WINDRUSH MEMBERS' ENCOUNTERS WITH THE 'HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT' AND A DEFICIT OF CITIZENSHIP: CENTRING AN AGENTIVE CITIZENSHIP EXPERIENCE

LIA STOREY*

This article is part of a broader, collaborative Oral History project working with members of the Windrush community to explore their experience of the 'Hostile Environment' and their own reckoning with a historical injustice, beginning pre-2012. This article focuses on the experience of three Windrush members and their encounters with the 'Hostile Environment' regime from 2012 onwards, particularly the actualisation of their exclusion from British citizenship as a denial of access to 'everyday' citizenship. Citizenship is interpreted from a grassroots level, through the individual's lens on how their life was uprooted in terms of their livelihood, security, wellbeing and social connection through encounters with the 'Hostile Environment' regime. During the data gathering process, a shared understanding of the activist nature of this research was established, creating a space within which participants were asked to reflect on and critique the state's bordering of British citizenship and the participants' identification as illegal within this. This article defends an agentive interpretation of citizenship as an experience that is holistically felt and made meaningful, consciously negotiated within state-imposed structures of law, enforcement and entitlement access, and then wielded as a subjectivity whereby individuals claim a more dignified existence. For members of the Windrush Generation who were left de facto stateless due to a lack of sufficient legal identification in the eyes of the state, their deficit of citizenship experience from the margins of British citizenship leaves them well positioned to critique and challenge the entrenched form of citizenship expressed through the 'Hostile Environment' regime.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I Introduction 38
II Centring 'Everyday Citizenship' within State Bordering and 'Illegalisation' 42
III 'Scholar–Activist' Subjectivities and Collaborative Oral History 46
IV The 'Hostile Environment' Regime's Bordering of Citizenship 49
V Encountering the 'Hostile Environment' Regime 52
VI Internalising 'Everyday' Exclusions 56
VII Conclusion 60

I INTRODUCTION

This research was part of a six month Master of Philosophy thesis project investigating how members of the Windrush Generation in Britain experienced the Government of the United Kingdom's 'Hostile Environment' immigration regime, launched by Theresa May as Home Secretary in 2012 and legislated for in

---

* Master of Philosophy Development Studies, University of Oxford, United Kingdom. Ethics approval obtained: this study was approved by the Central University Research Ethics Committee ('CUREC'), approval reference: SSH/ODID DREC: C1A_21_054. Informed consent: all participants provided written informed consent prior for the publication of quotes and for their names to be published. Thank you to the two anonymous reviewers of this article, the support of the *Statelessness & Citizenship Review* editorial team and Dan Hodgkinson, who supervised and guided the research project. A further thanks to the individuals who participated in the research and worked collaboratively with me to document the injustice of the Windrush Scandal.

2014 and 2016.[1] Thirteen Windrush members were interviewed overall, alongside three academic–activists, although only three Windrush members' experiences from 2012 onwards are included. The 'Hostile Environment' — now the 'Compliant Environment' as a rhetorical shift following the 'Windrush Scandal' — diffused immigration controls across 'the breadth of society' to check and potentially challenge the status, entitlements and belonging of citizens in all corners of everyday life.[2] For the people at the centre of this research, their experiences of the 'Hostile Environment' were deeply threatening, with the 'Windrush Scandal' involving a loss of legal rights and citizen entitlements, such as National Health Service ('NHS') and housing access, as well as wrongful detention and deportation.[3] Amelia Gentleman broke this story in *The Guardian* in 2017 after being contacted by the Refugee and Migrant Centre charity in Wolverhampton, following the detention of their client Paulette Wilson and her pending deportation.[4] This story was the first in a series that came to be publicly known as the 'Windrush Scandal', named after the generation of non-white, postwar imperial migrants to Britain who were asked as British subjects to help rebuild Britain, endured racial discrimination in doing so and then found their status as citizens rejected and their claim to belonging denied.[5] The Windrush Generation refers to an estimated 500,000 people who came to Britain as Commonwealth citizens or citizens of the United Kingdom and Colonies ('CUKC') from Commonwealth nations or colonies in the Caribbean, Africa and Asia between the time of the *British Nationality Act 1948* and 1973, when the *Immigration Act 1971* came into force.[6] This article is part of a broader 'scholar–activism' and 'critical public history' approach.[7] It works with Windrush members to explicitly challenge mainstream understandings of the Scandal beginning in 2012, with lived experience and academic evidence showing citizenship revocation post-1973 and decades before the 'Hostile Environment', whilst also

---

1 Colin Yeo, 'Briefing: What Is The Hostile Environment, Where Does It Come From, Who Does It Affect?', *Free Movement* (online, 1 May 2018) <https://freemovement.org.uk/briefing-what-is-the-hostile-environment-where-does-it-come-from-who-does-it-affect>, archived at <perma.cc/6N2J-BGC3>. Yeo summarises: 'The hostile environment includes measures to limit access to work, housing, health care, bank accounts and more. It is characterised by a system of citizen-on-citizen immigration checks.'

2 Melanie Griffiths and Colin Yeo, 'The UK's Hostile Environment: Deputising Immigration Control' (2021) 41(4) *Critical Social Policy* 521, 523.

3 Amelia Gentleman, *The Windrush Betrayal: Exposing the Hostile Environment* (Faber & Faber 2019) 14 ('*The Windrush Betrayal*').

4 Amelia Gentleman, '"I Can't Eat or Sleep": The Woman Threatened with Deportation After 50 Years in Britain', *The Guardian* (online, 28 November 2017) <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/nov/28/i-cant-eat-or-sleep-the-grandmother-threatened-with-deportation-after-50-years-in-britain>, archived at <perma.cc/35ZW-P98N>.

5 Amelia Gentleman, 'Windrush Cancer Patient Thanks Charity That Fought His Case', *The Guardian* (online, 7 December 2018) <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2018/dec/07/windrush-nhs-cancer-patient-praxis-charity-appeal>, archived at <perma.cc/78SE-BGXB> ('Windrush Cancer Patient Thanks Charity').

6 Adina Campbell, 'Windrush Generation: Who Are They and Why Are They Facing Problems?', *BBC News* (online, 27 July 2023) <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-43782241>, archived at <perma.cc/766T-ZRDW>.

7 'Scholar–activism' refers to a positionality and approach I adopted to simultaneously pursue the academic objectives of my master's qualification, whilst attempting to contribute to the activist efforts of Windrush members fighting for justice. 'Critical public history' refers to a historical framework of investigation I applied which identifies discontinuities between the lived experience of an event and the state's narrative, and the public's understanding of this event — in this case, the obscured historical roots to the injustice of the Windrush Generation's experience and the state's subsequent obstruction of a full reckoning with and recompense for this.

contesting the United Kingdom ('UK') Home Office's inadequate reckoning with and response to the injustice of the Windrush Schemes.[8] It was estimated that 160 'Windrush citizens' could have been wrongfully deported because of the 'Hostile Environment', although a further 11,000 people abroad have had their applications for citizenship denied in the wake of the Scandal, suggesting the number of those deported or denied re-entry is much higher.[9] However, this article will focus on those within the UK who experienced 'de facto statelessness', whereby a group with legal and notional claim to nationality are classified as not entitled to recognition of that claim within their own state based on a lack of documentation, leading to difficulties accessing rights and protections.[10] Whilst it was a minority of the Windrush Generation that experienced this (estimated as 15,000 people)[11] due to a lack of sufficient documentation, it raises the question of the 'quality and content of [their] nationality (or citizenship)', with Windrush members left to reflect on their 'ineffective nationality'.[12] The impact of this experience on the individual and shared sense of social and political belonging for the Windrush Generation has been profound, with the material and emotional harm of statelessness internalised and felt as a challenge to their subjectivity of belonging as a British citizen. Drawing from the feminist tradition, this article employs 'stateless standpoint epistemology' to prioritise the lived experience of Windrush members and their capability to '*recognise and challenge the historical, social and political arrangements that have persecuted them*' when discussing the conditions imposed by the 'Hostile Environment' regime.[13] This research promotes 'engaged knowledge with (rather than on or about) the stateless', to illustrate '*noncitizenist* accounts' of this event, meaning interpretations of citizenship (or statelessness) beyond statist logics, strictures and discourses.[14] This article explores how state bordering played out in individual citizenship

---

8 Angharad Closs Stephens and Jen Bagleman, 'Towards Scholar-Activism: Transversal Relations, Dissent, and Creative Acts' (2023) 27(3) *Citizenship Studies* 329; John Tosh, 'Public History, Civic Engagement and the Historical Profession in Britain' (2014) 99(335) *History* 191, 192; Mike Slaven, 'The Windrush Scandal and the Individualization of Postcolonial Immigration Control in Britain' (2022) 45(16) *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 49, 52; Windrush Lives, 'Victims' Open Letter to the Home Secretary', *Windrush Lives* (Web Page, 1 January 2021) <https://www.windrushlives.com/latest/m7mr9yde1modt7ffi2unwbosxvv8j4>, archived at <perma.cc/55DV-H5JE>.

9 Harriet Agerholm, 'Government Admits 83 Windrush Citizens May Have Been Wrongfully Deported Due to Scandal but Will Only Apologise to 18', *The Independent* (online, 22 August 2018) <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/windrush-government-deportations-british-citizens-uk-caribbean-home-office-rudd-javid-a8501076.html>, archived at <perma.cc/WCG7-KWT4>; 'WRTF_07: Number of Overseas Resolved Applications' in UK Home Office, *Windrush Taskforce: UK Visa & Immigration Transparency Data Q4 2020* (Migration Transparency Data, 26 February 2021) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/windrush-task-force-data-february-2021>, archived at <perma.cc/9ZZN-Y3WV>. See also Windrush Defenders Directors & Channels Research Group, 'Burning Work', *Windrush Defenders Legal* (Web Page, 22 June 2021) <https://wdlegal.co.uk/burning-work-1>, archived at <perma.cc/Z3RS-7SLF>.

