Windrush (1948) and Rivers of Blood (1968): Legacy and Assessment
Université de Picardie Jules Verne, Amiens : 24-25 May 2018
Logis du Roy

Thursday 24 May

9h00 Arrival of conference participants
9h30 Introduction
9h45 Keynote - Patrick Vernon OBE:

"Many Rivers To Cross: The Legacy of Enoch Powell in Wolverhampton"

10h30 Questions and discussion

10h45 Coffee

11h00 Panel 1 – Powell and Rivers of Blood: context and reactions

- David Shiels, Wolfson College, Cambridge: "Enoch Powell and the politics of Empire, 1948-1968"
- Neal Allen, Wichita State University: "Citizen Backlash Correspondence: Letters to Enoch Powell after 'Rivers of Blood'"

12h15 Lunch

14h15 Panel 2 – Rivers of Blood

- Carlos Navarro, Universidad Complutense de Madrid: "One among others. How the Empire Windrush event and the Rivers of Blood speech shaped the binary concepts of 'Nation – Englishness' and 'Race – Immigration' in Stuart Hall's work."
- Pascal Cudicio, Université de Paris 2 Panthéon-Assas: "Chris Hannan's 'What Shadows': What drama?"
- "What Shadows" - A conversation with playwright and novelist, Chris Hannan

16h00 Tea

17h00 Guided tour, in English, of Amiens Cathedral for conference participants

---

Friday 25 May

9h00 Keynote – Trevor Phillips OBE:

"2048: Europe One Hundred Years on from Windrush"

9h45 Questions and discussion

10h Coffee

10h15 Panel 3 – Windrush legacies

- Judith Misrahi-Barak, Université Paul-Valéry, Montpellier: "Letters and Chronicles from the Windrush Generation: Epistolary Sorrow, Epistolary Joy"
- Sharon Baptiste, Université Paris 13 Villetaneuse: "The Children of the Windrush Generation: An Oral History Study"
- Rick Blackman, Liverpool Hope University: "Forty Miles of Bad Road: the Stars Campaign for Interracial Friendship (SCIF) and the Notting Hill Riots of 1958"

12h00 Lunch

13h30 Panel 4 – The Windrush Generation in British culture

- Anne-Lise Marin-Lamellet, Université Jean-Monnet, Saint-Etienne: "'Is it 'cos I is Black?': Forever Other? Black Britons on Screen (1959-2016)"
- Josiane Ranguin, "'There soon may not be any West Indian left who made the passage to England': Caryl Phillips and the Windrush Years."
- Kerry-Jane Wallart, Université Paris-Sorbonne : "Capturing modes of togetherness: the 'British encounter' in some photographs by Pogus Caesar, Armet Francis, Dennis Morris and Charlie Phillips"
- David Bousquet, Université de Bourgogne, Dijon: "'Don't Call Us Immigrants': Reggae Music in the UK and the Rise of Multiculturalism"

15h45 Tea

16h Panel 5 – International perspectives

- Vincent Latour, and Catherine Puzzo, Université Toulouse-Jean Jaurès: "Framing and Legitimising Discriminatory Immigration Policies: A CrossChannel Survey (1948-1970)"
- Tal Zalmanovich, Hebrew University of Jerusalem: "Lessons from South Africa: Anti-Apartheid Activists Shape Anti-Powell Protest"
- Dirk Hoerder, Arizona State University**: "**Cold Winters – Open Reception:

Windrush and ensuing British out-migration with perspectives on British Canada and the West Indies Migration 1948-1960s"

17h45 Concluding remarks

*****

Abstracts

Neal Allen

Citizen Backlash Correspondence: Letters to Enoch Powell after 'Rivers of Blood'

When Enoch Powell made his Rivers of Blood speech in Birmingham on April 20, 1968, he presented a racialist defense of immigration restriction and opposition to the Race Relations Act as the only way a rational and clear-thinking Englishmen could react to the racial issues of post-war and post-imperial Britain. The Cambridge-educated classicist cast himself as the tribune of the British (or at least English) people, and their truth-teller against the naïve elites of Westminster. One writer from Manor Park London, of a letter to Powell demonstrated that this rhetorical racialism had followers: "I can assure you that not only support have you but 75% of the people in Newham, remember we live next door to them, fortunately some are clean, decent, but few and far between." Another writer from Manchester argues that MPs, "are there to do what we want and we want a ban on the coloured population, we don't want our grandchildren to be mongrels. England for the English."

