Mike Cole skilfully utilizes the lens of public pedagogy to examine the increasingly hostile politics of the UK within this contemporary moment. By so doing, he shows the inextricable connection between conservative state policies and worsening conditions of racialization, violence, and economic decline, in lives of immigrant and other subaltern communities. In light of rising immigration and political antagonisms worldwide, Cole’s book is indeed a timely contribution.

Antonia Darder, Leavey Endowed Chair of Ethics & Moral Leadership, Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles, USA

Theresa May’s legacy will be the enduring images of ‘Go Home’ vans in neighbourhoods like mine, of children growing up without their parents and of black Britons being sent back to the Caribbean in chains. Not since Enoch Powell has Britain seen a minister so enthralled by the power of fear and hate.

Cole’s book forensically examines May’s time in office, the cost of which will be counted for years to come in the lost lives and livelihoods of those who have fought simply to live with dignity in an increasingly hostile environment.

Satbir Singh, Chief Executive, The Joint Council for The Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI), UK

Through the theoretical lens of public pedagogy, Cole incisively takes apart Theresa May’s hostile environment approach. This has been used to create misery for so many (including the author himself). The book is an exposé and the reader will be aghast at Cole’s documentation of human-rights violations. The book crosses many disciplinary boundaries and will appeal to everyone interested in social justice and how to achieve it.

Alpesh Maisuria, Senior Lecturer in Education Studies, University of East London, UK

Cole presents a Marxian discourse analysis of Theresa May in the form of an important case study of the interaction of media and policy that is urgently needed. This text investigates the cultural and economic scapegoating of the most vulnerable populations after the 2008 advent of the global recession, blame-placeing simultaneously used by conservatives to enact and justify austerity measures. Far from being a ‘moderate conservative’ as is often portrayed via commentators, May has used her political position for years to cultivate racist and xenophobic policies that are linked with the global rise of the far right. The reader will be able to trace a direct line from May to the disaster that is Brexit, including making connections between immigration policy in the UK and other countries such as the US. Most importantly, the text serves as a blueprint for how conservative parties enable the far right in the hopes that they can achieve their political aims, along with how quickly they can then lose control of the narrative once that happens.

Faith Agostinone-Wilson, Professor of Education, Aurora University, USA
Theresa May, The Hostile Environment and Public Pedagogies of Hate and Threat

Theresa May, The Hostile Environment and Public Pedagogies of Hate and Threat analyses Theresa May’s involvement in the creation and promotion of public pedagogies of hate and threat around the issue of immigration, which are used to instil fear, stress and anxiety among large sections of the population.

This book uses public pedagogy as a theoretical lens and examines the economic and political backdrop to the hostile environment, before moving on to a consideration of its creation and consolidation by Theresa May as Home Secretary and later as Prime Minister. The effects of the hostile environment on health and education are addressed, as well as its specific impacts on asylum seekers and women. The book also interrogates the Windrush scandal and divided families, as well as the author and his family’s personal experiences of the hostile environment. It concludes by considering the escalation of racism in general, the crisis in neoliberalism, and the case for a socialist future without borders.

This topical book will appeal to doctoral, postgraduate and advanced undergraduate students in the fields of education studies, pedagogy and sociology as well as those interested in UK politics.

Mike Cole is Professor in Education in The International Centre for Public Pedagogy, College of Professional Services at the University of East London, UK. He is the author of Trump, the Alt-Right and Public Pedagogies of Hate and for Fascism: What Is To Be Done? (Routledge, 2019).
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Introduction

When a country uses draconian terror legislation against people for peaceful protest, snatches others from their homes in dawn raids, incarcerates them without time limit and forces them onto planes in the middle of the night, due to take them to places where their lives might be at risk, something is very seriously wrong.

(The ‘Stansted 15’, on receiving suspended jail terms and community orders for attempting to stop an immigration deportation flight at Stansted Airport in March 2017, having been accused under terror legislation of endangering the safety of an airport, cited in Electronic Immigration Network [EIN], 7 February 2019)

This book is about the creation of, and promotion by, Theresa May of the ‘really hostile environment’, initiated in an interview with May in the Telegraph on 25 May 2012. In the book, I use public pedagogy (education that takes place outside traditional educational institutions and elaborated upon in the next section of this Introduction) as a theoretical lens through which to view this ruthless project, enacted under her stewardship, first as Home Secretary and then as Prime Minister. The hostile environment entails public pedagogies of hate and threat around the issue of immigration that is used to instil fear, stress and anxiety among large sections of the population. The pedagogies are accompanied by aggressive policies and highly restrictive immigration legislation.¹

I examine both the development of the hostile environment per se, and how it has affected, and continues to affect, individuals and families. The intended effects, it is argued, are personal hardship and financial struggle, as part of an assault on individuals and family life that leads to division and turmoil, and that undermines human rights for (prospective) migrants and for families. May’s overall intention is to deter immigrants from entering the UK and is part of her long-term and ongoing obsession with
reducing net migration to the tens of thousands, rather than hundreds of thousands.

