The Network Newsletter:
tackling social exclusion in libraries, museums, archives and galleries

Number 232, June 2020

(Formerly published as *Public Libraries & Social Exclusion Action Planning Network Newsletter*, issue 1, May 1999 – issue 29, September 2001)

The Network's Website is at www.seapn.org.uk and includes information on courses, good practice, specific socially excluded groups, as well as the newsletter archive.

Contents List

Did you see …?

- *Books for Keeps* – page 2

Coronavirus/COVID-19

- *Poverty and COVID-19: a report of the Social Metrics Commission* – page 2

Health & Wellbeing issues – Other Agencies

- *The Prince's Trust youth index 2020* – page 4

Migration issues – Other Agencies

- *From expendable to key workers and back again: immigration and the lottery of belonging in Britain* – page 7

Abbreviations and acronyms – page 14

_____

Did you see …?

Books for Keeps

The July issue[1] has an interesting range of articles and reviews, as always, but of particular interest is Zoey Dixon "How to be an anti-racist librarian", which outlines some basic actions which anyone can take; she advises:

> "As children's librarians, supporting Black people and being antiracist goes beyond just listening and educating yourself; that is the first step, but it is not enough. You can bring a pro-active, anti-racist approach to delivering a library service, which will have an impact beyond your own attitudes and behaviours." [p3]

Coronavirus/COVID-19

Poverty and COVID-19: a report of the Social Metrics Commission

This is an important new report[2], highlighting some of the impacts of COVID-19.

> "This report uses original analysis of a new YouGov poll of close to 80,000 people between March and May 2020. Based on the approach of the Social Metrics Commission's poverty measurement framework, it provides early indications of the likely scale and nature of poverty impacts coming from the economic fallout of the Covid-19 pandemic in the UK." [p2]

The Social Metrics Commission:

> "[…] is an independent Commission formed and led by the Legatum Institute's CEO Baroness Stroud.
>
> The Social Metrics Commission was brought together to develop a new approach to poverty measurement that both better reflects the nature and experiences of poverty that different families in the UK have, and can be used to build a consensus around poverty measurement and action in the UK.
>
> The Commission is an independent and rigorously non-partisan organisation dedicated to helping policy makers and the public understand and take action to tackle poverty. Its ultimate goal has been

---

[1] *Books for Keeps*, no.243, Jul 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: https://content.yudu.com/web/1mjdv/0A1mjdx/BfKNo243July2020/html/print/BfK%2024 3%20July%202020_DL.pdf.

[2] *Poverty and COVID-19: a report of the Social Metrics Commission.* Social Metrics Commission, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: https://socialmetricscommission.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/SMC-Poverty-and-Covid-Report.pdf.

to develop new poverty metrics for the UK which will have both long-term political support and effectively identify those who are in poverty. By doing so, we hope that Government and others will be better able to develop interventions that reduce the number of people experiencing poverty and improve outcomes for those people who do experience it."[3],[4]

The report includes important findings:

- "Those employed prior to the crisis and already in the deepest forms of poverty have been most heavily impacted by the economic fallout. For example, compared to those more than 20% above the poverty line, those more than 50% below the poverty line have been 15 percentage points more likely to have experienced a negative labour market outcome.

- Groups already over-represented amongst the population in poverty have also been most heavily impacted by the crisis. For example, disabled people employed before the Covid-19 pandemic have been 4 percentage points more likely to have experienced a negative labour market outcome than people without a disability.

- The youngest and oldest workers have been impacted most by Covid-19. Compared to those aged between 35 and 44, those aged 18-24 have been 7 percentage points more likely to have experienced a negative labour market outcome, and those aged 55 and over have been 4 percentage points more likely to be negatively impacted.

- Some groups with already very high poverty rates have also been impacted more by the crisis. For example, those from Black and Asian ethnicities have been more likely to be negatively impacted (by 4 and 6 percentage points respectively) than those from White ethnic groups.

- Impacts vary significantly between workers in different industries. For example, 81% of those working in hospitality and leisure have been negatively impacted, compared to just 16% in financial services.