The massive outpouring of letters to Powell after the speech show the contours of British backlash to immigration and non-discrimination legislation in the 1960s. The decision of the government to allow (and in some situations encourage) immigration of non-whites is often understood as a betrayal of the social contract with its citizens, and of the core values of the United Kingdom. Powell's correspondents see him as a lone defender of their economic status, social and medical health, personal safety, and the future of their children in the U.K. Black Britons are cast as unhygienic, with foreign values, and inherently dangerous and dependent on the state. The betrayal of white status by Westminster is particularly galling in that it gave away what Britons had fought for in the Second World War. These arguments are usually presented as self-evident, and obvious to the vast majority of citizens and Powell.

Powell's *Rivers of Blood* speech mobilized reactionary citizen activism across the U.K. Dockworkers across the country organized in opposition to Powell's removal from the Shadow Cabinet, in one case leading to a violent confrontation with local MPs. Research on the 1970 election has shown that Powell's speech led to a movement of anti-immigrant voters to the Conservatives, contributing to the party's victory. This paper draws on a sample of the more than 10,000 letters housed at the Staffordshire Records Office to illuminate the role of reactionary demagogic communication in stimulating opposition to racial integration. I discuss the role of race, Empire, and

economic interest in the mobilization of backlash. Preliminary analysis finds that explicit racialist arguments are quite common in letters to Powell. While the backlash of the 1960s was ultimately unsuccessful in halting non-discrimination legislation, study of its grassroots components illuminates the relevance of racialism in British politics.

*****

Sharon Baptiste

The Children of the *Windrush* Generation: An Oral History Study

This paper uses the methodology of oral histories to present the experiences of people of Caribbean descent who were born in Britain or arrived there as young children during the 1948-1962 '*Windrush*' migration period. The discussion is based on qualitative interviews conducted in 2012-2013 with thirteen second generation Caribbean men and women aged between 45 and 60 years old.

Two topics are examined. The first is primary and secondary education. For the interviewees, school represented the first lone face-to-face encounter with white peers and adults. The low expectations from teachers and low achievement of disproportionately high numbers of children of Caribbean descent in 1960s, 1970s and 1980s British schools were denounced in several publications (E.J.B. Rose *et al*., 1969, Bernard Coard, 1971, Swann Report, 1985). The oral testimonies were largely consistent with the information in these publications. However, despite having been deterred from realising their intellectual capacities to the full in childhood, many interviewees sought actively to overturn this trend and later returned to education and gained qualifications.

The second topic is an exploration of cultural identity and self-representation. The children of the *Windrush* generation were the legatees of cultural identities rendered incompatible by the colonial domination of Britain – their country of birth or adoption – over their parents' birthplaces. The analysis shows that like many others of their generation, the interviewees embraced their dual heritage in a way that reflected their unique cultural situation within the country's new postcolonial configuration. They thus defined themselves as being black and British but also Caribbean, notably in the case of those not born in Britain the majority of whom proudly possessed passports delivered by their birth country.

Through the testimonies of the everyday lives of the interviewees, the paper aims to reveal a combination of discrimination, institutionalised racism and general hostility towards their presence in the country at a time when the white indigenous population, faced with large-scale post-war New Commonwealth[1] migration to Britain, was demonstrating unmistakable symptoms of postcolonial melancholia (Gilroy, 2005).

*****

Rick Blackman

[1] The New Commonwealth refers to those countries which have achieved self-government within the Commonwealth since 1945 (of which India, Pakistan and the former British West Indies).

The Stars Campaign for Interracial Friendship and the Notting Hill Riots of 1958

In September 1958, in the aftermath of the worst racial disturbances Britain had seen in a generation, an organisation was born to combat the racism and violence that had erupted in the streets of Notting Hill. Although now synonymous with Teddy Boys who are/were seen to be responsible for the violence, the riots had organised fascists operating behind the scenes, in fact two groups were openly organising in the streets of Notting Hill. Oswald Mosley's Union Movement and Colin Jordan's White Defence League were holding meetings and provoking violence in the area at the time, Mosley was to stand in Kensington North ward in the 1959 general election.