10 Susan Kneebone, Brandais York and Sayomi Ariyawansa, 'Degrees of Statelessness: Children of Returned Marriage Migrants in Can Tho, Vietnam' (2019) 1(1) *Statelessness & Citizenship Review* 69, 77.

11 United Kingdom ('UK') Home Office, 'Windrush Compensation Policy' (Impact Assessment No HO 0329, 9 January 2019) <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/windrush-compensation-scheme/outcome/impact-assessment-ia-windrush-compensation-policy-archived-accessible-version>, archived at <perma.cc/J3AA-B7NH>.

12 Kneebone, York and Ariyawansa (n 10) 74.

13 Haqqi Bahram, 'Towards a Stateless Standpoint Epistemology' (2021) 3(1) *Statelessness & Citizenship Review* 113, 116.

14 ibid 114.

experiences, interpreted as the 'actualisation' of imposed legal, material and notional exclusion in the subjective and personal 'everyday' experience of citizenship, as the basis for understanding how new citizen subjectivities emerged in the wake of the Scandal.[15] This not only captures the depth and breadth of the harm inflicted by the 'Hostile Environment', but also proposes a more holistic and agentive approach to understanding citizenship as an experience, bounded by the powers of the state but felt and made meaningful in self-defined terms beyond this.

An Oral History approach and open-ended, participant-guided interviews were used, with discussions on material marginalisation branching into reflections on the connection between citizenship and national belonging, the personal meaning of losing one's legal identity and entitlements, and deconstructions and critiques of the state's 'entrenched' formulation of citizenship of which the 'Hostile Environment' is a part.[16] There are complementary methodological and ethical reasons for conceptualising citizenship from the grassroots up, including the promotion of 'epistemic justice in the face of the injustice created by ... structures of citizenship'.[17] By employing Oral History, time and space is given to participants to generatively explore this experience, highlighting the agentive and self-reflective citizen identity whilst exploring the concurrent experience of claiming citizenship entitlements, both enabled by this political–legal right and dialectically intertwined through the citizenship experience.[18] The citizenship experience when encountering the 'Hostile Environment' becomes a 'site of knowledge' from which individuals are best placed to explicate the 'full spectrum of the lived reality of statelessness', including 'interrogating and transforming' naturalised knowledge produced by the state.[19] Ethically, this article challenges the state's imposed identity of non-citizens for Windrush members who experienced 'de facto statelessness' by consciously attending to the experience and interpretation of these events in terms of the individual's embodied, intersubjective and visceral experience of citizenship in the everyday, conditioned by, whilst mutually exclusive from, the logics of the state.[20] This stance supports the 'collective struggles' of Windrush members to claim notional belonging through their entitlement to citizenship and to exercise their 'inalienable agency' to produce knowledge of 'Strong Objectivity'; invaluable information for a holistic understanding of citizenship and its multifaceted manifestations.[21] Therefore, this article argues for the idea of a 'citizenship deficit' to describe this experience of statelessness, with Windrush members denied their full, expected

---

15 James Holston, 'Insurgent Citizenship in an Era of Global Urban Peripheries' (2009) 21(2) *City & Society* 245; Simuki Chigudu, 'The Politics of Cholera, Crisis and Citizenship in Urban Zimbabwe: "People Were Dying Like Flies"' (2019) 118(472) *African Affairs* 413, 414.

16 Holston (n 15).

17 Bahram (n 13) 119.

18 See Alistair Thomson, 'Moving Stories: Oral History and Migration Studies' (1999) 27(1) *Oral History (Colchester)* 24, 31; Al Paz, 'Communicating Citizenship' (2019) 48(1) *Annual Review of Anthropology* 77, 85.

19 Bahram (n 13) 116.

20 Jen Dickinson, Max J Andrucki, Emma Rawlins, Daniel Hale and Victoria Cook, 'Introduction: Geographies of Everyday Citizenship' (2008) 7(2) *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 100, 104; Lynn A Staeheli, Patricia Ehrkamp, Helga Leitner and Caroline R Nagel, 'Dreaming the Ordinary: Daily Life and the Complex Geographies of Citizenship' (2012) 36(5) *Progress in Human Geography* 628, 630–1; Kirsi Pauliina Kallio, Bronwyn Elisabeth Wood and Jouni Häkli, 'Lived Citizenship: Conceptualising an Emerging Field' (2020) 24(6) *Citizenship Studies* 713, 714.

21 Bahram (n 13) 117–8; Sandra Harding, '"Strong Objectivity": A Response to the New Objectivity Question' (1995) 104(3) *Synthese* 331, 341–3.

experience. This throws into sharp relief both the injustice committed by the state in what is denied, as well as the individual's interpretation of the denial's impact in social, emotional and personal terms, implying what is required for a dignified citizenship experience. Concurrently, such an explicit methodological framing of this issue as a temporary loss of citizenship, rather than identity as stateless, empowered the Windrush members I spoke with to wield their citizen identity to make critiques of and claims against the state itself. From this space, this methodological process both provides an exemplar of the embodied and agentive citizenship experience and reveals how the state's formulation of citizenship is actualised in the everyday citizenship experience, with those pushed to its margins best positioned to describe this deficit and propose what a full and satisfied citizenship experience should include.

II CENTRING 'EVERYDAY CITIZENSHIP' WITHIN STATE BORDERING AND 'ILLEGALISATION'

Historical and legalistic interpretations of citizenship provide an initial perspective of how, from its advent, citizenship was constructed through negotiations and struggles between the state and the citizenry over who is included and regarded as equal within society, with historically and culturally situated expressions of citizenship emerging from an amalgamation of the state's power and citizen acquiescence and reaffirmation of these boundaries.[22] This structuralist and a priori approach to citizenship can be applied to historically situated groupings of citizens, such as Stuart Hall's 'three moments' of postwar Caribbean settlement in Britain. Hall's 'three moments' can be understood as separate 'conjunctures' of racisms and resistance constituted in a 'fused but contradictory dispersion' of national and civic inclusion and exclusion, with specific artistic and political responses from this group of citizens to the state's imposition of a less than equal citizenship demarcated as: the 'rising optimism' of the 1950s and 60s; the 'anti-racist politics' of the 70s and 80s; and the 'age of refugees, asylum seekers, and global dispersal' into the 90s.[23] Hall and Paul Gilroy both describe different morphings of racial ideology into new discourses of national identity and modern structures of oppression that posed different questions for Windrush settlement over the decades, in terms of dignity and respect, entitlement access, subjective belonging and location in national historical narratives of citizenship.[24] Adding substance to how such historically situated constructions of citizenship emerge, Timothy Mitchell argues the state is not a 'free-standing entity', but rather an 'effect' through 'spatial organization, temporal arrangement, functional specification, and supervision and surveillance' that is actively 'producing and reproducing ... this line of difference' between itself and society, as well as who is

---

22 Immanuel Wallerstein, 'Citizens All? Citizens Some! The Making of the Citizen' (2003) 45(2) *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 650, 673; Matthew Grant, 'Historicizing Citizenship in Post-war Britain' (2016) 59(4) *The Historical Journal* 1187, 1188.

23 Stuart Hall, 'Black Diaspora Artists in Britain: Three "Moments" in Post-war History' (2006) 61 *History Workshop Journal* 1, 3, 5, 16–7, 22.

24 ibid 18; Paul Gilroy, 'Art of Darkness: Black Art and the Problem of Belonging to England' (1990) 4(10) *Third Text* 45, 46 ('Art of Darkness'); Paul Gilroy, '"My Britain is Fuck All" Zombie Multiculturalism and the Race Politics of Citizenship' (2012) 19(4) *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power* 380, 380 ('My Britain is Fuck All').

included within this society.[25] This itself is rooted in Michel Foucault's theory of 'political technology', whereby control is administered at the 'lowest possible costs', revealing how such 'effects', through state discourses, policy and law, are used to influence and manipulate how citizens self-identify, express themselves and experience their lives.[26] Due to my Windrush members' harsh experience of these state 'effects' and exclusion from citizenship, they are best positioned to propose interpretations of the historically–culturally situated formulation of citizenship from which they have been excluded.[27]

Citizenship is reinforced, to an extent, by those excluded from its benefits, with the 'Hostile Environment' regime part of a broader set of already existent immigration controls for bounding and defending British citizenship.[28] A paradigm of 'crimmigration' literature has emerged in migration studies studying the impact of these anti-immigrant state structures. For example, Nicholas P De Genova and others explore how states 'illegalise' individuals, employing discourses, laws and practices that condition and discipline individuals as 'illegal'.[29] Deportation is used as punishment to reaffirm the boundaries of the national community through physical exclusion, reflecting a discursive and ideological power to which the citizenry are receptive.[30] This theory has been expanded on by historicised analyses of the 'crimmigration' trend arguing it is the recreation of colonial ideologies of race, with some describing it as a 'neo-colonial project' as particular nationalities of majority non-white nations become legally marginalised and targeted.[31] Scholars such as Niamh Quille have explicitly identified the 'Hostile Environment' as part of this 'crimmigration' trend, highlighting the further racialisation of crimmigration controls within the UK now targeting Black British citizens.[32] Border policies, such as the citizenship and language tests, as well as the discourses of 'deserving' and 'undeserving' citizens, exemplify how performative bureaucratic checks are already used to discipline

---

25 Timothy Mitchell, 'The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and Their Critics' (1991) 85(1) *The American Political Science Review* 77, 91, 95.

26 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Alan Sheridan tr, Penguin Books 1991) 86, 90.

27 Bahram (n 13) 116.

28 Bridget Anderson, Matthew J Gibney and Emanuela Paoletti, 'Citizenship, Deportation and the Boundaries of Belonging' (2011) 15(5) *Citizenship Studies* 547, 548–9.