As well as immigrants, the promotion of the hostile environment serves to root out people already here, perceived to be ‘illegal’, or not able to (easily) prove ‘legality’, and targets long-term British citizens who have been in the UK for many decades who are not able to verify their citizenship.

The hostile environment scapegoats vulnerable people and blames them for the dire consequences of Conservative (Tory) austerity measures, and in addition to being one of Theresa May’s key driving forces, appeases the Tory hard right, such as the European Research Group (ERG) and those racists who vote for the Conservatives, and works to contain the (future) rise of UKIP, and/or any other subsequent right to far right populist party or parties.

**Public pedagogy**

In this book I use public pedagogy as a theoretical lens through which to analyse discourse.

**What is public pedagogy?**

Social justice educator Roger Simon (1995, 109) has argued that pedagogy as a concept lends itself to a variety of sites for education to take place, that are ‘multiple, shifting and overlapping’. The concept of public pedagogy has been defined by key public pedagogy theorists Jennifer Sandlin, Michael O’Malley and Jake Burdick as ‘educational activity and learning in extrainstitutional spaces and discourses’ (Sandlin *et al.*, 2011, 338). Public pedagogy, they go on,

> has been largely constructed as a concept focusing on various forms, processes, and sites of education and learning occurring beyond formal schooling and is distinct from hidden and explicit curricula operating within and through school sites. (Sandlin *et al.*, 2011, 338–339)

‘Public pedagogy’ has appeared in academic literature since 1894, but its presence has only been significant since the end of the twentieth century, having greatly increased since 2006 (Sandlin *et al.*, 2011, figure 1, p. 341). One of its foremost advocates, Henry Giroux, commends the work of David Trend (1992), Roger Simon (e.g. 1992, 1995) and others for extending pedagogy’s ‘application far beyond the classroom while also attempting to
combine the cultural and the pedagogical as part of a broader vision of political education and cultural studies’ (Giroux, 2004, 61). As Sandlin et al. (2011) explain, public pedagogy involves learning in educational sites such as popular culture, media, commercial spaces and the Internet; and through figures and sites of activism, including public intellectuals and grass-roots social movements. In addition, Donna Kerr (1999) locates pedagogy within the act of public speech itself. Public pedagogy scholars thus pose a multidimensional understanding of public education in democratic societies and relate it to ‘the development of the ideological social-political nation within the consciousness and lived practices of that nation’s citizenry’ (Sandlin et al., 2011, 342).

**Promoting progressive social change**

The overwhelming focus of the majority of historical and contemporary public pedagogy theorists has been on the promotion of social justice for all. To this end, as Sandlin et al. (2011) point out, many have been involved in a counter-hegemonic project against neoliberal capitalism and its multiple manifestations per se, and/or against the oppression of multiple identities, such as gender, ‘race’, age, sexual orientation, and social class that it upholds. Moreover, although

the context and meaning of [public pedagogy] differ[s] in early sources from current parlance, in some ways the general axiological import remains consistent – the term in its earliest usage [dating back to 1894] implied a form of educational discourse in the service of the public good. (Sandlin et al., 2011, 341–342)

A central contribution to public pedagogy has been from feminist scholars, who have argued that the teaching and learning inherent in everyday life can be both oppressive and resistant.

(Luke, 1994, 1996; Sandlin et al., 2011, 344)