Immediately after the riots The Stars Campaign for Interracial Friendship (SCIF) formed. It was a group of musicians; actors; authors, journalists and television stars who used their celebrity to organise against racism and promote the new multicultural society that was growing up in the years after the Empire Windrush docked in 1948. Amongst the many involved were: Paul Robeson, Claudia Jones, Cleo Laine and Johnny Dankworth, Frank Sinatra, Lawrence Olivier, Lonnie Donegan, Tommy Steele and Peter Sellers. Alongside these celebrities, local activists and groups made up of newly arrived Caribbean immigrants, organised dances and cultural evenings in attempts to disarm racist ideas. Set against a backdrop of increased racial violence and fascist activity, SCIF organised meetings and produced anti-racist newspapers which they distributed around the nightclubs of
Soho and in the streets of west London. SCIF campaigned against Mosley in the 1959 election.

At a time when the so-called colour bar was in operation all over the UK, and black and white people could not congregate socially in the same places, SCIF started youth clubs and night clubs where people could integrate, they could: talk together; drink together; sing together and most importantly, dance together.

Under constant threat from arson and violence SCIF was the first organisation to move musically *and* politically against the racism prevalent after the 1958 riots. SCIF was also instrumental in setting up the first Notting Hill Carnival in 1959. Like Rock Against Racism was to do twenty years later SCIF was a black and white organisation that used music as a political tool to combat racism. Until now they have been forgotten, lost in history, my book *Forty Miles of Bad Road* and the paper I am presenting is the history of this group.

*****

David Bousquet

'Don't Call Us Immigrants': Reggae Music in the UK and the Rise of Multiculturalism

Amongst the 'alien' cultural elements that Caribbean migrants brought with them to the UK on the Empire Windrush and in subsequent journeys, reggae music features prominently. The history of Jamaican popular music in Britain reflects the tensions and

conflicts around the arrival and settlement of black communities, and more generally around the emergence of a multicultural society. Reggae (and its related subgenres) became the soundtrack to all the major events in the history of Caribbean migrant communities in the UK, from early ska during the 1958 Notting Hill riots through roots reggae during the uprisings of the late 1970s and early 1980s to ragga and jungle at the time of Stephen's Lawrence death in 1993.

Reggae musicians have been overtly involved in the struggle against racism in Britain, notably with events and campaigns such as the Notting Hill Carnival or Rock Against Racism. Through their connections with African, Asian and white musicians, mostly within the British underground, they have also been instrumental in the creolisation of British pop music, which influenced the representations of migration and multiculturalism far beyond musical circles. This paper will look at the history of reggae in the UK, paying specific attention to the lyrics of British singers and DJs which document the emergence and development of a discourse on race and race relations.

*****

Pascal Cudicio

A Conversation with the Nation: Chris Hannan's *What Shadows*

What Shadows, the new, critically-acclaimed play of Scottish playwright Chris Hannan, stages Enoch Powell's Birmingham speech. It premiered at Birmingham Repertory Theatre in October 2016 after its newly-appointed artistic director had commissioned Chris Hannan to reflect Birmingham stories - Enoch Powell had long been an MP for Wolverhampton South West. It then went on tour to Edinburgh's Lyceum in September 2017 and London's Park Theatre in October 2017.

This purposely two-act play opens on a divided nation with characters going in pairs as a metaphor of division both in time and space. « How to talk to people we hate » are the first words, addressed by young black Oxford academic Rose who has come to remote Kintyre – the scene takes place in 1992 - to meet the older white former fellow professor Sofia, with whom she wants to write a manual on identity. She is also intent on meeting Enoch Powell.

Through Rose the playwright wants to take the audience into an emotional journey. The characters marry, team up and split, act one culminating in the re-enactment of Enoch Powell's speech. It is an invitation to renegotiate the social contract of a society turned multicultural. Easier said than done. It takes the international fame of Ian McDiarmid, who plays the role of Enoch Powell, to allow this catharsis moment.

The play questions our antagonistic feelings about identity beyond race. Echoing Lear's « Who is it that can tell me who I am? », it is an attempt to bring people together to start a conversation over who they think they are through the prism of a show, involving the responsibility of the author and the actors. It is not a history play but a contemporary, timely one as Britain proves divided with Brexit. It is a political play dealing with britishness.

