverage from all quarters, commentators and politicians attempted to distance themselves and the country from ‘hostile environment’ policies. For example, Sajid Javid – appointed Home Secretary in the wake of the scandal, the first British Asian to hold one of the Great Offices of State – described the ‘hostile environment’ as being ‘quite un-British’, preferring instead to label (unaltered) Conservative immigration policies as the ‘compliant environment’.<sup>103</sup> Amongst others, Cambridge University Reader in colonial and postcolonial literature and theory Priyamvada Gopal attempted to utilise mainstream newspapers to counter prevalent liberal self-identifications by detailing how imperial history demonstrates ‘there is nothing especially “British” about values such as tolerance, freedom, human rights or democracy’.<sup>104</sup>

Paradoxically, while it might be expected that the ‘Windrush scandal’ revealed how simple narratives of a tolerant and welcoming Britain are problematic, the outraged public reaction was used as evidence supposedly proving this very trait. Trevor Phillips again repeatedly contributed to this discussion. Acknowledging he was not a ‘liberal on immigration or multiculturalism’ – the fact that he was now writing in the *Daily Mail* attested to that – Phillips interpreted the ‘fire of indignation that erupted’ as demonstrating ‘a nation that remains passionately committed to the fair treatment of people who work hard and play by the rules, irrespective of race or colour’.<sup>105</sup> Many commentators also depicted a Britain that had progressed even further in its tolerance since the arrival of the *Windrush* in 1948, again perpetuating a narrative of the ‘irresistible rise of multi-racial Britain’. The *Daily Mail*’s Peter Osborne portrayed the widespread outrage – ‘from all parties across the political spectrum

including Ukip' – as demonstrative of a country that had learned 'over the decades [since 1948]... that immigration policy must be guided by the values of fairness and decency'.<sup>106</sup> Other newspapers followed suit, illustrated most starkly by sister paper the *Mail on Sunday*:

It's time to put the episode – as regrettable as it has been – into perspective. Over the past week I have been immensely heartened by the huge outpouring of anger from all quarters of society. This shows that, more than half a century after the first big influx of immigrants from the Caribbean began to arrive, Britain has accepted them... Just look around. Britain has embraced immigrants as they have embraced life here.<sup>107</sup>

Such portrayals asserted that the British public now evidently believed that those who had 'worked hard and play[ed] by the rules' should be accepted in modern Britain. Conservative journalist Peter Hitchens, painting Britons as generally 'immensely kind and tolerant towards newcomers', revealingly declared that 'most of us now regard the Windrush generation, from our former colonies in the Caribbean, as something *pretty close* to family'.<sup>108</sup>

Conversely, other commentators argued that the revelations instead demonstrated the long-ignored history that questioned notions of Britain as a liberal nation: that portrayals of the 'Windrush scandal' as being 'a solo aberration... is almost endearing in its absurdity'.<sup>109</sup> For instance, the High Commissioner of Barbados in London, Guy Hewitt, utilised the press to express his opinion that the revelations were 'a modern-day miracle' as they had forced Britain to acknowledge a situation that had been 'for too long begging for attention'.<sup>110</sup> Gary Younge, regular *Guardian* contributor, demonstrated how the 'Windrush generation' had only now been finally perceived as 'worthy immigrants' by the public due to their impact on Britain's identity and 'sense of self':

The fact that these people are being celebrated today is not a product of Britain's innate sense of fair play. The Windrush generation is far more popular now than it was just after the Windrush docked... Over the past week this ageing cohort has been elevated to the status of national treasure.<sup>111</sup>