29 Nicholas P De Genova, 'Migrant "Illegality" and Deportability in Everyday Life' (2002) 31(1) *Annual Review of Anthropology* 419; Katja Franko Aas, 'Global Criminology' in Eugene McLaughlin and Tim Newburn (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Criminological Theory* (Sage 2010); Juliet Stumpf, 'The Process is the Punishment in Crimmigration Law' in Katja Franko Aas and Mary Bosworth (eds), *The Borders of Punishment: Migration, Citizenship, and Social Exclusion* (Oxford University Press 2013) 58, 61; Anderson et al (n 28) 548–52; Luke De Noronha, 'Deportation, Racism and Multi-status Britain: Immigration Control and the Production of Race in the Present' (2019) 42(14) *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2413.

30 Aas (n 29); Stumpf (n 29) 58, 61; De Genova (n 29) 438–9; Anderson et al (n 28) 548; De Noronha (n 29).

31 Hindpal Singh Bhui, 'The Place of "Race" in Understanding Immigration Control and the Detention of Foreign Nationals' (2016) 16(3) *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 267; Nadine El-Enany, *(B)ordering Britain: Law, Race and Empire* (Manchester University Press 2020).

32 Niamh Quille, 'The Windrush Generation in Britain's "Hostile Environment": Racializing the Crimmigration Narrative' (Master's Dissertation, University of Oxford 2018) 29–31. See also Ben Bowling and Sophia Westenra, '"A Really Hostile Environment": Adiaphorization, Global Policing and the Crimmigration Control System' (2020) 24(2) *Theoretical Criminology* 163, 165.

those hoping to achieve citizenship status.[33] Likewise, the 'Hostile Environment' is understood as the 'neoliberalisation' of state structures, transforming access to entitlements into a punitive experience of surveillance and retraction of state support with the hope of assuaging anti-immigrant public sentiment whilst coercing service providers and users in areas of housing and health provision into holding racialised subjectivities.[34] The 'Hostile Environment' is imbued with these state effects and contextualises how Windrush members contended with encounters with state officials and the internalisation of anti-immigrant discourses. This bears importance not only for an understanding of state power, but also for recognising the power of the Windrush members to whom I spoke to deconstruct and reflect upon these 'effects' of state power as integral to their 'empowerment' as agentive citizens making meaning of their own experience.[35]

The 'Hostile Environment' had a significant impact on my participants' experience of citizenship, yet their reflections extended beyond the strictures of a statist, rights-based and bordering interpretation of these events. Citizenship literature has progressed beyond an unbalanced, predominantly state-imposed understanding of citizenship, with statelessness literature in tandem, although moving beyond the linguistic and conceptual framework of the state remains a challenge. Martin Roy and Catherine Neveu's survey of Engin F Isin's theories addresses the didacticism of citizenship as framed by the nation state and its legalistic, individualistic perspective in comparison with a conception of citizenship that incorporates 'different political identities[,] ... experiences ... and forms of citizenship practices'.[36] Isin argues that citizenship 'status' in terms of rights allows the possibility of 'practice', implying 'these two conceptions of

---

33 Joseph Turner, 'Testing the Liberal Subject: (In)security, Responsibility and 'Self-improvement' in the UK Citizenship Test' (2014) 18(3–4) *Citizenship Studies* 332, 341; Debra Gray and Christine Griffin, 'A Journey to Citizenship: Constructions of Citizenship and Identity in the British Citizenship Test' (2014) 53(2) *British Journal of Social Psychology* 299; Linda Morrice, 'British Citizenship, Gender and Migration: The Containment of Cultural Differences and the Stratification of Belonging' (2017) 38(5) *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 597; Bridget Byrne, 'Testing Times: The Place of the Citizenship Test in the UK Immigration Regime and New Citizens' Responses to It' (2017) 51(2) *Sociology* 323; Kamran Khan, 'Raciolinguistic Border-Making and the Elasticity of Assessment and Believability in the UK Citizenship Process' (2020) 21(2) *Ethnicities* 333, 341; Eleni Andreouli and Parisa Dashtipour, 'British Citizenship and the "Other": An Analysis of the Earned Citizenship Discourse' (2014) 24(2) *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 100, 104, 108; Pierre Monforte, Leah Bassel and Kamran Khan, 'Deserving Citizenship? Exploring Migrants' Experiences of the "Citizenship Test" Process in the United Kingdom' (2019) 70(1) *The British Journal of Sociology* 24, 25; Nisha Kapoor and Kasia Narkowicz, 'Characterising Citizenship: Race, Criminalisation and the Extension of Internal Borders' (2019) 53(4) *Sociology* 652, 653.

34 Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 524–5; Joe Crawford, Kim McKee and Sharon Leahy, 'More Than a Hostile Environment: Exploring the Impact of the Right to Rent Part of the *Immigration Act 2016*' (2020) 25(2) *Sociological Research Online* 236, 238; Jon Burnett, 'Entitlement and Belonging: Social Restructuring and Multicultural Britain' (2016) 58(2) *Race & Class* 37, 48; Nira Yuval-Davis, Georgie Wemyss and Kathryn Cassidy, 'Everyday Bordering, Belonging and the Reorientation of British Immigration Legislation' (2018) 52(2) *Sociology* 228, 240; Liz Fekete, 'Coercion and Compliance: The Politics of the "Hostile Environment"' (2020) 62(1) *Race & Class* 97, 100; Kim McKee et al, 'Redrawing the Border Through the "Right to Rent": Exclusion, Discrimination and Hostility in the English Housing Market' (2021) 41(1) *Critical Social Policy* 91, 94; Amaran Uthayakumar-Cumarasamy, 'The "Hostile Environment" and the Weaponization of the UK Health System' (2020) 36(2) *Medicine, Conflict and Survival* 132, 132.

35 Bahram (n 13) 118.

36 Martin Roy and Catherine Neveu, 'A Philosophy of the Theory of "Acts of Citizenship" Woven into the Fabric of a Political Anthropology of Citizenship' (2023) 27(3) *Citizenship Studies* 385, 386.

citizenship are entangled', although the latter can be confined to acts of voting or claiming entitlements, remaining within the purview of the statist interpretation.[37] Although Isin's theory somewhat succumbs to a static representation of status versus practice, citizenship literature is beginning to explore the 'ordinary', suggesting '*ordinary* languages of citizenship' to understand how individuals 'rationalize the world they live in' beyond state logics.[38] Jen Dickinson et al elaborate on what a theory of 'ordinary' or 'everyday' citizenship might look like, asserting that rather than further 'reinvention' of citizenship status, 'stretching and contracting' to include practices within the everyday, we should reframe our lens to include the 'spatio-temporalities of everyday life' beyond the 'fixation with the vertical hierarchies ... to foreground everyday life as horizontally emergent'.[39] Lynn A Staeheli et al elaborate that 'law and ordering are normalized through daily life', with legal status interacting with social claims 'rooted in family, in community, and in an expanded range of moral universes', such as 'values of care, mutuality, love, respect, and other-regardingness'.[40] This highlights how the actualisation of the state's citizenship policies is a vast interplay of considerations involving conditions imposed to a great extent by the state's power, although not entirely subsumed by this power. Thus, citizenship becomes multidimensional and holistic, experienced in 'spatial, intersubjective, performed, and affective' terms whereby individuals have 'issue-focused, relational, and motivated political agency which involves specific orientation, reflexivity, or intentionality'.[41] This perspective observes citizenship as a networked and interdependent experience, constantly recreated through the multiplicity of interactions between individuals and groups of citizens, as well as with the state and its myriad of forms. Such a framework focuses on how the citizenship identity, encompassing rights and entitlements, should enable a citizenship experience of sufficient agency to find subjective value in life. By sharing their rationalisation, deconstruction and critique of these events, Windrush members are reasserting their agency, foregrounding their lived experience of a citizenship deficit and backgrounding the state's identification and marginalisation of them as racialised, non-citizens.

Due to the experience of the Windrush members being one of contested marginalisation, it is significant to introduce a final strand of literature on emergent citizen subjectivities. James Holston theorises a statist–agentive parallel through the idea of an 'entrenched' form of citizenship partially constructed through state effects, whereby 'differentiated' forms of citizenship experiences emerge whilst prioritising the 'everyday' experiences of marginalised people and their struggle for the 'dignity' of a satisfactory life, within and beyond the strictures of state power.[42] The concept of citizen interactions with state effects is developed by Simuki Chigudu, who argues that the 'political subjectivity' of a citizen is formed through moments of crisis and 'actualised' by the former's encounters with state structures.[43] Chigudu notes the 'substantive' experience of

---

[37] Roy and Neveu (n 36) 387, citing Engin F Isin, 'Theorizing Acts of Citizenship' in Engin F Isin and Greg M Nielsen (eds), *Acts of Citizenship* (Zed Books 2008) 2, 18; Roy and Neveu (n 36) 387, citing Engin F Isin, 'Citizenship in Flux: The Figure of the Activist Citizen' (2009) 29(1) *Subjectivity* 367, 368.

[38] Roy and Neveu (n 36) 397 (emphasis added).

[39] Dickinson et al (n 20) 102, 104.

[40] Staeheli et al (n 20) 640.

[41] Kallio et al (n 20) 715, 724.

[42] Holston (n 15) 245–6, 255.