**Promoting hate and fascism**

Public pedagogy analysis has also been deployed to look at ways in which oppressive discourses are permeated. Thus Giroux (2010, 7) refers to a ‘public pedagogy of hate’ in the US, emitted by a ‘right-wing spin machine’, influenced by the right-wing media, in particular conservative radio talk show hosts, that ‘endlessly spews out a toxic rhetoric’ against Muslims, African Americans and other people of colour, immigrants, and many other groups (Giroux, 2010, 8).
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In a recent book (Cole, 2019, chapters 2, 3 and 4; see also Cole, forthcoming), I developed and extended Giroux’s public pedagogy of hate to understand how Donald J. Trump promotes hatred through his speeches and via Twitter. Trump’s public pedagogy of hate serves not only as an attempt to ‘educate’ the public at large, often to promote racism, sexism and climate change misinformation, and, on one occasion, to mock disability, but also to embolden and legitimate the views of individuals and groups associated with the alternative right or alt-right, and other far right groups with core fascist beliefs. Ongoing policies, I demonstrated, accompany Trump’s public pedagogy. The alt-right, I argued, are also clearly and manifestly engaged in public pedagogies of hate, but also actively promoting a public pedagogy for fascism, both in their quest for a white supremacy and a white ethno-state and in terms of policy recommendations for a neo-Nazi USA that embodies some key elements of classic fascism. The genesis and development of that book resonated with Sandlin et al.’s (2011, 363) call for ‘increased efforts by researchers, activists, artists, and practitioners to take up questions around educations that exist outside of institutional purview’, stressing the need to address ‘the species of pedagogy occurring in public spaces that might still elude our vision’ (Sandlin et al., 2011, 364). The public pedagogies of Trump and the alt-right are two such public spaces that had previously not been comprehensively analysed within public pedagogy literature. Just as Giroux (1998, 2000), in Sandlin et al.’s (2011, 344) words, is ‘collectively subverting dominant ideologies’, so are Trump and the alt-right, but from the perspective of the radical right rather than from the left. Whereas, as noted, public pedagogy has traditionally been for more social justice and more equality, that of Trump and the alt-right, I argued in Cole, 2019, is from the viewpoint of progressives, for less justice and equality. Thus Trump and the alt-right can be viewed as attempting to subvert ‘liberal democracy’ (e.g. Shattuck et al., 2018).

In Cole (2019), I also introduced new public pedagogies, including anti-fascist (pp. 94–95), anti-capitalist and pro-socialist pedagogies (pp. 97–115), which go beyond the social justice agenda of progressive public pedagogy theory, as well as a ‘public pedagogy for ecology’; a ‘public pedagogy of love’ and a ‘public pedagogy in reverse’, this last formulation referring to Trump’s use of ‘fake news’ to discredit anything that he feels undermines him, as far as certain news outlets are concerned: ‘don’t take any notice of them because you are being misinformed’. In this book, which focuses on Theresa May, I extend public pedagogy formulations still further, and thus further address Sandlin et al.’s (2011, 363) plea for greater elucidation of the efficacy of public pedagogy in illuminating unexamined pedagogy outside of formal educational institutions,
specifically to further explore anti-progressive public pedagogies of hostility as well as of hate, thus continuing to engage in Sandlin et al.’s (2011, 363–364) call for more work by researchers to take up educations that occur outside institutions that are not generally perceived to be ‘educational’. Importantly, I develop new articulations of socialist public pedagogy, including the inevitability and socially just imperative of open borders.

**From Trump to May**

While Trumpism has led to an increase in hatred *in general*, what Trump and May share in common is that they have both massively upped the barometer of racism, as well as unsurprisingly both being scored ‘somewhat populist’ in a major study (Lewis *et al.*, 2019).

The theoretical orientation of this book is Marxist. I take the position that it is a Marxist analysis that best explains the ascendancy of Theresa May (see the first section of Chapter 1, where I discuss the economic and political backdrop to the hostile environment⁶), and that also best informs a future socialist politics in a world without borders (see Chapter 5). However, it is not only those on the Left who have noted the ideological affinity between Trump and May. In his address to the UK Liberal Democrat Party’s conference in March 2017, its then leader, Tim Farron summarized some key political similarities between Trump and May. Farron referred to the ‘indecent haste with which Theresa May dashed to Washington DC to meet President Trump […] less than a week after Donald Trump became president’, the first world leader to do so: ‘It wasn’t just that … [the urgent liaison] looked desperate – begging for a new deal as we cut our ties with Europe. It was because’, he continued, ‘of the world view that Donald Trump represents’ (cited in Lindsay, 2017). As Farron argued:

> Here is a man who is building a wall, banning Muslims, telling the world that climate change is a conspiracy. A man who ridicules people with disabilities and jokes about sexually assaulting women. A man who claimed that President Obama wasn’t born in the USA. […] And it sent a very clear message. Britain is leaving behind our neighbours in Europe and all they stand for and hitching ourselves to Donald Trump and all he stands for is the new normal, the new status quo. Aggressive. Nationalistic.

(Cited in Lindsay, 2017)

During her infamous meeting with Trump, May mouthed enthusiasm for his election result – ‘stunning’, and what it meant for ‘blood relationships’ – ‘kinship’:
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Thank you for inviting me so soon after your inauguration and I’m delighted to be able to congratulate you on what was a stunning election victory. And, as you say, the invitation is an indication of the strength and importance of the special relationship that exists between our two countries, a relationship based on the bonds of history, of family, kinship and common interests.