*****

Dirk Hoerder

Cold Winters – Open Reception: British Canada and the West Indies Migration 1947-1960s

When the Windrush reached (white) Britain in 1948, (white) Canada had announced in 1947 that future migrations would not change the composition of the population. The "population", francophone Canadians included, was "British" since in colonial subservience no "Canadian" citizenship existed. Well-to-do British Canadians outmigrated during cold winters to the British West Indies, Jamaica in particular. By the early 1950s they intended to bring the nannies for their children, upon their return, to Canada. This set off a debate in government whether women from a warm climate had to be protected from cold winters or whether a slot in the labor market needed to be filled by in-migrants. The issues involved colour, citizenship, rotatory or immigrant labor and gender. While the debate differed from Britain, the results were similar: Caribbean in-migration, acculturation and citizenship, Notting Hill carnival and Toronto Caribana. Migrants from Haiti would later move to French Canada. I will argue that in Canadian society of the 1940s a strong current of opinion favored immigration, had been drifting away from Britishness, accepted – with strong racist overtones – "black" people, and move to multicultural perspectives before the policy was announced.

*****

Vincent Latour and Catherine Puzzo

Framing and Legitimising Discriminatory Immigration Policies: A Cross-Channel Survey (1948-1970)

Straight after WW2, Britain opted for a universalist approach to immigration (British Nationality Act, 1948), as the country sought to keep good relations with her colonies, past and present, as stated by Conservative MP Ralph Glyn during the House of Common Debates: "We have a responsibility in this house to see that nobody who is a genuine subject of the King and has held the position of British Subject, is deprived of that position. It is something of which we really are custodians […]."

This quickly led to a disconnection of immigration from the actual economic needs of the country, without avoiding a differentialist, racialised conception of New Commonwealth immigrants.

France, on the other hand, hesitated between a differentialist and a universalist approach to immigration. The differentialist approach was supported by General De Gaulle, as head of the temporary, postwar coalition government and by the *Haut Comité Consultatif de la Population et de la Famille* (HCCPF), a recently-created state agency, which advocated 'replacement migration', due to the country's substantial demographic needs. In De Gaulle's own words, the idea was to recruit 'people of good origin', in order to provide France with the '12 million beautiful babies' that it

needed. According to the dubious, racial theories defended by Georges Mauco, who despite serving as a notorious civil servant under the Vichy regime headed the HCCPF, people of 'good origin' were notably to be found in Germany, Northern Italy, Northern Spain, Scandinavia, England or Belgium. The universalist option, on the other hand, was defended by Communist ministers and the INED, another recently-created State agency: no restrictions, whether national, ethnic or religious should apply.

Universalism finally prevailed but as a result, immigrants were to be defined only in relation to their contribution to the national economy. This means that immigrants were to be kept at a distance from French society for the next thirty years, hence the expression *travailleurs immigrés* ('immigrant workers') which was used throughout the *Trente Glorieuses* period.

Across the Channel, for political reasons mostly, mass economic immigration came to an end as early as 1962, despite the country's continued economic needs. This change had been contemplated since the mid-1950s within the Conservative party and justified both in terms of the strain on housing and public services and in terms of the supposed impact on the very fabric of British society, as shown in a famous quotation by the Marquess of Salisbury taken from the minutes of a Cabinet meeting in October 1955.[2]

The end of mass economic immigration signalled the beginning of a new phase, family reunion, which arguably transformed the country's profile far more than economic immigration in the 14 years between 1948 and 1962. Under the Labour governments of the 1960s, immigration controls became more drastic still but were to be balanced by a unique anti-discriminatory legislation and a liberal interpretation of integration, distinct from any attempt at 'cultural uniformity', in Roy Jenkins's own words.

France, in contrast, stuck for a few more years to unskilled, mass immigration while neglecting, by and large, integration and discrimination-related issues, although a specific piece of legislation was passed in 1972 (« *Loi 72-546 du 1er juillet 1972 relative à la lutte contre le racisme* »), although it did not match in any way the scope of the Race Relations Acts passed in Britain in 1965 and 1968.