[43] Chigudu (n 15) 413.

citizenship is reflected upon and identified by individuals as a deficit of expected rights, entitlements and narratives of national belonging, reflecting the agentive lens on the meaning of the citizenship experience.[44] Such reflections become challenges to the state's imposed form of citizenship, with mean-making in 'imaginary as well as ... judicial-political dimensions', similarly described by Holston as 'law-talking' and 'rights–acting citizens', translating everyday experience into actionable demands in relation to the structures and language of state power, whilst grounded in a subjective experience and meaning of citizenship in the everyday.[45] Holston argues that assertive subjectivities emerge to contest 'alternative formulations of citizenship', described as an 'insurgence', rooted in claims to entitlement that would enable dignity in everyday life.[46] Critically, this relates to Staeheli et al's argument that everyday values are used to contest the legalistic framework of the state and, in the case of Holston and Chigudu, become reinterpreted back into state discourses to be made legible and actionable.[47] Such a view attends to how 'legal status, norms, and systems of rule' combine 'with the everyday and the unremarkable', whereby the 'everyday' sets the 'stage for the political acts through which citizens may be simultaneously and variously included and excluded from particular communities and places', including both the 'procedural' and the 'substantive' nature of this experience.[48] By employing an anthropological, agentive and relational understanding of citizenship, this article acknowledges and prioritises Windrush members' own theorisations of their citizenship experience. From this, a more visceral understanding of citizenship takes shape. The meaning of losing one's legal identification and entitlements as a citizen takes both a granular and expansive shape, with this networked and multifaceted everyday experience threaded together through my participants' holistic reflections, simultaneously encompassing material experience, emotional impact and theoretical propositions. This both describes their deficit of experience and actively challenges their identification as non-citizens or stateless through their asserted citizen agency, authentically rooted in their response to deeply felt disruptions in their everyday lives.

III 'Scholar–Activist' Subjectivities and Collaborative Oral History

This article explores the experiences of Carl Nwazota, Artnell (Anthony) Williams and Winston Walker, all second generation Windrush members who agreed to share their stories, with our conversations and additional contact unfolding over the course of several months. Carl was born in 1974 and raised in London with his mother and father who were from Jamaica and Nigeria, respectively. Artnell travelled from Jamaica to the UK with his parents in 1971, aged seven. Winston also arrived with his family from Jamaica in 1966 at 18 months old. Each family landed and settled in Britain pre-1973 with Commonwealth citizen status, following Jamaica's independence in 1962 and Nigeria's independence in 1960. This meant they were entitled to 'Right of Abode' and were free of immigration

44 ibid 413.
45 ibid 429; Holston (n 15) 255.
46 Holston (n 15) 246–8.
47 Staeheli et al (n 20) 633; Holston (n 15); Chigudu (n 15).
48 Staeheli et al (n 20) 631, 640.

enforcement.[49] I interviewed Artnell six times, Winston twice and Carl (who also shared a draft evidence document supporting his compensation case) once. I contacted Carl and Artnell through *Windrush Lives*, an online activist group supporting Windrush members to claim compensation, of which they are both claimant–members of the steering committee.[50] I first spoke with a non-Windrush group member to share the details and intentions of the project, who emphasised the taxing nature of interviews and public engagements for these individuals. I then interviewed Ramya Jaidev, a non-Windrush activist leader of *Windrush Lives* who established the group through online conversations with individuals like Artnell. The group has supported individual applications for compensation, collected survey data for judicial review and directly challenged the Home Office's handling of the compensation scheme, with Artnell describing *Windrush Lives* as a 'pain in the ass for the Home Office'. Ramya informed me that Artnell was keen to share his story, explaining in our first meeting that he was doing this so 'all Windrush' will be remembered, whilst Carl agreed to share his story after Ramya spoke with him. I contacted Winston, who was seeking compensation as an individual, directly through Twitter (now 'X') after I saw him commenting online about the 'Windrush Scandal'.

To create the space for a holistic exploration of the citizenship experience, I prefaced my introductions to them with my understanding of the longer experience of the 'Windrush Scandal', predating the 'Hostile Environment', as well as a desire to understand their experience of the Scandal within their broader lived history of citizenship. The interviews were open-ended and lines of questioning were discussed and reflected upon, with the interviewee leading the discussion in many cases. Whilst rooted in the experience of exclusion due to the 'Hostile Environment', we explored their longer histories, developing a framework whereby contemporary events resonated with past experiences of racialisation and marginalisation. This both contextualised the participants' claim-making and subjectivity as citizens today and helped encourage a space for theorising about the nature of citizenship and belonging in Britain more broadly, resisting essentialisations of the experience as one of 'victimhood' or 'non-existence'.[51] Although Winston and Carl both felt belonging in Britain, of note is Artnell's 13 year service in the British Army that was a conscious part of staking his claim to belong, dominating his British subjectivity over more place-based and familial relations. He explains:

> I really have had a really interesting life ... leaving Birmingham when I did at 17 and joining the army, because I didn't feel like I belonged anywhere ... and even when I was in the army, I rarely came back to Birmingham, I rarely came back to see my family, the longest I was away was probably three years.

Discussions with all three individuals encompassed their reflections on contemporary political discourse around immigration, as well as their substantive experience of citizenship, couched within their lived history of racism within the UK to varying degrees of depth. Artnell shared his experience of the cadets, school, the army, various employments, the police, comedy, television and going

49 'Windrush Scheme: Full Eligibility Details', *GOV.UK* (Web Page, 24 October 2023) <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/windrush-scheme/windrush-scheme>, archived at <perma.cc/AR5B-DH6N>.

50 'What We Do', *Windrush Lives* (Web Page) <https://www.windrushlives.com/what-we-do>, archived at <perma.cc/SY3L-JXEQ>.

51 Bahram (n 13) 118.

clubbing. Carl reflected on his encounters with Teddy Boys[52] in his youth, the experience of precarious work in the 2000s before the 'Hostile Environment' and the impact of marginalisation on his family relations before and after the 'Hostile Environment'. Winston outlined his experience of and reflections on social racism and anti-racism in Scotland, his exposure to national events, such as the Brixton riots,[53] and his understanding of his place in Britain's colonial past. This helped to build a bottom-up understanding of the citizenship experience as impacted by the 'Hostile Environment' in terms that were 'ordinary and extraordinary', 'symbolic and ... institutional', 'territorial' and 'codified in law', and most notably couched in critical understandings of the historical development of racial ideology in Britain and its meaning for the citizenship experience for Windrush members.[54] Due to the entanglement of state structures and effects with the everyday values and experiences of citizens, Oral History was most suitable for attempting to encompass this holistic perspective, whereby the state is backgrounded and the individual's narration, reflection, and critique of their own experience and the state's structure itself takes precedence. Embedding this contemporary story within this longer experience of racism was appropriate for acknowledging the continuity of such experiences, with the 'Hostile Environment' being the latest iteration and arguably most significant form of state-imposed racialised exclusion from citizenship for my participants.

This research posed ethical questions, such as my positionality as a white, male-presenting, higher-educated individual attempting to engage in a collaborative project that would centre my participants' argumentation and political prerogatives, as well as provide academic insights into citizenship. Central to this was validating my participants' identities as citizens and making clear that the purpose of the project was to provide them with a space to justify this claim and to critique the injustice done to them — an approach adopted in tandem with 'stateless standpoint epistemology', albeit with a rhetorical shift to centre the citizen identity.[55] This shift is integral for acknowledging 'those deeds by which actors constitute themselves (and others) as ... subjects of rights' as worthy of investigation, described elsewhere as the 'mutual recognition of citizens *as citizens*', validating a more expansive and holistic interpretation of citizenship and Windrush members' self-identification of their citizenship experience.[56] Therefore the effects of the 'Hostile Environment' are framed as a deficit of citizenship imposed by bordering effects, rather than an experience of 'illegalisation' or statelessness. To explore this, I attempted to overcome the 'fixity' of 'insider'–'outsider' research relations by acknowledging the 'multiple positionalities' all

52 Gangs of male youths identifiable as a subculture interested in rock and R&B music in the 1950s and mid-1960s. They were notorious for initiating unprovoked attacks on racial minorities in the UK, most famously sparking the 1958 Notting Hill race riots: Emily Cousins, 'The Notting Hill Race Riots', *Black Past* (online, 8 June 2010) <https://www.blackpast.org/global-african-history/notting-hill-riots-1958>, archived at <perma.cc/6Q64-75JA>.

53 Violent protests by the Black community in Brixton between 10 and 12 April 1981. These were in response to the discriminatory use of stop and search laws, and the anguish felt following the New Cross Fire Massacre in January that year, followed by similar violent protests in many English cities later in July of the same year: Felix Brenton, 'Brixton Riots (April 10–12, 1981)', *Black Past* (online, 13 June 1010) <https://www.blackpast.org/global-african-history/brixton-riots-april-10-12-1981>, archived at <perma.cc/FGJ8-6HHY>.

54 Staeheli et al (n 20) 630.

55 Bahram (n 13).

56 Isin (n 37) 371, cited in Roy and Neveu (n 36) 388; Alejandro I Paz, 'Communicating Citizenship' (2019) 48 *Annual Review of Anthropology* 77, 77.

individuals hold and stating one of my identities as a fellow citizen, my shared belief that the Scandal began before 2012, as well as my desire to work collaboratively and beyond the academy.[57] This final point included working on a documentary with another Windrush member documenting his family's experience of the 'Windrush Scandal'. However, despite being a 'common project', the historian maintains 'the "floor", whether admittedly or not', and I employed these stories to explore citizenship theoretically, albeit to support a reckoning with Windrush members' experience of the 'Hostile Environment'.[58] I did my best to empathise with the traumatic nature of the stories I heard, once sharing with Winston how I could not truly 'understand' his painful experience, to which he replied, 'you can empathise, because that's what you're doing'. This reflects the 'dynamic rhythms of multi-positionalities', using 'empathy and rapport' in a 'dance', whereby interviewer and interviewee take turns leading the discussion.[59] In a concurrent 'scholar–activism' framing, this work is both 'active and ambivalent in its pursuit of change', determined and hopeful in proposing more meaningful perspectives on citizenship, simultaneously drawing attention to the lived experience of the 'Windrush Scandal'.[60] However, this requires an acceptance that such actions may effect no political change, whilst believing that recording these experiences in the archive serves as its own contribution by validating the experiences of Artnell, Carl, Winston and others like them. However, one shortcoming is the narrow focus on second generation, male Windrush members with family from the Caribbean, omitting focus on younger, older, female and more geographically diverse experiences, as well as experiences differentiated by class, sexuality or ability.