(Cited in Campbell, 2017; emphasis added)

May then told of an unprecedented visit:

And in a further sign of the importance of that relationship I have today been able to convey Her Majesty the Queen’s hope that President Trump and the First Lady would pay a state visit to the United Kingdom later this year and I’m delighted that the president has accepted that invitation.7

(Cited in Campbell, 2017)

May’s dallying with Trump puts her, according to Farron ‘to the right of Thatcher’ (cited in Lindsay, 2017). Given Conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher’s enthusiasm for the ruthless Chilean military dictator Augusto Pinochet (Cole, 2018c, 276, 296, note 8), it is quite likely that Thatcher would also have fawned to Trump had history been different.8

While Farron has a good track record of opposition to racism, this intervention was in effect and in intent an open and over-optimistic bid to replace the Labour Party as the main party of opposition. It is littered with references to how progressive his Liberal Democratic Party is, but in fact the party is solidly pro-capitalist and, as we shall see in Chapter 1, formed a coalition government with the Conservatives for a period of five years. Moreover, rather than the internationalist outlook that would have informed a progressive speech, Farron’s address was centred around patriotism – ‘the most emotive and unifying thing that we have as a society’ – and the [patently false] notion that ‘the old debate between left and right, capitalism versus socialism’ is over (cited in Lindsay, 2017).

Outline of the book

In the first chapter of the book, I begin by addressing the economic and political backdrop to the ‘really hostile environment’, initiated by Theresa May, then Home Secretary in May 2012. Its genesis needs to be seen in the light of the financial crash of 2007–2008 and the onset of the Great Recession, followed by the austerity measures implemented first by a Tory-led coalition, and then by the Conservative Party itself. In order to make sense
of the relationship between austerity and the hostile environment, forged in a blanket public pedagogy of hate around the issue of immigration, and the deployment by the Tories of ‘the “race” card’ in the lead-up to the 2010 General Election (that resulted in the ConDem coalition Government), I introduce the Marxist concept of racialization. Having set this toxic background, I move on to an analysis of the naming, creation and consolidation by May of the hostile environment itself. This entailed the fostering of a most reactionary climate of fear directed at some of the UK’s most vulnerable people. The hostile environment is accompanied by draconian policies, regulations, legislation and rules, centred around May’s ideological and political obsession with reducing net annual migration to below one-hundred-thousand, and to be the one to herald the permanent cessation of free movement of workers. I focus in this chapter on May’s stewardship of the Home Office. In so doing, I note key changes in family migration rules, May’s controversial ‘go home vans’ and her moving of the second reading of the Immigration Bill in 2013. The subsequent 2014 Act is viewed in the context of ongoing racism in the run-up to the 2015 General Election, a racism that I demonstrate was not confined to the Tory Party. The result of the election was an outright majority for the Tories under Cameron.

In Chapter 2, I begin by noting that, on winning the 2015 General Election, David Cameron named Theresa May as a possible successor. I move on to an analysis of May’s 2015 speech to the Conservative Party Conference, in essence a bid for Conservative Party leadership. In the speech, consistent with her established ideological orientation, May uses public pedagogies of hate and threat, in an attempt to win over the Tory faithful, and to scupper UKIP. I go on to address the 2016 Immigration Act that amounted to a ‘doubling up’ on ‘hostile environment’ policies. Following the pro-Europe Cameron’s resignation in the light of a ‘leave’ victory in the EU referendum, May’s ambition came to fruition and she became Prime Minister. I continue the chapter, therefore, with a consideration of her fragile and unstable premiership. I discuss her offensive against international students, and her relationship with Donald Trump and his world view, which has been critiqued by leading Liberal Democrat, Tim Farron. I go on to address the 8 June 2017 snap General Election, a disastrous and failed attempt to crush all opposition to her. Next, I consider May’s pledge to end free movement once and for all, and her ‘jump the queue’ remark concerning EU nationals. I conclude the chapter with an evaluation of the 2018 White Paper on Immigration that has been described as the biggest single attack on migrant rights in a generation.

I begin Chapter 3 of the book with some snapshots of the ‘really hostile environment’ in action – in health and education. I go on to consider its overall impact on asylum seekers with respect to accommodation, the right to work, and detention. I then address the effect of the hostile environment
on asylum seekers who are victims of torture, before looking at the issues surrounding migrants trying to cross the English Channel, and Home Secretary, Sajid Javid’s response to this. I end the section on asylum seekers with a consideration of health care, and what happens if refugee status is granted. I conclude the chapter with an analysis of the specific impact of the ‘really hostile environment’ on women, with respect to both detention and domestic violence. As concerns the latter, I include a critical analysis of the Domestic Violence and Abuse Bill.