By then, colonial immigrants in both countries (Maghrebis and Africans in France; Caribbeans and Asians in Britain) became the targets of violent racist groups, testifying to the resurgence of a xenophobic far-right (e.g. foundation of the National Front en 1967 and of Jean-Marie Le Pen's Front National in 1972) while the old colonial right was becoming increasingly vocal, as shown in the comparative influence of the

---

[2] "The problem of colonial immigration has not yet aroused public anxiety, although there was some concern, mainly due to the housing difficulties in a few localities where most of the immigrants were concentrated. On the other hand, if immigration from the colonies, and, for that matter, from India and Pakistan, were allowed to continue unchecked, there was a real danger that over the years there would be a significant change in the racial character of the English people", CAB 128/29, C.M.39 (55), minute 7, Cabinet Meeting, 3 November 1955, quoted in Bob Carter, Clive Harris and Shirley Joshi, « The 1951-55 Conservative government and the racialisation of Black Immigration » *Policy Papers in Ethnic Relations* No.11, Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations, University of Warwick, October 1987.

Monday Club within the Conservative Party and the tremendous and long-lasting impact of Enoch Powell's Rivers of Blood Speech.

By the turn of the 1970s, the French and British governments had started converging towards some form of streaming of immigrants along national, if not ethnic or racial lines: the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act introduced the 'patrial' clause (to be strengthened in 1971), which favoured 'white Commonwealth' immigrants. In France, simultaneously, the entry of Algerians was drastically reduced in July and December 1968, while the *Rapport Calvez* (1969) upheld high levels of economic immigration, provided migrants were selected according to their ethnic origin, which clearly favoured the entry and settlement of Europeans (from Spain and Portugal mostly but also Yugoslavia), in contrast with non-European immigrants, who were either denied entry altogether or allowed in for a limited period of time, in keeping with the guest worker approach.

Ultimately, despite the sometimes conflicting mechanisms at work in both countries, the views of British and French political elites on immigration and integration differed far less than might be superficially assumed. This, in turn, explains some of the converging outcomes of their distinct approaches.

*****

Anne-Lise Marin-Lamallet

"'Is it cos I is Black?' Forever Other?
Black Britons on Screen (1959-2016)"

British cinema really started to deal with the question of black immigrants and their descendants in the wake of the 1958 Notting Hill riots thereby acknowledging the growing hybridisation/heterogeneity of the British working class. Most of the 135 films studied featuring black Britons are indeed set in a working-class environment though more recent films sometimes tend to show middle-class characters, particularly as part of an ensemble cast in rom-coms. Films can present extra or intradiegetic point of views depending on whether the main character and/or director is white or black. Since the late 1950s, British cinema has thus used various angles to study the idiosyncrasies, such as the importance of music, and the evolution of that minority in a professional and/or family environment.

Films have always pointed out all the difficulties and problems generated in a multicultural society increasingly under fire by showing recurrent types of rejection of black Britons: a direct form of xenophobia coming from the white working class (mostly teddy boys and skinheads) as well as a more indirect form of discrimination coming from middle and upper-middle class people with the related gentrification of former black neighbourhoods such as Notting Hill and Brixton (often criticised as a form of social cleansing and "whitewashing"); institutional racism especially from the police sometimes leading to reverse racism and rioting. These various forms of othering black people have led some of them to reclaim this otherness by developing tendencies towards insularity through philosophical and/or religious radicalisation inspired by the Back-to-Africa movement and Rastafarianism, alongside the

AfricanAmerican experience through the Civil Rights movement as well as the ghetto culture derived from gangsta hip-hop. Through this reflection on imposed or intentional otherness, films have constantly tackled the issue of British national cohesion in times of affluence as well as recession, hence their illustration of the evolving definition of the concepts of community and in-betweenness as well as their symbolical use of flags and accents.

Despite a somewhat depressing first impression (black characters often keep being seen as either threats/social menace or victims of multiple deprivation, like hoodies), British cinema seems determined to promote an inclusive agenda, first by acting like a medium of resistance overtly criticising other types of media and/or political parties deemed to be spreading racial hatred (such as tabloids, Powellism, the National Front); secondly by seeking to re-universalise the UK in order to better celebrate its cosmopolitan national identity, notably by focusing on interethnic marriages and mixed-race people, a form of blending in that counteracts and contradicts otherness/othering. That may explain why the gangsta/hoodie subculture is often presented like a false consciousness, and trans or post national identity as a deadend. Films rather seek to assert the Britishness of the black characters they portray and the black hero even becomes a nation saviour in some genre films. They also seem to wish for a repoliticisation of social issues. The rise in endemic violence on council estates, with knife or gun culture, and rioting are seen like the ultimate stage of identity alienation. Similarly, the racialisation of what remains class interactions is denounced as class supersedes race on council estates where both white and black youths are seen like a new disenfranchised underclass.