IV The 'Hostile Environment' Regime's Bordering of Citizenship

The 'Hostile Environment' regime, launched in 2012, was part of the Conservative Party's 2010 manifesto pledge to reduce net migration to the 'tens of thousands' through deportation.[61] The Home Office business plan for the 'Hostile Environment' in 2015/16 confirmed that, 'individually these interventions may be seen as just a nuisance but collectively ... they have the ability to encourage illegal migrants to voluntarily leave or never attempt to come to the UK illegally'.[62] Whilst these extremely harsh conditions were supposed to induce voluntary deportation, a 'really hostile environment', in the words of Theresa May, was created within Britain's borders for some Windrush members.[63] Windrush citizens encountered this regime and were penalised for the 'official scepticism' around their status due to a lack of passport identification or sufficient proof of leave to remain, leaving them labelled as illegal aliens.[64] Through this encounter, their 'dignity' as citizens was challenged and they were forced into poverty, homelessness, ill-health and

57 Louise Ryan, '"Inside" and "Outside" of What or Where? Researching Migration Through Multi-positionalities' (2015) 16(2) *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1, 1.
58 Alessandro Portelli, 'The Peculiarities of Oral History' (1981) 12(2) *History Workshop Journal* 96, 103–5.
59 Ryan (n 57) 5.
60 Closs Stephens and Bagleman (n 8) 330.
61 Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 522.
62 Yeo (n 1).
63 Bowling and Westenra (n 32) 168.
64 Gentleman, *The Windrush Betrayal* (n 3) 14.

isolation, having been denied their status and access to entitlements.[65] Employing a Foucauldian understanding of the effects of state policies and discourse, this encounter involved disciplining and conditioning through anti-immigrant policies and discourse, forcing individuals to exist and act as illegal.[66] This internal bordering of British citizenship occurred in the mundane spatiality of people's homes, employer's offices and state official premises, whereby such encounters become sites of political contestation and racialisation.[67] State power filtered down into various third party organisations, with significant consequences for those who were not sufficiently documented and thus labelled 'illegal' and treated as stateless, both through direct encounters and the reception of anti-immigrant discourses.

Described as 'difficult to pin down', the regime took effect through multiple parliamentary acts from 2012–16, reinforcing pre-existing rules, deployed across different government departments, such as Employment, Housing, Education, Healthcare and Transport, with a 'sweeping range of public servants, agencies, companies, private organisations, and members of the public' deputised as border officials.[68] The state employed coercive tactics to discipline illegal immigrants and citizens alike, forcing the latter to apply checks through the threat of fines for engaging with undocumented individuals, as well as legal requirements placed on public services to share information.[69] Despite a lack of data, it is argued this process was and is racialised, as '[e]thnic minorities are disproportionately subject to immigration checks and having their residence questioned' based on not fitting the (white) image of Britain.[70] This process has also been found to foster 'racism' and 'discrimination' through third parties conducting checks, such as in housing provision.[71] The draconian nature of this regime is epitomised by Theresa May's 'deport first, appeal later' policy — declared unlawful by the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom in 2017 — which accompanied the *Immigration Act 2014* ('*2014 Act*') and the *Immigration Act 2016* ('*2016 Act*').[72] I apply categories of 'welfare and services', 'employment and housing' and 'protection and movement' as aggregations somewhat reflecting my participants' encounters with the regime, reflecting state–citizen and citizen–citizen relations based on substantive entitlement access within the context of the state's bounding of citizenship.

For those of a lower socioeconomic status and older age, the impact on 'welfare and services' had severe effects. Individuals lacking documentation had their benefit payments stopped, were charged for public services and faced investigation by the Home Office, which could build a case for their deportation.[73] Artnell kept his army pension, although there were instances of people having their pensions frozen, reflecting the heterogenous experience of Windrush members. Accessing other services, such as healthcare, could also lead to the sharing of

---

65 Holston (n 15) 246.

66 Foucault (n 26).

67 Staeheli et al (n 20) 630, 638.

68 Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 522, 525.

69 Fekete (n 34) 98; McKee et al (n 34) 93; Uthayakumar-Cumarasamy (n 34) 133.

70 Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 533; Amreen Quereshi, Marley Morris and Lucy Mort, *Access Denied: The Human Impact of the Hostile Environment* (Report, Institute for Public Policy Research September 2020) 3.

71 Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 533; Quereshi, Morris and Mort (n 70) 3.

72 '"Deport First, Appeal Later" Policy Ruled Unlawful', *BBC News* (online, 14 June 2017) <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-40272323>, archived at <perma.cc/7W2C-RDZ5>.

73 See, eg, Gentleman, *The Windrush Betrayal* (n 3) 10–6, 88–94.

confidential information with the Home Office, which was previously only accessible for criminal investigations, with 9,000 data requests made in 2016 and 6,000 people traced.[74] Schools and universities also engaged in data sharing schemes, the former offering up 1,500 pupils a month to help identify immigration offenders, whilst universities have been accused of an 'overzealous application' of the rules, racially identifying students suspected of illegal status.[75] The NHS surcharge was also increased alongside the sharing of information with the Home Office, meaning financial barriers and fear of deportation disciplined individuals into avoiding service access.[76] The regime therefore conditioned the areas of life that sustain health, supplement livelihood and support access to a home and stable social networks when unemployed and in ill-health. This affected how Windrush members interacted with fellow citizens as representatives of the state and the former's ability to inhabit a fulfilled and satisfactory citizenship experience.

A second policy area of 'employment and housing' arguably had the most devastating effect on Windrush members, making individuals homeless and exposing them to exploitative work required to survive. This particularly hurt Carl, who faced precarious employment for over a decade. The regime built on previous legislation to increase the punishment for landlords or employers engaging with illegal immigrants to enhance enforcement, for example, by doubling the fine for employers to £20,000, lengthening prison sentences to up to five years and expanding grounds for criminality to those with 'reasonable cause to believe' that they were engaging with someone of illegal status.[77] However, this did not stop bad landlords from pushing vulnerable people into a space of not being able to ask for help. The combination of this policy and a restriction on bank accounts[78] meant individuals were prohibited from legally earning a wage and saving money securely, forcing individuals into unregulated employment and obstructing their access to state financial support. Fines of £3,000 per resident were introduced for private landlords who rented to undocumented individuals through the *2014 Act*, with prison sentences extended to up to five years through the *2016 Act*.[79] An assessment of this policy, dubbed the 'Right to Rent', showed 44% of landlords would not rent to people who 'appear to be immigrants', with 58% refusing ethnic minorities without a British passport.[80] Whilst the loss of an income and home is an immediate challenge to living a dignified life, the changes to intersubjective relations between citizens, with many coerced to adopt racist dispositions, reflect a deeper conditioning for Windrush members from their fellow citizens, adding an affective layer to their material exclusion.

The final policy area of 'protection and movement' references how the regime introduced immigration enforcement into Britain's public transport and policing services. This impacted 'everyday' citizenship by infecting transport infrastructure and police protection with additional racialised status checks and the threat of deportation to those failing such checks. For example, spot checks were introduced

---

[74] Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 528.

[75] ibid 529, 536.

[76] Uthayakumar-Cumarasamy (n 34) 132.

[77] Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 526–7.

[78] Alan Travis, 'Home Office Wrongly Denying People Bank Accounts in 10% of Cases', *The Guardian* (online, 22 September 2017) <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2017/sep/22/home-office-errors-already-leading-to-people-being-denied-bank-accounts>, archived at <perma.cc/JD8U-NYSL>.

[79] ibid 527; Quille (n 32) 45.

[80] Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 533.

at train and bus stations and continue today, despite allegations of 'racial profiling'.[81] The policy also restricted individual access to driving licences, with the *2016 Act* making driving without proof of lawful residence a crime with a punishment of up to 51 weeks in prison and/or a fine.[82] Concurrently, Operation Nexus accompanied the regime's rollout, embedding immigration officials within the police system, with the police used to check immigration statuses and build cases for deportation.[83] Critically, individuals could now face deportation as a 'foreign criminal' for mere contact with the police, rather than conviction.[84] Encountering the legal structure of the regime actualised my participants' exclusion from elements of 'everyday' citizenship — yet these 'state effects' emanated from anti-immigrant discourses and the 'disciplining' of my participants before and after such direct encounters, best understood as 'law and ordering ... normalised through daily life'.[85] These changes influenced how my participants conceptualised or judged their own experiences as 'dignified', with this material and emotive experience undermining notional claims to belonging to the British national community.

V ENCOUNTERING THE 'HOSTILE ENVIRONMENT' REGIME

Artnell first encountered the regime in 2013, losing his job because his national insurance number, employment history and army papers were not sufficient proof of legal status. He initially 'just laughed at' the human resources representative in disbelief, assured in his own sense of legal and notional belonging, and that he possessed the sufficient evidence and lived experience to prove this. Subsequently, he applied for benefits, but the Department for Work and Pensions ('DWP') denied him payment as they had no record of him. He was left to live on £100 a month from his army pension, along with some savings, describing how he went into 'survival mode' to cope with this ostracisation. Winston discovered he lacked status in 2008 when he applied for a driver's licence and was told he was not on the system. However, he did not experience anything more severe until post-2012, when he became 'frightened to go to the doctors' because of the threat of deportation. He explained how 'your life just comes to a halt, because you know you're entitled, but you've got the view that you're not'. Winston describes the 'indignity' of being put in this situation: the 'system said I'd never existed', but 'you actually find information about yourself ... I had a history that's quite traceable in this country', referencing his time in social services and education. However, he highlights the question of 'how [do] you get information that you're quite entitled to about yourself?' He shares that the most 'frustrating' part is the 'waiting' and 'sometimes you never even hear anything back', which is why he suggests 'a lot of people give up'. Both Artnell and Winston experienced 'de facto statelessness', lacking the documentation demanded of them by the state, with Artnell feeling the effects of this through denied entitlements, whilst Winston tried

81 Jack Doyle, 'Racial Profiling Row as Officials Hold 140 "Illegal Immigrants" and Home Office TWEETS Out the Arrest Pictures', *Daily Mail* (online, 2 August 2013) <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2383156/Police-arresting-139-illegal-immigrant-suspects-watchdog-launches-probe.html>, archived at <perma.cc/5EG8-6PTW>.