- Impacts also vary between different local authorities. On average, close to a half (47%) of the workforce have been negatively impacted in local authorities experiencing the biggest impacts. This compares to less than a third (30%) in local authorities experiencing the lowest impacts." [p2]

In addition, it seems very likely that:

- Many of those already in poverty could move deeper into poverty as a result of losing their jobs or having lower earnings because of reduced hours or pay. This would exacerbate the already increasing trend in deep poverty seen over the last 20 years.

---

[3] Taken from: https://socialmetricscommission.org.uk/about/.
[4] "The Legatum Institute is a London-based think-tank with a bold vision: to create a global movement of people committed to creating the pathways from poverty to prosperity and the transformation of society." [Taken from: https://li.com/about/]

- Those previously close to, but above, the poverty line could move into poverty because of their changing employment status. This could result in a significant increase in poverty." [p3]

The report concludes that:

"What these results show is that poverty, the Lived Experience of poverty and the impacts of the Covid-19 crisis, are complex and driven by an interlocking range of factors. Understanding, measuring and documenting these and using the findings to drive anti-poverty responses will be central to ensuring that, as the economy begins to emerge from the lockdown of previous months, the recovery leads to a situation where poverty after Covid-19 is lower and less severe than it was before the pandemic. The Commission's poverty measurement framework provides a comprehensive approach both through which this can be undertaken, and against which the Government can be held to account for tackling poverty in the UK." [p4][5]

Health & Wellbeing issues – Other Agencies

The Prince's Trust youth index 2020

This report[6], released to coincide with International Youth Day, is the latest annual 'snapshot' from the Trust, supported by L'Oréal Paris.

"This year, the Index found that the overall wellbeing of 16 to 25-year-olds in the UK has dropped to its lowest ever level. The figures are based on data collected towards end of 2019, before we knew that a global pandemic was upon us and that we were heading into an economic crisis that would take such a brutal toll on the jobs market. The employment challenges facing young people today are arguably greater now than at any other point in living memory." [p2]

The research findings are derived from:

"[…] the results of an online survey in which a sample of 2,103 16 to 25-year-olds participated between 19th December 2019 and 7th January 2020." [p3]

Key findings include:

---

[5] Source: JRF *Weekly round-up*, 7 Aug 2020.
[6] *The Prince's Trust youth index 2020*. The Prince's Trust, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: https://www.princes-trust.org.uk/about-the-trust/news-views/youth-index-2020?utm_campaign=1500860_IYD%20-%20August%20ENews%202020&utm_medium=email&utm_source=The%20Prince%27s%20Trust&dm_i=4DH7,W62K,273YFE,3YQ1L,1.

- "This year's overall Index score for 16 to 25-year-olds in the UK is 68, the lowest ever level in Youth Index history. The equivalent score for NEET young people is 57, which is also the lowest score on record.
- Over half of young people (54 per cent) say they always or often feel anxious. For NEET young people, this rises by 14 percentage points, with 66 per cent claiming to always or often feel anxious.
- NEET young people are also much less likely to feel happy than those who are not NEET. Overall, 40 per cent of young people said that they only sometimes, or never, feel happy, while 60 per cent of NEET young people said the same." [p5]

The report also highlights a crisis in confidence which holds back many young people:

- "38 per cent of 16 to 25-year-olds say they feel powerless to change their future. This rises to 44 per cent for NEET young people.
- Over a quarter (28 per cent) of young people report feeling like they are going to fail in life, rising to 40 percent for those not in work or education.
- More than a third of young people say they don't believe in themselves and one in five say they think their life will amount to nothing, no matter how hard they try.
- 43 per cent of NEET young people say they do not believe in themselves." [p5]

The research also identified a gender divide:

> "Young women are more likely to experience stress and anxiety, as well as to feel down or depressed. Young men, on the other hand, are less likely than young women to say they feel loved […]" [p5]

The report focuses on the needs of young people who are NEET:

> "Sadly, NEET young people are more likely to feel negative emotions, such as sadness and anxiety, which can so often have a long-term impact on their emotional wellbeing […]" [p9]

To help overcome this, the report recommends that:

> "By supporting NEET young people to build the confidence and skills they need to move into work, education or training, we can set them up for a happier future and ultimately help to close these gaps." [p9]

As Jonathan Townsend (Chief Executive of the Trust) says in the Foreword:

> "The most important thing now is that government, employers, educators and charities work together to help young people. In doing so, we can support them to develop the necessary skills, resilience and self-belief they need to navigate their way through the unpredictable months and years ahead." [p2][7]

---

[7] Source: email from the Prince's Trust, 12 Aug 2020.