Some may see in that overall prescriptive optimism a well-meaning, roundabout attempt to re-establish assimilationist discourse but by putting the black minority to the fore thanks to the success of some films, British cinema tries to counter the disintegration/marginalisation of certain sections of the population by reasserting the necessity of a shared experience to pacify social relations. Additionally, the blending in of black Britons in most recent films may also be a sign that they are no longer just the product of a "cinema of duty" (Malik, 1996) and have finally been freed of the "burden of representation" (Mercer, 1990) to fully take part in a post-imperial view of Britishness on screen.

*****

Judith Misrahi-Barak

Letters and Chronicles from the Windrush Generation:
Epistolary Sorrow, Epistolary Joy

Transportation and migratory patterns to and out of the Caribbean are numerous and complex. From the Atlantic slave trade to indentured labour to more recent migrations, they have structured Caribbean reality and imagination. Going beyond the discourse of loss, uprooting, exile and separation, Caribbean literature has (re)presented these transportation and migratory patterns but also shaped the diasporic, or even 'metasporic' consciousness (Joel Des Rosiers, 1996, 2013).

Among the literary genres most often used, and played with, by Caribbean writers, the epistolary speaks to the Caribbean historical, geographical and mental space in very peculiar ways. In the context of the Windrush and post-Windrush generations, and of the migrations between the UK and its colonies, it is interesting to examine this revisiting of a genre that used to be associated with 17th, 18th and 19th century Europe, with the Enlightenment, and mostly with the wealthy and the powerful. The writers and thinkers who belonged to that Republic of Letters elaborated their own thought and relationship with the world through the letters they wrote, received and responded to. Whether those letters were 'fictionalized' or 'real', they became a laboratory, and the best possible translation of the self on the global stage.

From the 1940s onwards, a flurry of Caribbean authors have used the genre as the epitome of a presence beyond the absence. The letter is the diasporic artefact *par excellence*, sent across land and water when bodies cannot meet in the same time and space. It aims at abolishing distance yet creates a new time and space in which individuals can reinvent themselves, a laboratory redesigned. Authors like James Berry (*Windrush Songs*, 2007; *Lucy's Letters and Loving*, 1982), Linton Kwezi Johnson ('Sonny's Lettah', 2006), David Dabydeen ('Coolie Son', 1988) or Fred D'Aguiar ('Letter from Mama Dot', 1985) have used the letter to chronicle the migrations from the Caribbean to the United Kingdom, some thirty years later, and have helped us take a fresh look at the ways literature may have empowered a response to the xenophobia and racism Caribbean emigrants have been faced with.

*****

Carlos Navarro Gonzalez

One among others: Identity, race and migration in Stuart Hall as an immigrant in Postwar Britain

The arrival of immigrants to post-war Great Britain was a social and political shock, extensive in equal terms to the three spaces of analysis alongside the process of migration immigrant (subject) – space (location) - receiving population (society). In this paper I tries to analyze the problematics of this historical conjuncture from the texts and the memories of Stuart Hall, being himself one of those immigrants of postwar who arrived at the port of Avonmouth in 1951. In his writings we can firsthand study and from a privileged situation the discrimination by race, the emergence of the debate about alterity, and even racism within these immigrants by the tonality of their skin. This individual who sometimes arrived alone, and in other cases with his family, faced the questioning of his own identity as a valid individual inside a (still) colonial and racist logic. This ecosystem of discrimination and social tension not only reached the economic level, but also the educational, gender, political and spatial struggles within the city.

*****

Trevor Phillips

"2048: Europe One Hundred Years on from Windrush"

For almost seventy years official British attitudes to immigration have been shaped by two symbolic events. First the arrival of migrants from the Caribbean, amidst a cloud of anxiety and hostility; and second, the reaction to the 1968 speech by Enoch Powell, denouncing the government's policies on immigration and race relations.