Similarly, the *Independent's* Matthew Norman characterised the widespread appalled reaction as being due to modern day perceptions of the 'Windrush generation' as the 'right kind' of migrants: 'The government's mistake was to pick a fight with the wrong minority. If it chooses its victims more carefully in the future, the apathy will be deafening'.<sup>112</sup> He suggested that the 'Windrush generation' had been accepted in Britain due to narratives in popular memory of their having worked their way to recognition by answering the call from the 'motherland' for workers, while simultaneously ignoring longer pre-*Windrush* histories which explained such imperial connections.<sup>113</sup> As Kushner similarly detailed, the *Windrush* myth 'allows acceptance of inward migration to be part of the nation's history' – but such tolerance is 'regarded as exceptional', as other groups, such as British Muslims, are denounced as 'less assimilable' or 'separatist'.<sup>114</sup> As demonstrated in this study, such explanations certainly fit with Trevor Phillips' venerating of *Windrush* narratives at the expense of others, his increasingly right-wing interjections confirming that Muslims do not seem to fit his construction of 'Britishness'.<sup>115</sup> Other journalists noted how, despite outrage and displays of apparent solidarity with the 'Windrush generation', opinion polls suggested that public attitudes on immigration had not generally been altered by the 'scandal'. Reporting a YouGov poll, Nesrine Malik detailed that an 'overwhelming majority' of respondents accepted that

'Windrush migrants' had the right to remain in Britain, but also that the government's overall approach to immigration simultaneously retained high levels of public support.<sup>116</sup>

Kushner noted how 'The construction of the *Windrush* myth since the late twentieth century has led to both inclusion and exclusion.'<sup>117</sup> Certainly, some commentators in 2018 acknowledged the power of the *Windrush* narrative, such as that those caught up in the 'scandal' were largely not actually members of the 'Windrush generation' themselves, but of the following generation. Amelia Gentleman, prizewinning *Guardian* journalist for articles reporting the scandal, detailed that while 'Windrush generation' was a misnomer, it was 'a phrase that evoked the emotional response that people feel towards the pioneers of migration who arrived on that ship'.<sup>118</sup> Campaigner Patrick Vernon, who had inspired Gentleman to use the term, himself expressed this when previously declaring that the *Windrush* 'is not a symbol of the 492 Caribbean men and women who arrived on that ship... but of everyone who came from the Empire'.<sup>119</sup> However, such declarations of inclusive terminology underplay limitations of a narrative that has been so concentrated on the *Windrush*. It cannot be a universal symbol when it is constructed in such a selective and limiting way. For example, Nicholas Boston in the *Independent* observed that 'little effort is made to really consider the nuances'. Using the example of the overlooked sixty-six Polish refugees who also sailed on the *Windrush*, Boston demonstrated how certain people are displaced by dominant narratives – even within marginalised stories.<sup>120</sup> Interestingly, Mike Phillips had previously revealed that they deemed their 1998 television series too short to mention these Polish refugees considered superfluous to their narrative: 'I mean, this is a black story after all'.<sup>121</sup> Moreover, as Aditya Chakraborty pointed out in the *Guardian*, the *Windrush* myth has perpetuated a very narrowly-defined 'black story': 'Take that cosy, clichéd history of black Britain that begins with the Pathe newsreel of Empire Windrush docking at Tilbury. On which decks would have been the arrivals from Nairobi or Accra?'<sup>122</sup>

The unique and central position of the *Windrush* in mainstream narratives of race and migration in modern Britain shows few signs of changing. In contemporary newspaper articles, particularly following extensive and ongoing coverage of the 'Windrush scandal', it retains descriptions of being 'a watershed in British history'.<sup>123</sup> Patrick Vernon, writing in the *Guardian* to mark the first national Windrush Day on 22 June 2019, even suggested that the *Windrush*'s anchor should be salvaged and utilised as 'part of our national history' – an 'inspiration for generations of black, brown and white people in Britain', in addition to celebrating 'the postwar migrants who first arrived aboard'.<sup>124</sup> Such suggestions, and indeed Windrush Day itself, demonstrate the centrality of the *Windrush* as 'marking the symbolic beginning of a more multicultural Britain'.<sup>125</sup> A representational moment where Britain irreversibly changed from a monoracial nation into one that has, slowly and gradually, accepted racialised Britons 'as something *pretty close* to family'.<sup>126</sup> However, where does this leave those who don't neatly fit into the 'Windrush myth'? As this study has demonstrated, the manufactured centrality of this 'Windrush-as-origins' narrative has diminished and downplayed the experiences of racialised Britons who have lived, arrived, and contributed through different means before or after the *Windrush* made its now famous journey to these shores. Their life stories have often been downplayed or distorted in attempts to locate them within generally accepted mainstream histories of modern Britain. If, as Andrea Levy suggested in *Small Island*, the narrative of racialised Britons often characterised as starting with the *Windrush* is something of a 'shared history', a more nuanced consideration is

required of how such shared histories are constructed, who they include, and who they have excluded.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Financial Times*, 7 November 2018.