In Chapter 4, I begin by looking at an extraordinary event that became known as the Windrush scandal and that came to light in 2018. British subjects, mainly from the Caribbean, who had arrived in the UK before 1973, were detained, denied legal rights, threatened with deportation and some actually wrongly deported. I then consider families more generally who were, or are, divided directly as a result of the effects of the hostile environment, and examine what it actually costs in financial terms to obtain various UK visas, and ultimately for those who want it, UK citizenship. At the end of the chapter, I provide a personal testimony which outlines my own family’s and my direct encounter with the hostile environment and of being in a divided family, and estimate the costs for us, both in financial and emotional terms.

In the final chapter, I begin by posing the question, is the hostile environment crumbling or being ramped up? I move on to a discussion of what many see as a crisis on neoliberalism, a crisis that is receptive and potentially conducive to the promotion of public pedagogies for socialism. Accordingly, I then make the case for what I consider to be the urgent need for a left-led Labour Government. In so doing, I outline what such a government might look like before concluding by briefly making the case for a socialist future without borders.

Notes

1 For ongoing updates to UK immigration legislation, see GOV.UK (Ongoing).
2 This first section of this Introduction on public pedagogy draws on Cole (2019, 2–4).
3 Sandlin et al. are using ‘school’ and ‘schooling’ in their US sense to encompass all institutional education, not just pre-college, pre-university schools, as in the UK convention.
4 For a comprehensive edited collection on public pedagogy, comprising some 65 chapters, see Sandlin et al. (2010); and for a far-reaching overview of 420 sources, see Sandlin et al. (2011).
5 As I argued in Cole (2018a, 48–49), ‘race’ is a social construct. That this is the case is explained succinctly by neuroscientist Steven Rose and sociologist Hilary Rose (Rose and Rose, 2005; see also Darder and Torres, 2004, pp. 1–12, 25–34). As Rose and Rose note, in 1972 the evolutionary geneticist Richard Lewontin pointed out that 85 per cent of human genetic diversity occurred within, rather
than between, populations, and only 6–10 per cent of diversity is associated with the broadly defined ‘races’. Rose and Rose explain that most of this difference is accounted for by the readily visible genetic variation of skin colour, hair form and so on. The everyday business of seeing and acknowledging such difference is not the same as the project of genetics. For genetics, and more importantly, for the prospect of treating genetic diseases, the difference is important, since humans differ in their susceptibility to particular diseases, and genetics can have something to say about this. However, beyond medicine, the invocation of ‘race’ is increasingly suspect. There has been a growing debate among geneticists, I pointed out, about the utility of the term, and an entire issue of the influential journal *Nature Reviews Genetics* (Autumn, 2004) was devoted to it. The geneticists agreed with most biological anthropologists that for human biology, the term ‘race’ is an unhelpful leftover. Rose and Rose argue that ‘[w]hatever arbitrary boundaries one places on any population group for the purposes of genetic research, they do not match those of conventionally defined races’ (Rose and Rose, 2005). For example, the DNA of ‘native’ Britons contains traces of the multiple entries into the UK of occupiers and migrants. ‘Race’, as a scientific concept, Rose and Rose conclude, ‘is well past its sell-by date’ (Rose and Rose, 2005). The popular political slogan ‘one race, the human race’ would appear to be accurate. ‘Race’ as a concept should be abandoned. For these reasons, following Marxist sociologist Robert Miles, if I need to use the term ‘race’ as an ‘idea’, as a social construct, I put it in inverted commas. As Miles explains:

> I am rigorous in believing that there is a very clear distinction between an idea and a concept … insofar as there is an idea of ‘race’ that is a historical reality … [I] use the notion of racialization [the false categorisation of people into distinct ‘races’] to then seek to explain the origin, development and use of that idea.

(Ashe and McGeever, 2011)

The Marxist concept of racialization is discussed in Chapter 1 of this book.

6 The economic and political backdrop to the ascendency of Donald Trump is discussed in Cole (2019, 45–47).

7 No previous US presidents have had a state visit to the UK in their first year in the White House. As it turned out, Trump’s UK visit was downgraded to an official visit because of mass objections, while the visit itself was mired by angry protests from which Trump was shielded.