82 Quille (n 32) 50.

83 Griffiths and Yeo (n 2) 528.

84 Melanie Griffiths, 'Foreign, Criminal: A Doubly Damned Modern British Folk-devil' (2017) 21(5) *Citizenship Studies* 527, 533.

85 Holston (n 15); Mitchell (n 25); Foucault (n 26); Staeheli et al (n 20) 640.

and failed to navigate various bureaucracies to support his claim, later conditioned to avoid claiming entitlements to evade encounters with the regime.[86] This state–citizen interaction illustrates the complexity of citizenship experiences through 'spatial, intersubjective' and 'performed' elements of state offices, officials and rules enforcing the regime's bordering of citizenship, with notable and significant 'affective' outcomes for Winston and Artnell of confusion and disbelief.[87] From each multifaceted expression and experience of citizenship, through its different spaces, relations and performances, in its material and subjective form, ultimately lingers the deeper internalisation of the affective impact on the sense of self.

Other Windrush members did access entitlements, such as medical treatment or benefits, but were later asked for repayment. For example, Sylvester Marshall, aged 65, who arrived as a teenager in 1973 and had lived in the UK for 44 years, was charged £54,000 in 2018 for radiotherapy cancer treatment and then denied further treatment because of 'official suspicion' of his status. He described this treatment as feeling like 'they are leaving me to die'.[88] Similarly, Valerie Baker, aged 68, who arrived from Jamaica aged four, was told to repay £33,590 of 'overpayments' for her disability allowance in April 2017 and given seven days to leave the country.[89] Horrifyingly, Artnell was forced to 'tak[e] [his] own teeth out' because he feared accessing health services and was left with hard choices over 'heating [his] flat or food'.[90] The loss of access to welfare claims and public services suspended people's lives, saddling them with debt and forcing them to bear a declining quality of health, overall diminishing their quality of life. The loss of rights and access to substantive citizenship entitlements then undermines one's physical wellbeing and financial sustainability. The affective impact fully actualises when 'daily life' is chipped away at and made less viable as 'survival mode' takes precedence.[91]

An interconnected assault on this holistic experience of citizenship was the loss of employment and housing. Carl shared his compensation claim evidence, explaining how he had managed 'long periods of underemployment' since 2001, when the Home Office failed to return his passport after he sent it off for renewal, with the regime forcing him into 'long-term poverty' post-2012, when he failed to access even exploitative employment, leaving him unemployed for 63 months. He describes how he had lost his demolition and waste collection business in the early 2000s due to a lack of identification, forced to get 'paid cash in most jobs', eventually forcing him to live in a 'sub world' of undocumented people. He had used his savings to afford housing but was made homeless by South Gloucestershire Council in 2019 after he complained about his temporary accommodation, despite them knowing he was 'a victim of the Windrush Scandal'. He was told by a counsellor helping him: '[T]he hostile environment has trickled down into local authority', meaning the Council was avoiding the risk of

---

86 Kneebone et al (n 10).

87 Kallio et al (n 20) 715.

88 Gentleman, 'Windrush Cancer Patient Thanks Charity' (n 5).

89 Amelia Gentleman, '"Lambs to the Slaughter": 50 Lives Ruined by the Windrush Scandal', *The Guardian* (online, 19 March 2020) <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2020/mar/19/lambs-to-the-slaughter-50-lives-ruined-by-the-windrush-scandal>, archived at <perma.cc/72HQ-G3G9> ('Lambs to the Slaughter').

90 Jack Fenwick, 'Windrush Scandal: 'I Started Taking My Own Teeth Out', *BBC News* (online, 1 March 2021) <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-56215349>, archived at <perma.cc/BR4P-EZ23>.

91 Staeheli et al (n 20) 640.

a fine at the expense of Carl's wellbeing. Winston also ended up homeless for a time in 2012 after he was evicted from his bedsit in Surrey for lacking a passport, describing the feeling of being 'vulnerable' and aware that 'the one thing you can't do is complain'. The loss of dignified accommodation for both Carl and Winston, and their reflections on this, highlights this basic entitlement as an 'arena for ... contestation' — a confrontation that Winston deliberately avoided and to which Carl succumbed as his right to speak and be heard as a citizen was undermined.[92] In Carl's case, his subjectivity as a claim-making, 'insurgent' citizen came into conflict with the 'meeting of ... political interdependencies' present in his housing service, with the 'Hostile Environment' regime's political prerogative to exclude individuals lacking documentation overriding the primary role of the service to provide safe housing to those entitled to it.[93]

Other individuals endured similar hardships, such as Hubert Howard, who arrived from Jamaica in 1960 and lived in the UK for 59 years. He lost his job in 2012 and died shortly after, aged 62, before receiving an apology or compensation from the government.[94] Michael Braithwaite, who arrived from Barbados in 1961 as an eight year old, also lost his job as a special needs teaching assistant after 15 years of employment.[95] Bevis Smith, aged 64, was treated for a brain aneurysm and charged with a £5,000 bill. He then lost his home due to his citizenship status being challenged via the health service and was forced onto the streets having been denied access to a state-funded homeless hostel.[96] Each encounter with the 'Hostile Environment' regime was unique, based on the needs and security of individuals prior to the encounter. For example, Artnell owned his flat so did not suffer the same homelessness as Winston or Carl. However, one can highlight a shared experience of 'law and ordering ... normalised through daily life', whereby the 'dignity' of each individual is challenged, with the significance of a loss of rights and legal identity felt through the harsh experience of being ostracised to the streets or 'subworld', losing access to a job that gives purpose, as well as sustainability, to one's life.[97]

The conditioning of Windrush members through the 'effects' of the regime's power — most harshly felt as denied entitlements and services — was notably nefarious in terms of the indirect power of the regime's public discourse to dissuade people like Winston from even using health services.[98] Just as third parties were legally enrolled as state border officials within the spaces of everyday living and entitlements, the police's enhanced role as immigration enforcers imposed further trepidation for the Windrush members into the basic act of moving and feeling safe in public. Operation Vaken, which entailed vans driving around ethnically diverse areas of London plastered with 'go home or face arrest', a message also posted in local newspapers, evidences the use of this discursive power by the state. In its employment of racialised political tools of surveillance and control, the government actively produced 'negative tropes' which spoke to public anti-immigration sentiment and which were similarly actualised through

92 Dickinson et al (n 20) 105.
93 Holston (n 15); ibid 108.
94 Gentleman, 'Lambs to the Slaughter' (n 89).
95 ibid.
96 ibid.
97 Staeheli et al (n 20) 640; Holston (n 15) 246.
98 Mitchell (n 25); Foucault (n 26).

police's racial profiling of people at public transport stations.[99] Carl remembers how post-2012 he saw more pushbikes being used by other undocumented people he lived around because of such checks, reflecting how individuals avoided encounters with the regime in ways that impeded their freedom to move and feel safe. Similarly, Winston describes how he 'would never go into London', forced to 'hide in the public lavatories' at Victoria Coach Station one time due to the presence of immigration officers. Whilst Artnell never encountered this sort of harassment, he remembers how his ostracisation left him 'on edge' when out in public:

> If I'm walking down the road and there's cameras around, are the cameras going to be following me ... If I'm walking down the road and I see a police car out of the corner of my eyes ... I'm worried are they going to stop me ... I'm walking on a pavement and there's a white woman walking the same side ... I will cross the road to avoid a situation.

Artnell is describing the indirect power of discourses beyond the structures of the regime, altering his perception of the police and being in public, including his relationship with fellow citizens, based on his racialised and 'illegalised' identity.[100] Winston and Artnell were both aware they lacked documentation to prove their legal entitlement in the eyes of the state, therefore they both feared and avoided the chance of 'contestation' with the state in their everyday life.[101] These fears are reflected in Carl's statement, who states he had heard of 'detentions and deportations happening' in London, making him 'anxious' and inducing him to move to Bristol, a Sanctuary City for refugees and undocumented people. Cases of illegal removal are well documented. For example, Anthony Bryan, aged 62, was detained for five weeks in an immigration removal centre and booked on a flight to Jamaica; a country he left when he was eight years old in 1965. This was prevented only at the last moment.[102] Horrendously, Jocelyn John, aged 58, was convinced to 'self-deport' after being scared by threats of arrest texted to her by the Home Office.[103] Consequently, the threat of deportation as punishment for those 'not fit for citizenship' had both the material impact of changing where and how individuals could move and live — basic and innocuous elements of citizen access — and the subjective impact of Windrush members internalising an identity as 'deportable', with some following the rules of this conditioning to their conclusion.[104] Carl, Winston and Artnell's experiences reflect a severe undermining of their 'substantive' forms of citizenship — the actual experience of accessing 'everyday' life and entitlements derived from legal rights — alongside a concurrent 'affective' impact on their subjectivities as British citizens, identifiable as a loss of 'dignity' felt in material and notional senses, leading to a feeling of non-belonging.[105]

---

99 Hannah Jones et al, *Go Home?: The Politics of Immigration Controversies* (Manchester University Press 2017) 11; Crawford et al (n 34) 248; Doyle (n 81).

100 Foucault (n 26).

101 Dickinson et al (n 20) 104.

102 Gentleman, 'Lambs to the Slaughter' (n 89).

103 ibid.