<sup>2</sup> Salandy-Brown, 'Andrea Levy'.

<sup>3</sup> *The Times*, 3 January 1998.

<sup>4</sup> Lowe, 'Remember the Ship', 546.

<sup>5</sup> Levy, *Small Island*

<sup>6</sup> The annual Windrush Day has been criticised as a tokenistic reaction to the ongoing 'Windrush scandal'. See, for example: Perry, 'Windrush Narrative'.

<sup>7</sup> Grant, *Homecoming*.

<sup>8</sup> Perry, *London is the place for me*, 13.

<sup>9</sup> David Miles, *The Tribes of Britain* (London, 2005), 440 cited in Korte and Pirker, *Black History*, 26; Holmes, *John Bull's Island*, 220; Phillips and Phillips, *Windrush*, 6.

<sup>10</sup> Sewell, *The Windrush Legacy*, 1; Lunn, 'The British state and immigration, 1945-51', 162; Mead, 'Empire Windrush', 143.

<sup>11</sup> *Guardian*, 28 June 1997.

<sup>12</sup> Trouillot, *Silencing the Past*, xix.

<sup>13</sup> Schwarz, *Memories of Empire*, 8.

<sup>14</sup> Gilroy, *Ain't No Black*.

<sup>15</sup> Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia*.

<sup>16</sup> Williams, *Paul Gilroy*, 63.

<sup>17</sup> Burkett, *Constructing Post-Imperial Britain*, 7. See also: Carter and Joshi, 'Creation of a Racist Britain'; Paul, *Whitewashing Britain*.

<sup>18</sup> Gilroy, *Ain't No Black*, 45-6; Gilroy, *Postcolonial Melancholia*, 80-1; Williams, *Paul Gilroy*, 109.

<sup>19</sup> Evans, 'Across the Universe', 76; Sivanandan, *Catching History on the Wing*, xi.

<sup>20</sup> *Guardian*, 18 May 1998. The *Mayflower* transported English Puritans from England to the Americas in 1620, and has become a cultural icon in U.S. history. However, Tony Sewell has highlighted potential issues with such comparisons: Sewell, *The Windrush Legacy*, 1.

<sup>21</sup> For example, see: Cavendish, 'Arrival of SS Empire Windrush'; Goodhart, *The British Dream*, 195.

<sup>22</sup> Oppenheim, 'The Forgotten Voyages'; Lindsey, 'Halting the Tide', 73; Mead, 'Empire Windrush', 144; Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 164, 167-8, 179-80.

<sup>23</sup> Mead, 'Empire Windrush', 139-44; Lowe, 'Remember the Ship', 544-5; Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 167-8.

<sup>24</sup> Mead, 'Empire Windrush', 139, emphasis in original.

<sup>25</sup> Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 166-7.

<sup>26</sup> Mead, 'Empire Windrush', 144.

<sup>27</sup> Adi, 'Introduction', 10. See, for example: Fryer, *Staying Power*; Nubia, *Black Tudor Society*.

<sup>28</sup> Anderson, *Imagined Communities*; Hobsbawm and Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition*; Samuel and Thompson, 'Introduction', 4.

<sup>29</sup> Franklin, 'The Future of Newspapers', 635; Fenton, 'De-democratizing the News?'

<sup>30</sup> Alibhai-Brown, 'The Media and Race Relations', 118-9.

<sup>31</sup> Cole, 'Newspapers and the Net', 35.