8 Thatcher also, of course, had an ideological affinity with May on immigration, having used her public pedagogy, which included on one occasion the adjective ‘hostile’, to threaten prospective immigrants, also in the context of getting the numbers down:

> if we went on as we are then by the end of the century there would be four million people of the new Commonwealth or Pakistan here. Now, that is an awful lot and I think it means that people are really rather afraid that this country might be rather swamped by people with a different culture and, you know, the British character has done so much for democracy, for law and done so much throughout the world that if there is any fear that it might be swamped people are going to react and be rather hostile to those coming in.

(Margaret Thatcher Foundation, 1978; emphasis added)

This was, of course, a classic example of playing ‘the “race” card’.
global neoliberal capital, and he did not point out that if Brussels and Strasbourg comprise the distant threat, the racialized ‘enemies’ on British streets emanate from Sofia and Bucharest.

The 2015 General Election Campaign began officially on 19 December 2014. In addition to the racist consensus that had been forged, the Cameron factor was important in the eventual result of the election. As Deputy Political Editor of the *Telegraph*, Steven Swinford (2015) put it, the Tories had always been acutely aware that Cameron was ‘significantly more popular than his own party’, whereas the Labour leader was ‘afflicted by the opposite problem – Ed Miliband [was] significantly less popular than his party’, a factor that was exacerbated by Conservatives questioning Miliband’s fitness to lead Britain. The Tories were also remorseless in their attacks on the Liberal Democrats, their Coalition partners of five years, with Cameron repeatedly visiting Liberal Democrat target seats. Finally, while Labour was riven by infighting, Eurosceptic Tory backbenchers were placated by the promise of an EU Referendum. (Swinford, 2015).

**Notes**

1 Here is not the place to engage with the complex debates pertaining to the cause of the crisis. For opposing views within the Marxist tradition see, for example, Kliman (2015) and Harvey (2015).

2 See Ryder (2014).

3 I say ‘right-wing to far right’ because although UKIP supremo Farage disassociates himself from far-right politics and racism, many of UKIP’s members and supporters do not. The embrace of far-right politics became increasingly the case towards the end of 2018, when a third senior UKIP member left the party over the decision of leader Gerard Batten (who describes Islam as a ‘death cult’) to appoint the anti-Islam activist Tommy Robinson (real name Stephen Yaxley-Lennon) as an adviser and take the party in a hard-right direction. Yaxley-Lennon is the founder of the far-right English Defence League (EDL), an anti-Muslim street movement.

4 Reference to ‘non-EU immigrants’ relates to the fact that Britain’s membership of the European Union at the time allowed free movement of people throughout member states. The main issue, as we shall see, that informed May’s determination to exit the EU was a vain attempt to reduce net numbers of immigration, her primary driving force throughout her periods in office.

5 Austerity/immiseration capitalism continues to this day (Butler, 2019; Centre for Cities, 2019; Hill, 2019), despite May’s false promise in October 2018 that austerity is over (Kentish, 2018a). In February 2019, the Institute for Fiscal Studies estimated that Chancellor Philip Hammond must find an extra £5 billion in the year’s Whitehall spending review to reverse planned cuts and demonstrate that austerity has really ended (following Theresa May, Hammond had claimed that ‘austerity is coming to an end’ in the Autumn budget of 2018). John McDonnell, the Shadow Chancellor commented: ‘The evidence is mounting that, despite …
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[the] rhetoric, austerity is not over. Nine years of brutal Tory austerity have wounded our public services and the whole country which relies on them’ (Inman, 2019).

6 From a Marxist perspective, capitalism relies for its very existence on the extraction of surplus value from workers who have to sell their labour power to survive: capitalists pay them less than the value they produce, with the value added by workers’ labour appropriated as profit by and for the capitalist when goods are sold. This is known as the labour theory of value (LTV). For an elucidation of the LTV, see Marx (1887), especially chapter 1. For a brief summary and a numerical example of how this works, see Cole (2011, pp. 42–44).

7 For an interesting discussion of the origins of the term, ‘hostile environment’ see Hansard (2018).

8 I put ‘working class’ in brackets because, although the measures pertain to all affected families, the financial requirements clearly discriminate against workers most. From a Marxist perspective, as opposed to a sociological one, the overwhelming majority will be working class because they have to sell their labour power in order to live, irrespective of whether they are middle or working class in its everyday (sociological) sense (see note 6 above).