104 Anderson et al (n 30) 548.

105 Staeheli et al (n 20) 637; Chigudu (n 15); Holston (n 15); Kallio (n 20) 718.

VI INTERNALISING 'EVERYDAY' EXCLUSIONS

Speaking with Artnell about his 'survival' from 2013 to 2018, he thinks, 'how the hell did I get through those five years psychologically?' He shares that: '[T]here were days and days and days I had nothing to do ... all I could do was sit in my flat and stare at the wall ... I'd spend hours standing at my window watching people go to work and coming back.' The loss of employment, the fear of public spaces and constrained budget nearly collapsed Artnell's in-person social networks and access to purposeful employment, reflecting the importance of the 'intersubjective' and 'affective' elements of the citizen experience.[106] To cope, Artnell 'started drinking', describing his routine to me: 'I'd drink a bottle of vodka and that would take me through the day. I'd fall asleep around six or seven o'clock in the evening and wake up about one o'clock [am] ... I'd buy a couple cans of special brew and that would take me through to 8 o'clock.' Artnell explains he tried to access the roof of his building drunk one night, only to be saved from a potential suicide attempt by the door's security lock. He then began 'training like mad for the next four years' to improve his health. Artnell is conscious his army training allowed him to cope physically and mentally with the self-destructive patterns that had been imposed upon him. The 'effects' of state power are identifiable in the assault on Artnell's 'moral universe', particularly challenging his self-'care' and 'respect'.[107] His lived experience provided him with the physical and mental strength to make the 'intentionality' to 'train like mad'.[108] Whilst Artnell had secure housing, his loss of employment had a cascading impact on his 'dignity', reflecting the multiplicity of value in the legal right to work.[109] While Artnell had a pension, housing and a degree of sustainability, 'watching people go to work and coming back', the absence of daily meaning and denial of social connection drew him into a state of dangerous alcohol consumption and further pain. This was something that was potentially avoidable through socialisation via volunteering or generic public interactions, but was denied by his fear of surveillance and encountering the 'Hostile Environment' regime.

Winston also felt his dignity challenged, particularly when encountering fellow citizens deputising as immigration controls, notably reflecting the importance of the 'mutual recognition of citizens *as citizens*'.[110] For example, having been rejected from a job, he believed the potential employers 'were being racist' for asking for identification and so he 'stormed out in disgust' as 'any right-minded person would have done'. He took his Jamaican birth certificate to the next job but was told 'it ain't even worth the paper that it's written on'. Winston's initial comprehension of this legal rejection reflects a relatively secure sense of belonging and hold of his 'dignity'; storming out in 'disgust', as well as an 'insurgent' subjectivity to legally challenge representatives of state power to claim his access and entitlements.[111] He shares how 'it's only since the Scandal broke that I really did think about it ... what a cheek ... because they don't know history'. Winston's actions reflect a defence of his 'dignity' and right to belong in the face of perceived profiling, rooted in a historical and implicitly legal connection to

---

[106] Kallio (n 20) 717.
[107] Mitchell (n 25); Staeheli et al (n 20) 629–30, 640.
[108] Kallio (n 20) 724.
[109] Holston (n 15).
[110] Griffiths and Yeo (n 2); Paz (n 56) 77.
[111] Holston (n 15).

Britain from Jamaica's colonisation. Therefore, the '*ordinary* languages of citizenship' with which Winston came to 'rationalise the world' include a knowledge of his place in history to be claimed in both 'imaginary as well as ... judicial–political dimensions'. It is a knowledge he identified as lacking in the state representatives, fairly reflecting their subjective location within the 'entrenched' white experience of British citizenship.[112] Winston elaborates that it's the 'embarrassment you don't get over', reflecting how a micro-contest over legal belonging and access to a substantive citizenship is layered with indignities. This performance of citizen-bordering, felt through the particularly harsh intersubjective encounter deriding the 'worth' of Winston's birth certificate, adds mental anguish to the loss of material entitlements and access, felt through Winston's 'affective' expression of citizenship.[113] Yet Winston retained his agency; in deriding the state-representatives as 'racist', storming out and understanding that they 'don't know history', despite the material impact on his life, he is cognitively fighting to retain his dignity as a full British citizen. Such an insight reveals a myriad of ways to cope with the legal and material consequences of exclusion. Sarah O'Connor, who had lived in the UK for 50 years, explained at a parliamentary event in May 2018 how she reacted to being labelled illegal after encountering the 'Hostile Environment' regime: 'I wouldn't cry in front of the jobcentre. I'd go home and I break down.'[114] Even this small act of waiting to cry at home was Sarah's attempt at retaining her dignity in relation to fellow citizens around her, similar to how Winston 'stormed out in disgust', albeit rooted in her own self-expression of agency. However, despite this assertion of agency, the dignity of citizens was severely impacted by this loss of mental wellbeing, disrupting a notional belonging in Britain.

The 'entrenched' and exclusionary formulation of citizenship takes effect directly through these citizen–citizen or citizen–state encounters, but also through the accumulation of the state's discursive expression of this form of citizenship. Artnell shared how he is receptive to the perpetuation of anti-immigrant discourses, such as Priti Patel's anti-refugee tactic of 'push back', using the border force to push boats crossing the English Channel back to France rather than rescuing them.[115] He describes how getting 'jet skis in the water' is just a 'photo opportunity in the paper ... feeding the right wing of her party'. He describes feeling that 'all of the hostility is building up, it's not getting any better, that's why I feel it's really, really hard', seeing this as the 'hostile environment on steroids'. Within our conversations about immigration policy, Artnell couched these reflections alongside comments made by then Prime Minister Boris Johnson about 'chain gangs' and 'tough love' for criminals. Artnell identified these comments as containing the message: 'I've got these niggas under control, that's what he's saying to his people.' Winston shares a similar feeling and connection from the material and immediate expression of the 'Hostile Environment' to his holistic

---

[112] Roy and Neveu (n 36) 397; Chigudu (n 15) 429; Holston (n 15).

[113] Kallio (n 20) 718.

[114] Peter Walker, 'Immigration Minister Apologises to Windrush Victims at Meeting', *The Guardian* (online, 1 May 2018) <https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2018/may/01/immigration-minister-apologises-to-windrush-victims-in-meeting>, archived at <perma.cc/KUD9-AWB4>.

[115] Lizzie Dearden, 'Patel's Plan to Push Back Migrant Boats in Channel Thrown into Doubt by Home Office's Own Rules', *The Independent* (online, 13 November 2021) <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/channel-boats-push-backs-patel-b1956827.html>, archived at <perma.cc/PZ9Y-L6XC>.

interpretation of British citizenship formulation, describing how he became 'frightened' of living in England when David Cameron voiced desires to scrap the *Human Rights Act 1998*.[116] He describes how 'you actually thought you was living in a dictatorship ... you just feel like you don't have nobody to talk to', conditioned by his lack of status and isolation. He shares how he has felt 'anxious' for 'every election that they ever had in this country', because 'immigration would always be at the top of the agenda', receptive to the racist tones of anti-immigrant discourses.

Such rhetoric is identified by Gilroy as 'a tradition of English political speech in which racism is loudly disavowed while the speaker seeks simultaneously to instrumentalise it', with anti-immigrant discourse seemingly sanitised on the grounds of the citizenry's security.[117] Winston describes how this undermined his political voice and made him shrink in the face of other citizens vocalising their racist views: '[Y]ou didn't really think you could speak ... because the way I used to look at myself, well, I was still an immigrant ... I'm still an immigrant.' He felt if he spoke out 'the easiest thing for them to say is "well, you're not supposed to be here anyway" ... so I didn't really think I could argue with them.' These insights reflect the potency of longstanding anti-immigration discourse amalgamating with the legal denial of Winston's identity to affect his relation to other citizens, conditioning his behaviour in accordance with the lack entitlement he had internalised, with material exclusion further actualised as he policed his own right to speak. Carl had his subjectivity of belonging more directly challenged by state official enforcement, as he was left 'traumatised' by officials trying to 'convince' him he had no status, describing a process of being 'consistently gaslighted over a period of 20 years' and how that impacted his 'mental health'. The 'Hostile Environment' and racialised political discourse pre- and post-'Windrush Scandal' reflect racism that was both 'dog whistled with a smirk' and 'coded as culture and civilisation'.[118] This final example acutely highlights how such bordering logics of the state can be applied and felt. The loss of entitlements blocks citizens' access to regular experiences providing meaning to life, whilst the anti-immigrant rhetoric and state actors implicitly and explicitly sought to confirm this legal and material exclusion in my participants' subjectivities as a racialised non-citizens.

My participants' theorisations are based on their personal 'moral universes', drawing from a subjective sense of national belonging to critique the 'entrenched' form of citizenship from which they have been ostracised.[119] These final reflections highlight the multiplicity of citizenship imaginaries and experiences that can coexist and coalesce as a citizenship identity, and the pressure this identity is placed under by the racially exclusionary bordering of citizenship. This reflects an idea raised by Gilroy about Black Britain's identity being one of 'exile, voluntarily and involuntarily', whereby there is a conscious relation to the history of colonial exclusion and the continuation of racialised exclusion as citizens.[120] Winston relates his sense of belonging to this contemporary public bordering:

---

116 Owen Bowcott, 'Cameron's Pledge to Scrap *Human Rights Act* Angers Civil Rights Groups', *The Guardian* (online, 2 October 2014) <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/oct/01/cameron-pledge-scrap-human-rights-act-civil-rights-groups>, archived at <perma.cc/3XCX-4F83>.

117 Gilroy, 'My Britain is Fuck All' (n 24) 394.

118 ibid 395.