These findings have been reinforced by new research[8] in London:

> "A new briefing paper – supported by Trust for London – shows that low paid workers in the capital have been hit hardest by the economic impact of the pandemic. Low paid workers are more likely to have lost their job, they are more likely to have suffered a drop in income, and they are more worried about their financial future."[9]

As their Key Findings show:

> "Low paid workers in London are more likely to be women, young people, migrants, and those from black ethnic groups. Eight in ten (83%) low paid workers in London are women, more than two in five (45%) are migrants, one in six are black (16%) or Asian (17%), over half (56%) have lower levels of qualifications, and nine out of ten (88%) are younger workers."[10]

In addition, recent research published in *The Lancet*[11] found that:

> "Young people, women, and those with small children saw their mental health worsen significantly more than other groups."[12]

All of this work really does emphasise that we have not all reacted in similar ways to the pandemic (or been treated equally by it), and that there is an urgent need to develop provision for young people.

Finally, at the time of writing this, the issues around A level and other results were just starting to take off – this too is having a major impact on young people and their future lives.

---

[8] *The impact of the coronavirus outbreak on London's low paid workers: early research findings.* National Learning and Work Institute, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from: https://learningandwork.org.uk/resources/research-and-reports/the-impact-of-the-coronavirus-outbreak-on-londons-low-paid-workers/?vgo_ee=QPKkT1SxgsiUdFucpWmZgU5Xw8IcJbZJCEP4X9vwpSQ%3D.

[9] Taken from Learning and Work Institute *Supporter Newsletter*, Aug 2020.

[10] Taken from: https://learningandwork.org.uk/resources/research-and-reports/the-impact-of-the-coronavirus-outbreak-on-londons-low-paid-workers/?vgo_ee=QPKkT1SxgsiUdFucpWmZgU5Xw8IcJbZJCEP4X9vwpSQ%3D.

[11] Matthias Pierce *et al*. "Mental health before and during the COVID-19 pandemic: a longitudinal probability sample survey of the UK population", *The Lancet*, 21 Jul 2020, https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanpsy/article/PIIS2215-0366(20)30308-4/fulltext#%20.

[12] Kathryn Abel and Matthias Pierce "Young people's mental health deteriorated the most during the pandemic, study finds", *The Conversation*, 12 Aug 2020, https://theconversation.com/young-peoples-mental-health-deteriorated-the-most-during-the-pandemic-study-finds-143326?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Latest%20from%20The%20Conversation%20for%20August%2012%202020%20-%201702316429&utm_content=Latest%20from%20The%20Conversation%20for%20August%2012%202020%20-%201702316429+CID_7acf8476aa4680547dda5d28dfbbdaef&utm_source=campaign_monitor_uk&utm_term=Young%20peoples%20mental%20health%20deteriorated%20the%20most%20during%20the%20pandemic%20study%20finds.

As just one example, Helen Barnard (Deputy Director of Policy and Partnerships, JRF) has written[13]:

> "Before coronavirus, too many young people from poorer backgrounds were shut out of opportunities to get good qualifications and decent jobs. In a compassionate and just society, it is unacceptable for them to also pay the price of a global pandemic."

and she concludes by emphasising the attainment gap between young people from poorer and more affluent backgrounds:

> "We have had a big and stubborn attainment gap across the UK for many years. The focus today is on A-level results, but less than half of young people from poorer backgrounds get five good GCSEs. They're already locked out of most pathways to university, higher level qualifications and good jobs. Of those who do make it to A-levels, they're around half as likely as those from richer backgrounds to come out with two or more A-levels. The biggest danger in the current situation is that these unacceptable attainment gaps widen even further.
>
> We have already seen lockdown hit children from poorer backgrounds harder than those from richer families. Less likely to have a school providing good on-line education. Less likely to have digital access, a quiet place to work, essentials like food and education supplies.
>
> These unequal effects of Covid could be compounded by an approach to exam results which relies in part on a school's track record, since young people from low income backgrounds tend to go to schools with worse results. It may also be reinforced if the appeals process depends heavily on students, parents and schools assertively challenging results and skilfully navigating a confusing system. Families and schools who are trying to stay afloat whilst caught up in deepening poverty are likely to have less time, energy, confidence and knowledge of the system than those in areas where the essentials of life are taken care of."