9 I have changed the tenses of Richmond Chambers’ summary from future to present where coherence demands.

10 Interpellation is the process by which the legitimation, values, and attitudes required by capitalism are instilled in the populace. Interpellation is the concept neo-Marxist, Louis Althusser (1971, p. 174) used to describe the way in which ruling class ideology is upheld and the class consciousness of the working class – that class’s awareness of its structural location in capitalist society – undermined. Interpellation makes us think that ruling class capitalist values are actually congruent with our values as individuals.

11 Border Force is also the title of a regular documentary about the Force, broadcast on Sky Witness. Here one can see public pedagogies of hatred, contempt and brutality on the front line. One can only surmise what goes on when the cameras aren’t running. Television is, of course, and important medium of public pedagogy (e.g. Sandlin et al., 2011, 345–347).

12 The rest of this section of the chapter draws on Cole (2016, pp. 69–70).

13 See BBC News (2014).

14 The following analysis draws on Cole (2016, pp. 67–70). Cole (2016, pp. 70–83) includes a timeline of anti-immigrant and racist announcements and events in the seven months leading up the election on 7 May 2015. Two interpellative devices that continue to this day were particularly noticeable in the speeches of all the mainstream Westminster politicians prior to that election. They were a constant referral to ‘our country’, rather than ‘the country’, and a persistent reference to ‘working people’. The former worked to reinforce a sense of verified and demonstrated patriotism as well as a stress on ‘us’ and ‘them’ thus excluding ‘foreigners’, while the latter was useful to the ruling class on at least two levels. First, it served to render social class obsolete (since the term was working people, not the working class); second, it conveyed the message that there are just two groups of people: those who work and those who do not, thus denigrating those unable to find work and people receiving welfare. It also reinforced the myth of the Eastern European worker, who was just in the United Kingdom for benefits and free health and education. If anything was slightly more prominent than racism in the election run-up, it was fears over the demise of the NHS.
because of the effects of wars, arms sales, trade deals, tax avoidance and corporate behaviour sanctioned by Britain. It is outrageous to drain other countries of wealth and then refuse to give a place to those who lose out from these policies.

(Cited in Global Justice Now, 2018)

‘The freedom to move’, Lewis concludes, ‘shouldn’t just be confined to the rich or middle classes’ (cited in Global Justice Now, 2018). The case for a borderless socialist future is made in Chapter 5 of this book.

Notes

1  To be fair, it should be pointed out that the gesture was apparently nothing to do with close affection between the pair – but instead Trump was leaning on May while suffering a phobic episode. He is said to be scared of germs – but his fear of stairs and ramps is even worse, and is known as ‘bathmophobia’. A White House spokesperson stated: ‘He hates heights where you can see the ground or sharp inclines even more than germs. He particularly dislikes staircases and his biggest nightmare of all is a dirty stair rail’ (cited in Campbell, 2017). If this is the case, one would have thought he could have held May’s arm rather than her hand.

2 Farron’s speech, which was patriotic and anti-socialist (‘capitalism versus socialism, has been overtaken by a new debate about the sort of country we are’), is also discussed in the Introduction to this book (see pp. 5–6).
With both protests at Yarl’s Wood and the issues around domestic violence, we see how through a ‘critical examination of daily experience and the complex interactions of government, media, and popular culture, public pedagogy creates sites of struggle’ (Sandlin et al., 2011, 344). In these sites of struggle, ‘images, contradictory discourses, canonical themes and stories, and common sense versions of reality are disputed’ (Dentith and Brady, 1999, 1), and grass-roots feminist public pedagogy fosters movement ‘from positions of social inequality to ones of informed activism’ (Dentith and Brady, 1999, 2).

Notes

1 Theresa May was Home Secretary up until 13 July 2016; thereafter Amber Rudd. Rudd carried on in much the same vein as May. Some, like Jeremy Corbyn, consider that, having inherited a ‘failing policy’, she actually made it ‘worse’ (cited in Grierson, 2018).

2 The Global Peace Index, which lists countries for levels of peace, had the following ranks for 2018. Syria was the least peaceful at 163 out of 163, and Afghanistan next at 162. Sudan was at 153; Eritrea at 138; and Iran at 131 (Institute for Economics & Peace, 2018).
in the UK (see p. 27 of this book; and for full details, see Yeo, 2017). In the event that a dependent relative does, or relatives do, get leave to remain on human rights grounds (initial cost, £2,622), the granting of indefinite leave to remain takes a phenomenal ten years, and UK citizenship a further year after that. The ensuing costs for a couple are nearly £20,000 at 2019 levels to obtain UK citizenship after being granted leave to remain, amounting ‘to ten years of indentured servitude to the Home Office’ (Vassiliou (2019) provides an example and breakdown of costs).