119 Staeheli et al (n 20) 640; Holston (n 15).

120 Gilroy, 'Art of Darkness' (n 24) 42.

'[T]he way I see myself in recent years ... in Britain is probably disposable baggage'. Further, he likens his experience to the way Shamima Begum had her citizenship revoked and was abandoned overseas having been deemed a national security threat, reflecting the political prerogative of bordering the citizen–body through exclusion.[121] Artnell similarly believes the state's message to the public is 'black people don't mean nothing, people of colour don't mean nothing, they don't belong here'. Artnell expresses his own historical sense of belonging by articulating that: '[W]hen I was growing up, the hostile environment was the police.' He served in the cadets and then the army because he 'wanted people to see [him], to see black people, as contributors to society ... serving [the] Queen and country ... It's a sense of belonging as well really.' In contrast to this intention to claim belonging, Artnell is 'questioning [himself] these days, especially serving the country', with his previous rationalisation of how to gain inclusion thrown into contradiction. As an ex-soldier, the botched British evacuation from Afghanistan also triggered him, with anti-immigrant discourse and politics made plain in the barriers thrown up for Afghan refugees.[122] 'When we talk about British values, how we feel as immigrants in this country, I don't feel welcome now, not at all.' He argues that, alongside Afghanistan, 'we've got the Windrush Scandal, and ... we've got the deportations, so what's that saying to us? You're not welcome'. Artnell explains, 'we should be getting on with our lives, building communities, building together', indicating a collective approach to a dignified citizenship experience and that he's tired of people of colour being used as 'political tools'. Artnell's experience has led him to reflect and question his location within a broader Black British identity, pointing out, 'you never hear of Black English, only Black Caribbean' on census surveys. Winston similarly relates his experience to broader experiences of racism, such as being the lone Black person in a pub and hearing racist language:

> Everybody will just stand there and not say anything. And that's when you feel most vulnerable. Because you think you've got nobody to defend you or anything like that, but like, you know, you will probably get somebody turn up a day later and say 'I'm sorry that that happened to you', and you say '[w]ell, why weren't you calling it out then?'

He elaborates, 'if I was with you, being white, and you was in a pub full of Black people, and they started that, I wouldn't tolerate it', arguing those that didn't say anything are 'all complicit'. Both Artnell and Winston are identifying the expression of an exclusionary form of citizenship, whilst simultaneously theorising and proposing 'alternative formulations of citizenship'.[123] Through 'building community' with or refusing to 'tolerate' racism against fellow citizens, they are asserting through their own intentionality and value systems what a more racially equal citizenship experience should encompass. These theorisations, contextualised by the challenge to and deficit of substantive everyday citizenship

---

[121] Naga Kandiah, 'Like Shamima Begum, I Could Soon Be Stripped of British Citizenship Without Notice', *The Guardian* (online, 15 December 2021) <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/dec/15/shamima-begum-stripped-british-citizenship-nationality-and-borders-bill>, archived at <perma.cc/WA6Y-4Z6Z>; Andre Rhoden-Paul and Dominic Casciani, 'Shamima Begum Loses Bid to Regain UK Citizenship', *BBC News* (online, 23 February 2024) <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-68378818>, archived at <perma.cc/C63K-DJ9A>.

[122] Zoe Gardner, 'Briefing: The Afghanistan Crisis and Refugee Rights' (Briefing Paper, The Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants, August 2021) 1.

[123] Holston (n 15) 246.

(an experience of 'de facto statelessness'), reveal desired intersubjective relations rooted in care and compassion from fellow citizens and the state attendant to the history of racialisation in Britain. They also point to the deeply felt internalisation of the exploitation and diminishment of their sense of belonging, actualised by exposure to anti-immigrant discourses.

Material and discursive encounters with the 'Hostile Environment' and accompanying immigration enforcement has forced Artnell, Carl and Winston to re-evaluate their overall claim to Britishness. Carl, once 'proud' of his passport, has been 'left feeling stateless in the country [he] was born in' and certainly does not 'feel British, not anymore'. Similarly, Artnell is '99% sure' he will leave the UK for Jamaica — which he has now done — because of this experience and continued hostility, explaining, 'I've never been wanted here so why should I stay? I was never wanted here by the system, not the individuals, by the system'. Whilst Carl and Artnell reflect a belonging extricated from them, in contrast, Winston reflects on his multiple positionalities. His 'two cultures', British and Jamaican, make him 'culturally richer than white native British [people]'. In a sense, he is compensating for his exclusion from Englishness, which he interprets as 'a [white] clique ... that you're never going to be accepted into', dismissing such a singular belonging as being 'boring'. The substantive experience of encountering the 'Hostile Environment' regime brought Artnell, Carl and Winston to the borders of a particular articulation of citizenship, historically located in this moment, which they have identified and defined in terms of the prerogatives and effects of the regime. I would argue this articulation of citizenship expresses an 'entrenched' expression of white British citizenship with roots in colonial exploitation.[124] Their insights reflect a range of values and feelings found in the 'everyday' experience of citizenship that, in deficit, have undermined their 'dignity' as citizens.[125] From this expansive, everyday moral universe, we should also attribute what is conventionally thought of as higher order thinking — theorisations about the nature of British belonging and identity itself, the dynamic construction and bordering of the national community, and the meaning and significance of such effects for individuals on the outside looking in — reflecting a microcosm of 'anti-systemic' thought challenging the state.[126] Artnell, Carl and Winston drew from this harsh lived experience to agentively describe their deficit of citizenship and internalised subjectivities as non-belonging and racialised citizens as part of the process of reckoning with this injustice and making their claim as entitled British citizens.

VII Conclusion

This article has explored the deep and interconnected impacts of the 'Hostile Environment' regime on three members of the Windrush Generation. This was done through the prism of 'everyday' citizenship and the meaning of the state's legalistic and discursive bordering of citizenship at a granular level in the 'ordinary' language and generative lens of the citizenship experience.[127] Such a lens encompasses the conventional significance of legalistic and state-imposed structures and effects of citizenship, notably describable as an 'entrenched' form

[124] Grant (n 22) 1192; Hall (n 22) 18; Mitchell (n 25); Holston (n 15); Bhui (n 31); El-Enany (n 31).
[125] Holston (n 15).
[126] Staeheli et al (n 20) 635; Wallerstein (n 22) 653.
[127] Holston (n 15); Staeheli et al (n 20) 630–1; Dickinson et al (n 20) 104; Kallio (n 20) 714.

of white British citizenship, whilst foregrounding an agential, self-reflective and multifaceted experience of citizenship based on the 'standpoint' of those experiencing this 'illegalisation' or 'de facto statelessness'.[128] Included are the myriad of arenas, interactions and feelings contained within citizen–citizen and state–citizen encounters, contextualised by contested encounters with the regime. Encounters with the 'Hostile Environment' were 'actualised' through its 'substantive' effect on livelihoods, security, wellbeing and social connection, as well as through reception to anti-immigrant discourses, accumulating as a challenge to the British citizen subjectivities of Artnell, Carl and Winston, whereby they existed within and identified with a deficit of citizen, non-belonging and statelessness.[129] Whilst each experience was unique, one can identity a shared loss of 'dignity' as a fully included and respected citizen for Windrush members exposed to the Scandal.[130]

Within a 'scholar–activist' approach, this research has sought to centre the agency of my participants, record the holistic impact of the injustice of the Scandal and contribute in a small way to reckoning with it.[131] Through the prism of the 'everyday', the performative and mundane spaces and interactions between citizen–state and citizen–citizen alike are interpreted through a 'range of moral universes' that compose and articulate the citizenship experience.[132] This is significant for illustrating the deep impact of state power and exclusion, alongside the academic and ethical benefits of explicating the multiplicity of citizenship expressions, comprehensible in the '*ordinary* languages of citizenship', whereby entitlement to access to work, housing, health and protection takes meaning as purpose, safety, wellbeing and connection.[133] By tapping into this 'political agency which involves specific orientation, reflexivity, or intentionality', this research highlighted 'insurgent' citizen subjectivities and claim-making in both 'imaginary' and legalistic terms as a response to the injustice and indignity suffered.[134] Therefore, through Oral History the material and affective pain of this experience, rather than remaining an exogenous observation of state bordering, forms the substantive basis of theorisations on the citizenship experience, including the nature of the participants' citizenship within a broader and historical understanding of the state's structures and effects.[135]

By foregrounding the participants' 'everyday' experience through their own 'moral universes', this article acknowledges my participants' power to comprehensively critique an expression of British citizenship from the margins.[136] Through an 'everyday' citizenship lens we can see how the citizenship experience is undermined and left in deficit in a myriad of 'ordinary' ways which coalesce to condition individual subjectivities of non-belonging. Artnell, Carl and Winston's experiences hint at what the citizenship experience can or should mean, in terms of dignified livelihoods, homes, wellbeing and social relations, silhouetted by the deficit of citizenship imposed by the 'Hostile Environment'. By accounting for

---

128 Holston (n 15); De Genova (n 30); Kneebone et al (n 10).
129 Chigudu (n 15); Bahram (n 13).
130 Holston (n 15).
131 Closs Stephens and Bagleman (n 8) 330.
132 Staeheli et al (n 20) 640.
133 Roy and Neveu (n 36) 386.
134 Kallio (n 20) 724; Holston (n 15); Chigudu (n 15).
135 Portelli (n 58); Mitchell (n 25).
136 Bahram (n 13).

this holistic experience, individuals agentively embody their citizenship experience to theorise their own meaning of citizenship and to astutely critique the exclusionary structures imposed upon them. This article has sought to do justice to Windrush members' experiences and promote their critiques of Britain's racialised and exclusionary form of citizenship as valid theories. It is hopeful that the framework of 'everyday' citizenship can be foregrounded in future political and policy discussions to encompass the views of individual citizenship experiences and the agency of individuals and communities to propose critiques and solutions to injustice imposed upon them. Further research could attend to the meaning of a full, inclusive and dignified citizenship experience beyond the context of the 'Windrush Scandal'. Conversely, documentation of the Windrush Generation's 'insurgent'[137] attempts to claim a fuller and more dignified citizenship experience in the wake of the Scandal is required, such as their challenge to the state's control of this reckoning through the Windrush schemes.

[137] Holsten (n 15).