<sup>32</sup> *Sun*, 14 June 2008.

<sup>33</sup> Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 171. He attempted to recover some such diverse accounts, particularly of women and African migrants: *Ibid.*, 161-210.

<sup>34</sup> *Financial Times*, 13 June 1998.

<sup>35</sup> Chessum, 'Race and Immigration', 46.

<sup>36</sup> Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 192; Perry, 'Windrush Narrative'.

<sup>37</sup> *Guardian*, 16 June 2011.

<sup>38</sup> This is a far from perfect methodology. See: Zhang, 'Pitfalls of Using Google Ngram'.

<sup>39</sup> Banton, 'Recent Migration', 10. See: Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 163-8.

<sup>40</sup> Pilkington, *Beyond the Mother Country*, 154.

- 
- <sup>41</sup> Lambeth Council, *The Voice* newspaper and South London Press, *Forty Winters On*.
- <sup>42</sup> *Independent*, 27 June 1998.
- <sup>43</sup> Pirker, 'Interview with Mike Phillips'.
- <sup>44</sup> Prince of Wales, 'A speech by HRH The Prince of Wales at the S.S. Empire Windrush Reception, St James's Palace State Apartments', 25 June 1998 cited in Korte and Pirker, *Black History*, 27.
- <sup>45</sup> The Windrush Foundation was established by Sam King and Arthur Torrington in 1996. Korte and Pirker, *Black History*, 11-12, 20; Lowe, 'Remember the Ship', 543; Cannadine (ed.), *History and the Media*.
- <sup>46</sup> *Financial Times*, 30 May 1998.
- <sup>47</sup> *The Sunday Times*, 31 May 1998.
- <sup>48</sup> Wambu (ed.), *Empire Windrush*, 20. See: Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 186.
- <sup>49</sup> Korte and Pirker, *Black History*, 35-6.
- <sup>50</sup> Lowe, 'Remember the Ship', 545.
- <sup>51</sup> *Guardian*, 18 May 1998.
- <sup>52</sup> Pirker, 'Interview with Mike Phillips'.
- <sup>53</sup> *Guardian*, 16 May 1998.
- <sup>54</sup> *Sun*, 14 June 2008.
- <sup>55</sup> Lowe, 'Remember the Ship', 543.
- <sup>56</sup> *Guardian*, 11 July 1998; *Sunday Mirror*, 10 May 1998.
- <sup>57</sup> *The Times*, 5 June 1998. See: Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 173-5.
- <sup>58</sup> *Independent*, 29 September 1998.
- <sup>59</sup> *Daily Mail*, 2 March 1999.
- <sup>60</sup> *Independent*, 31 August 1998.
- <sup>61</sup> *Financial Times*, 30 May 1998.
- <sup>62</sup> Lowe, 'Remember the Ship', 542-4.
- <sup>63</sup> Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 169, 192, 198.
- <sup>64</sup> *Independent*, 17 May 1998.
- <sup>65</sup> *The Times*, 2 May 1998.
- <sup>66</sup> *Independent*, 29 September 1998.
- <sup>67</sup> *Mail on Sunday*, 7 June 1998.
- <sup>68</sup> *Independent*, 2 June 1998.
- <sup>69</sup> *Financial Times*, 13 June 1998; Lowe, 'Remember the Ship', 542.
- <sup>70</sup> Macpherson, *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry*. See: Bridges, 'The Lawrence Inquiry'; Hall, 'From Scarman to Stephen Lawrence'.
- <sup>71</sup> *Financial Times*, 4 July 1998.
- <sup>72</sup> *Observer*, 15 October 2000.
- <sup>73</sup> *Irish Times*, 6 June 1998.
- <sup>74</sup> *Observer*, 10 January 1999.
- <sup>75</sup> *The Times*, 1 October 1999.
- <sup>76</sup> *Daily Mail*, 24 July 1998.
- <sup>77</sup> *Daily Mail*, 6 June 1998.
- <sup>78</sup> *The Sunday Times*, 1 July 2012; *Guardian*, 9 March 2013.
- <sup>79</sup> *Daily Telegraph*, 10 January 2006; Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 166.
- <sup>80</sup> *Guardian*, 29 July 2012.
- <sup>81</sup> *The Times*, 30 July 2012.
- <sup>82</sup> *Guardian*, 13 August 2012.
- <sup>83</sup> *Guardian*, 29 July 2012.
- <sup>84</sup> *Guardian*, 1 August 2012.
- <sup>85</sup> *Daily Mail*, 2 August 2012.
- <sup>86</sup> *Independent*, 6 September 2014.
- <sup>87</sup> *Daily Telegraph*, 28 July 2012.
- <sup>88</sup> *Sunday Express*, 29 July 2012.
- <sup>89</sup> *Independent*, 28 July 2012.
- <sup>90</sup> *The Times*, 20 April 2018.
- <sup>91</sup> *Daily Mirror*, 21 April 2018.
- <sup>92</sup> UK Government News, 'Tribute to Windrush Generation'.
- <sup>93</sup> *Daily Telegraph*, 25 May 2012.