The political and media establishment have presumed since then that the British public feared the social and economic impact of large scale immigration and disliked the cultural change wrought by non-white immigrants. For many, the surprise decision to leave the EU has been widely attributed to this combination of attitudes. The presumption of public prejudice may also explain why the UK's civil servants knowingly ignored the plight of the Windrush generation, assuming that sentiment could never be aroused in favour of people the government characterised as potential illegal immigrants.

Yet, when confronted with what appeared to be injustice to Caribbean migrants, the public response has been devastatingly hostile to this official point of view. As with the election of Donald Trump, and the steady advance of nativist political parties across continental Europe, the political, media and academic establishment consensus has once again been confounded.

Why? And how should the intelligent state respond to ensure that we apply the lessons of the past seventy years to the next three decades?

*****

Josiane Ranguin

« There soon may not be any West Indian left who made the passage to England »: Caryl Phillips and the Windrush Years

For Caryl Phillips, an artist born in St Kitts in the late 1950's and raised in Yorkshire, the Windrush Years are a pivotal moment both for the Anglo-Caribbean community and Britain. Caryl Phillips's body of work often reverberates from the shock waves provoked by Enoch Powell's 1968 speech that echoed the sentiment evinced by the1964 infamous slogan quoted in The Final Passage (1985): "If you want a nigger for a neighbour - vote Labour"(122). The writer has often felt compelled to engage in what he terms "historical repair work" (Kevin Rabalais, 2009) to inscribe the Windrush generation accomplishments within the British heritage and "recalibrate British people's perception of the main narrative of British history to include people whom they naturally exclude."(Maya Jaggi, 2000) This paper intends to explore the Windrush years as they are evoked by Caryl Phillips in his radio play The Wasted Years(1984), his novel The Final Passage(1985) and its 1996 TV adaptation he wrote for Channel 4(1996). A somber evocation of the pioneers' life written thirteen years later appeared in In The Falling Snow(2009). This recurrence points to the need to commemorate

rather than celebrate the Windrush Years: "My screenplay is primarily about the pain of leaving; that's more pronounced than the problems and triumphs of arrival.Throughout there are references to the pain of what one has lost: you can't stay in the country you would have loved to remain loyal to, and that pain is to colour the rest of your life."(2000).

*****

David Shiels

Enoch Powell and the Politics of Empire

This paper will explore the development of Enoch Powell's views on empire in the period before his 'Rivers of Blood' Speech in 1968. In the historiography, Powell is often described as a 'post-imperial' politician, one whose rejection of empire in the 1960s was at odds with the prevailing mood on the right of the Conservative Party at that time. Although Powell started off his political career as a still-passionate imperialist – for a time he was a member of the pro-empire Suez Group – he soon parted company with those who wanted to preserve British imperial power. Having originally favoured a consolidated imperial unity after the independence of India, he quickly revealed his misgivings about the development of the Commonwealth as a multi-racial organisation and became one of its most bitter critics. He also took a hard-headed approach to Britain's overseas military commitments, leading him to call for withdrawal 'east of Suez'. This message was a difficult one to articulate to a generation concerned about Britain's imperial decline. However, Powell's willingness to take up immigration as a political issue and his emergence as a populist politician obscured these aspects of his message. As recent scholarship has shown, Powell's anti-immigration views meant that he continued to speak to people who felt nostalgia for the empire – and to some extent showed that he still held imperialist assumptions about Britain's place in the world. A similar pattern can also be seen in his later attitude to European integration and his opposition to membership of the Common Market. Although rejecting the pro-Commonwealth rhetoric of some anti-Marketeers, he continued to define Britain as an Atlanticist, and anti-continental, free-trading nation, sending out a powerful message about national identity. Looking at the evolution of Powell's views on these subjects, this paper will seek to unpack the different layers of Powell's thinking about empire, stressing the continuities throughout his career. It will also suggest ways of understanding Powell's relevance in the contemporary debates on Europe and immigration.