The rules give no weight ‘to any emotional ties that might exist between older people and their adult children and grandchildren’ (Vassiliou, 2019). Thus, though in our case the ties with our Cambodian extended family are very strong – Lyka’s mother and father had looked after Meoun for the many years that she worked in the factories, and I have a very close relationship with the whole extended family, for whom I have been the main financial supporter since 2012 – having her mother and father come and live with us (even though we wanted to) was ruled out. Instead, we applied for a visitor’s visa for Lyka’s mother. This was met in March 2016, with the familiar response:

I am not satisfied on the balance of probabilities that you are genuinely seeking entry as a visitor for a limited period or that you intend to leave the United Kingdom at the end of the visit … there is no right of appeal or right of administrative review.

After four years of successfully ‘proving’ to the authorities that our intentions were honest, we were once again being accused of lying and colluding in so-called ‘illegal immigration’. Such is the nature of the ‘really hostile environment’. Notwithstanding occasional visits to Cambodia, until the demise of the Theresa May Government we have resigned ourselves to not even contemplating anything beyond remaining an extended family via Skype for the foreseeable future.

Notes

1 Husbands were not allowed entry until changes made in 1974 (see Hansard (1974) for the second reading of the Spouses of United Kingdom Citizens (Equal Treatment) Bill.

2 While reading this section, the reader may like to refer back to the heading, ‘Spouses and partners’ in Chapter 1 of this book – see p. 26.
and war, the environment, health and welfare, which would in turn necessitate a re-evaluation of our history, of our understanding of ourselves as a species.

(Younge, 2018)

Notes

1 Space does not permit a discussion of the origins of neoliberal capitalism. However, that is provided by Bramble in his article (Bramble, 2018; see also Maisuria and Cole, 2017; Maisuria, 2018.

2 I explained the Marxist theory of the tendency of the rate of profit to fall as capitalism advances in Cole (2019, 113) as follows:

   The central contradiction in the development of capital is ‘the project of expelling labour power from the capitalist labour process through technological innovation’ (Rikowski, in Rikowski and Ocampo Gonzalez, 2018, 14). The ever-increasing technological drive for productivity, in order to undercut rivals by making commodities more cheaply, means more machines (‘dead labour’ – since labour produces them) and less labour power (the source of profit) [for a brief explanation, of why labour power is the source of profit – the Labour Theory of Value – see Note 6, in Chapter 1 of this book]. Thus there is a tendency for the rate of profit (the ratio of profit to investment) to fall, meaning that booms get shorter and slumps, longer and longer and deeper and deeper. As Samir Hinks (2012) explains, profit can only come from human labour. ‘[A]s more and more capitalists invest in the new machinery the average labour time required to produce each commodity falls. This is what makes the rate of profit fall, as the ratio of surplus value to investment falls across the whole system.’ It is important to stress that this is only a tendency rather than a law. The solution for the capitalist is to attack workers’ conditions, for example, by increasing hours without increasing pay, giving workers less breaks, keeping them under greater surveillance and by laying off workers on contracts and replacing them with workers on zero hours contracts at very low rates of pay or the legal minimum wage if there is one.

3 As Bramble (2018) explains, the neoliberal project coincided with the advent of two other factors that further boosted corporate profitability. First, in the 1980s and 1990s, the large-scale implementation of computers and information technology cheapened constant capital (the value of goods and materials required to produce a commodity, as opposed to variable capital, the wages paid to produce it) and allowed a widespread restructuring of industry by making possible much tighter control over business operations extended over larger areas (and thus for example, the introduction of ‘just in time’ methods and the construction of international supply lines). Second, the arrival of China as a major player in world trade in the 1990s and 2000s was a boon for Western capitalism, in cheapening the cost of imported goods, depressing the value of labour power, and, for some capitalists, providing a big new market for manufactured goods, financial services and resources. For an excellent Marxist analysis of industrial revolutions, culminating in the fourth, and the need for a socialist revolution, see Craven (2017).
While quite rightly completely rejecting the absurd notion that the Labour Party, of which I am a member, is institutionally antisemitic, McDonnell has nevertheless acknowledged that the Party must be quicker and sometimes ‘more ruthless’ in eradicating antisemitism from its ranks (Sky News, 2019b). For a spirited defence of Jeremy Corbyn’s leadership from over 200 Jewish members and supporters of the Labour Party, see Guardian Letters (2019), where the signatories state that Corbyn’s ‘lifetime record of campaigning for equality and human rights, including consistent support for initiatives against antisemitism, is formidable. His involvement strengthens this struggle.’
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