- 
- <sup>94</sup> Conservative Party, *Conservative Manifesto 2010*, 21; Simon Hattenstone, 'Why was the scheme behind May's 'Go Home' vans called Operation Vaken?', *Guardian*, 26 April 2018 cited in Cole, *The Hostile Environment*, 29.
- <sup>95</sup> See: Cole, *The Hostile Environment*.
- <sup>96</sup> HC Deb 22 October 2013 vol.569 c.158.
- <sup>97</sup> See: Gentleman, *The Windrush Betrayal*.
- <sup>98</sup> *Daily Telegraph*, 28 April 2018.
- <sup>99</sup> *Sunday Telegraph*, 29 April 2018.
- <sup>100</sup> *Financial Times*, 17 April 2018.
- <sup>101</sup> *Daily Mail*, 1 May 2018.
- <sup>102</sup> The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance criticised the *Sun* and *Daily Mail* for printing 'hate speech' headlines that 'encourage prejudice': ECRI, 'Report on the United Kingdom'.
- <sup>103</sup> *The Times*, 16 May 2018; Gentleman, *The Windrush Betrayal*, 277.
- <sup>104</sup> *Guardian*, 6 July 2019.
- <sup>105</sup> *Daily Mail*, 17 April 2018; *Daily Mail*, 7 June 2018.
- <sup>106</sup> *Daily Mail*, 21 April 2018.
- <sup>107</sup> *Mail on Sunday*, 22 April 2018.
- <sup>108</sup> *Mail on Sunday*, 22 April 2018, emphasis added.
- <sup>109</sup> *Independent*, 29 April 2018.
- <sup>110</sup> *Guardian*, 1 August 2018.
- <sup>111</sup> *Guardian*, 20 April 2018.
- <sup>112</sup> *Independent*, 30 April 2018.
- <sup>113</sup> See: Khan, 'Refugees, Migrants, Windrush and Brexit', 107.
- <sup>114</sup> Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 183-5.
- <sup>115</sup> *Guardian*, 9 March 2020.
- <sup>116</sup> *Guardian*, 13 May 2018; Wells, 'Where the public stands on immigration'.
- <sup>117</sup> Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 182.
- <sup>118</sup> *Guardian*, 14 September 2019; Gentleman, *The Windrush Betrayal*, 9.
- <sup>119</sup> *Guardian*, 25 January 2010.
- <sup>120</sup> *Independent*, 29 May 2019; Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 167-8.
- <sup>121</sup> Pirker, 'Interview with Mike Phillips'.
- <sup>122</sup> *Guardian*, 30 October 2014. See: Kushner, *Battle of Britishness*, 186-210.
- <sup>123</sup> *Independent*, 3 March 2019.
- <sup>124</sup> *Guardian*, 22 June 2019.
- <sup>125</sup> *Guardian*, 22 June 2019.
- <sup>126</sup> *Mail on Sunday*, 22 April 2018, emphasis added.