*****

Kerry Jane Wallart

Re-evaluating the past: Caribbean London in some photographs by Pogus Caesar, Armet Francis, Dennis Morris and Charlie Phillips

In 1991, Mike Phillips edited a volume of Charlie Phillips's photographs entitled *Notting Hill in the Sixties*. The 51 photographs had been retrieved "from where they'd been lying battered and forgotten beneath a bed" (5); in more than one way, the pictures reclaim visibility in the public sphere. Mike Phillips's commentary opens and closes the

book and ensures that this recognition is operated for the reader. It includes numerous newspaper articles and oral testimonies gleaned from the archives of the 1960s and makes for a crucial contribution in documenting the life of then recent Caribbean immigrants in that part of London. Such an archival perspective is corroborated by mentions of Pearl Jephcott's 1964 study (*A Troubled Area: Notes on Notting Hill*) and draws the viewer's attention to the historiographic intentionality behind the volume. However, the repeated disjunctions between photographs and text intimate that the historian adds to the image. Where one sees anonymous figures, he reintroduces Michael X and Christine Keeler; where one sees nameless streets and walls he mentions the Black House and the Metro. Shots snatched at a funeral suddenly ring with an evocation of Kelso Cochrane. More crucially, there is an instantiation at work in the narration woven between the black and white images, as is revealed by how photographs appear in clusters isolated by pages of commentary insisting in various ways that "these people existed and exist today and did what they did" (7). Mike Phillips unearths these unseen photographs and reads them with hindsight, as when he states, in a temporal perspective straddling both past and present: "it's going to take us about another half a century to really get, not on an equal footing, but on a footing where we can dictate where our life is going" (109).

The insistence on the relevance of 1960s London to contemporary Britishness was already asserted by Jamaican critic and thinker Stuart Hall when he analysed the photographs of Armet Francis, a Jamaican artist who had arrived in Great Britain in 1955 to be reunited with his Windrush passenger parents ("Cultural Identity and Diaspora", 1990). I will show in this paper how the re-discovery of Charlie Phillips's work documents the urban life of Windrush immigrants in ways that ascribe that generation to an unavoidable, and sustained, subversion, how commenting these pictures triggers a movement of instantiation; this is also somehow the case with such other Caribbean photographers as Pogus Caesar and Dennis Morris, whose works I will briefly include. Just as West Indians have re-valued Notting Hill before being expelled therefrom (as Mike Phillips, along with Trevor Phillips, went on to show in their 1998 study), they have also been re-evaluating their own past, far away from such established re-appropriations as the 'Staying Power' collection of the V&A. Remarkably, such re-evaluation has seized upon contact zones between the white and the black populations and revealed how the Windrush generation not only shaped contemporary Britishness but also been aligned with its own past of ceaseless racial and social encounters.

*****

Tal Zalmanovich

Lessons from South Africa: Anti-Apartheid Activism and Anti-Powell Protest

In early October 1969, Britons tuned into ITV in anticipation of a confrontation between two charismatic leaders: Tory MP, Enoch Powell, and the Bishop of Stepney, Anglican monk, and anti-apartheid activist, Trevor Huddleston. The programme entitled, "The Great Debate: My Christian Duty," was the culmination of a lengthy public disagreement between Powell and Huddleston. Their dispute originated with Powell's "Rivers of Blood" address the previous year, and

Huddleston's understanding of Powell's subsequent call for repatriation of immigrant as "evil." The televised debate presented viewers with opposing ideas about immigration, dignity and duty. In the debate, Powell employed an emotional vocabulary of invasion and loss to construct the nation as a subject endangered by the presence of "others." Huddleston, in contrast, argued that Britain would benefit from an increase in immigration rather than supporting legislation that further limited Commonwealth immigration.

Powell's "Rivers of Blood" address still dominates the historiography of the post-war era. In this talk, I use the televised debate between Powell and Huddleston as a case study to reveal competing voices in the contemporary discussion over race relations. The analysis of the debate, letters from viewers, and newspaper coverage, will reveal Huddleston's contribution to deliberations over immigration. In the debate, Huddleston presented a forceful portrayal of state-sponsored racism as gleaned from his twelve-year sojourn in South Africa between 1943 and 1955. He had harnessed his considerable reputation as an authority on and a witness of the injustices of apartheid to confront viewers with the potential dangers of racial discrimination. As importantly, Huddleston had used the television studio as a platform to call for solidarity in the struggle against racism in Britain. His performance stimulated anti-racist and anti-apartheid activists, lay and clerical Christians, as well as individuals affected by Powellism to congregate around him in support. Therefore, the analysis of the debate is an opportunity to examine how the experience of individuals such as Huddleston in former imperial outpost had impacted the politics and grassroots activism in Britain. It will also testify to the growing place of television as a site of political debate.

*****