## References

- Adi, Hakim, 'Introduction', in Adi (ed.), *Black British History: New Perspectives from Roman Times to the Present Day*. London: Zed Books, 2019, 1-14.
- Alibhai-Brown, Yasmin, 'The Media and Race Relations' in Tessa Blackstone, Bhikhu Parekh and Peter Sanders (eds), *Race Relations in Britain: A Developing Agenda*. London: Routledge, 1998, 111-27.
- Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London, Verso, 1983.
- Banton, Michael, 'Recent Migration from West Africa and the West Indies to the United Kingdom', *Population Studies*, 7:1 (July 1953), 2-13.
- Bridges, Lee, 'The Lawrence Inquiry – Incompetence, Corruption, and Institutional Racism', *Journal of Law and Society*, 26:3 (1999), 298-322.
- Burkett, Jodi, *Constructing Post-Imperial Britain: Britishness, 'Race' and the Radical Left in the 1960s*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

- 
- Cannadine, David (ed.), *History and the Media*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Carter, Bob and Shirley Joshi, 'The Role of Labour in the Creation of a Racist Britain', *Race & Class*, 25:3 (1984), 53-70.
- Cavendish, Richard, 'Arrival of SS Empire Windrush', *History Today*, 48:6 (June 1998).
- Chessum, Lorna, 'Race and Immigration in the Leicester Local Press 1945-62', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 17:2 (1998), 36-56.
- Cole, Mike, *Theresa May, The Hostile Environment and Public Pedagogies of Hate and Threat*. London: Routledge, 2019.
- Cole, Peter, 'Newspapers and the Net – Peaceful Coexistence or Fight to the Death?', in David Nicholas and Ian Rowlands (eds), *The Internet: Its Impact and Evaluation*. London: Aslib, 2000, 29-42.
- Conservative Party, *Invitation to Join the Government of Britain: The Conservative Manifesto 2010*. London: The Conservative Party, 2010.
- European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI), 'ECRI Report on the United Kingdom (fifth monitoring cycle)', 4 October 2016, <https://rm.coe.int/fifth-report-on-the-united-kingdom/16808b5758> [accessed 01/12/19].
- Evans, Neil, 'Across the Universe: Racial Violence and the Post-war Crisis in Imperial Britain, 1919-25', *Immigrants & Minorities*, 13:2-3 (1994), 59-88.
- Fenton, Natalie, 'De-democratizing the News? New Media and the Structural Practices of Journalism', in Eugenia Siapera and Andreas Veglis (eds), *The Handbook of Global Online Journalism*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012, 119-34.
- Franklin, Bob, 'The Future of Newspapers', *Journalism Studies*, 9:5 (2008), 630-41.
- Fryer, Peter, *Staying Power: The History of Black People in Britain*. London: Pluto, 1984.
- Gentleman, Amelia, *The Windrush Betrayal: Exposing the Hostile Environment*. London: Guardian Faber, 2019.
- Gilroy, Paul, *Postcolonial Melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Gilroy, Paul, *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack: The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*. London: Hutchinson, 1987.
- Goodhart, David, *The British Dream: Successes and Failures of Post-War Immigration*. London: Atlantic Books, 2014.
- Grant, Colin, *Homecoming: Voices of the Windrush Generation*. London: Random House, 2019.
- Hall, Stuart, 'From Scarman to Stephen Lawrence', *History Workshop Journal*, 48 (1999), 187-97.
- Hobsbawm, Eric and Terence Ranger (eds), *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Holmes, Colin, *John Bull's Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871-1971*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Khan, Yasmin, 'Refugees, Migrants, Windrush and Brexit', in Stuart Ward and Astrid Rasch (eds), *Embers of Empire in Brexit Britain*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019, 101-10.

- 
- Korte, Barbara and Eva Ulrike Pirker, *Black History – White History: Britain’s Historical Programme between Windrush and Wilberforce*. London: Transcript, 2011.
- Kushner, Tony, *The Battle of Britishness: Migrant Journeys, 1685 to the Present*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010.
- Lambeth Council, The Voice newspaper and South London Press, *Forty Winters On: Memories of Britain’s Postwar Caribbean Immigrants*. London: London Borough of Lambeth, 1988.
- Levy, Andrea, *Small Island*. London: Review, 2004.
- Lindsey, Lydia, ‘Halting the Tide: Responses to West Indian Immigration to Britain, 1946-1952’, *Journal of Caribbean History*, 26:1 (1992), 62-96.
- Lowe, Hannah, ‘“Remember the Ship”: Narrating the Empire Windrush’, *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 54:4 (2018), 542-55.
- Lunn, Kenneth, ‘The British State and Immigration, 1945-51: New Light on the Empire Windrush’, *Immigrants & Minorities*, 8:1-2 (1989), 161-74.
- Macpherson, Sir William, *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: Report of an Inquiry by Sir William Macpherson of Cluny*. London: Stationery Office, 1999.
- Mead, Matthew, ‘Empire Windrush: The Cultural Memory of an Imaginary Arrival’, *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 45:2 (2009), 137-49.
- Nubia, Onyeka, *England’s Other Countrymen: Black Tudor Society*. London: Zed Books, 2019.
- Oppenheim, Naomi, ‘The Forgotten Voyages: beyond Windrush’, 5 July 2018, <https://blogs.bl.uk/americas/2018/07/the-forgotten-voyages-beyond-windrush.html> [accessed 17/10/2019].
- Paul, Kathleen, *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era*. London: Cornell University Press, 1997.
- Perry, Kennetta Hammond, ‘Undoing the Work of the Windrush Narrative’, *History Workshop*, (September 2018), <http://www.historyworkshop.org.uk/undoing-the-work-of-the-windrush-narrative/> [accessed 05/11/19].
- Perry, Kennetta Hammond, *London is the Place for me: Black Britons, Citizenship and the Politics of Race*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Phillips, Mike and Trevor Phillips, *Windrush: The Irresistible Rise of Multi-Racial Britain*. London: HarperCollins, 1998.
- Pilkington, Edward, *Beyond the Mother Country: West Indians and the Notting Hill White Riots*. London: Tauris, 1988.
- Pirker, Eva Ulrike, ‘“For me, Familiarity and Strangeness is about Right”: An Interview with Mike Phillips’, 2004, <http://www.freidok.uni-freiburg.de/volltexte/3316> [accessed 04/11/2019].
- Salandy-Brown, Marina, ‘Andrea Levy: “This was not a Small Story”’, *Caribbean Beat*, 70 (November/December 2004), 38-9.
- Samuel, Raphael and Paul Thompson, ‘Introduction’, in Samuel and Thompson (eds), *The Myths We Live By*. London: Routledge, 1990, 1-22.

---

Schwarz, Bill, *Memories of Empire, Volume 1: The White Man's World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Sewell, Tony, *Keep on Moving: The Windrush Legacy: The Black Experience in Britain from 1948*. London: Voice Enterprises, 1998.

Sivanandan, Ambalavaner, *Catching History on the Wing: Race, Culture and Globalisation*. London: Pluto Press, 2008.

Trouillot, Michel-Rolph, *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1995.

UK Government News, 'Prime Minister Pays Tribute to Windrush Generation', 22 June 2013, <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/prime-minister-pays-tribute-to-windrush-generation> [accessed 05/11/19].

Wambu, Onyekachi (ed.), *Empire Windrush: Fifty Years of Writing about Black Britain*. London: Gollancz, 1998.

Wells, Anthony, 'YouGov: Where the Public Stands on Immigration', 27 April 2018, <https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2018/04/27/where-public-stands-immigration> [accessed 09/11/19].

Williams, Paul, *Paul Gilroy*. London: Taylor and Francis, 2003.

Zhang, Sarah, 'The Pitfalls of Using Google Ngram to Study Language', *Wired*, 12 October 2015, <https://www.wired.com/2015/10/pitfalls-of-studying-language-with-google-ngram/> [accessed 12/11/19].