Migration issues – Other Agencies

From expendable to key workers and back again: immigration and the lottery of belonging in Britain

This is an important new report[14] from Runnymede Trust.

---

[13] Helen Barnard "#ResultsDay 2020 – A fog of uncertainty has created a new peak of anger and worry", *FE News*, 13 Aug 2020, https://www.fenews.co.uk/featured-article/53112-it-is-unacceptable-for-young-people-to-pay-the-price-of-a-global-pandemic#.XzUKJb9zzLQ.twitter.

[14] Kimberly McIntosh (ed). *From expendable to key workers and back again: immigration and the lottery of belonging in Britain*. Runnymede Trust, 2020. Available to download as a pdf from:

It begins with a brief Foreword by Lord Alf Dubs, setting the scene:

> "The world is facing the greatest refugee crisis since the Second World War. With no prospect of global conflicts or persecution ceasing any time soon, the crisis is set to continue. Global migration, driven often by poverty, is a reality that our societies cannot ignore. And with the growing threat to the world's poorest communities of climate change, the refugee crisis and global migration will only increase, as drought, crop failure and flooding drive even more people from their homes.
>
> There are 30 million refugees worldwide and 35 million internally displaced people." [p3]

He calls for a "Europe-wide response to Europe's refugee population" and the need to "talk honestly about migration and the enormous benefits it brings to recipient countries."

This is followed by an introduction by Kimberly McIntosh, and eight chapters looking at different aspects of migration.

The introduction is called "Migration in crisis":

> "When we started putting together this volume it was in response to an immigration and asylum system that was failing on all counts […]
>
> Then an unprecedented pandemic brought the dysfunction of the immigration system and the possibility of change into even sharper focus." [p4]

The introduction also highlights another impending issue:

> "According to the Immigration Bill currently going through parliament, our 'low-skilled' workers, who are unlikely to meet the salary thresholds that both EU and non-EU citizens will have to meet after Brexit, are the very people who have kept the country moving, fed, cared for and in many cases alive during the Covid-19 pandemic." [p4]

The main thrust of the report is that the immigration system has to change, that change is possible, and that the pandemic has exposed the injustices at the heart of immigration and asylum policy. Finally, the introduction argues for more collaborative working:

> "Now is the time to push for change. It's vital that we work together to call for it." [p5]

Section 1 of the report is called "A broken system: how did we get here?", and has a chapter by Maya Goodfellow[15], "A hostile environment for migrants: How

---

https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/ImmigrationAndTheLotteryOfBelongingFINALJuly2020.pdf.

[15] Maya Goodfellow is the author of *Hostile environment: how immigrants became scapegoats*. Verso Books, 2019 (ISBN: 978-1788733366).

did we get here?", which looks at the UK's history of immigration legislation, that led to the 'hostile environment' policies. Yet:

> "People's views on immigration are not inevitable; they are produced not in a vacuum but in a society where an anti-immigration politics is the norm. But we got here because these anxieties around immigration are treated as if they're natural and so unavoidable unless immigration is 'controlled'." [p8]

Section 2 is "Citizenship and reaffirming rights". This includes two chapters, the first of which is "Prioritising children's rights to British citizenship" by Zubaida Haque (the interim director at the Runnymede Trust). This reminds us that:

> "[…] birthright citizenship (otherwise known as *jus soli*) no longer exists in the UK. It was removed in 1983, by Margaret Thatcher, then Conservative prime minister, through the 1981 British Nationality Act (BNA). From 1 January 1983, under Section 1(1) of the BNA, persons born in the UK, or brought up here from a young age (under 10 years), would now only be entitled to automatic British citizenship if one or both of their parents were British, or settled in the UK. In addition, any entitlement to British citizenship (through Section 1(3) and Section 1(4)), if not registered, would be lost at the age of 18 for those children who were brought here at a young age." [p10]

In addition, under Tony Blair's Labour Government in 2006, the 1981 BNA was extended:

> "[…] ensuring that hundreds – possibly thousands – of children, predominantly from black and minority ethnic backgrounds, would be denied citizenship based on 'good character' […] requirements." [p11]

The 'good character' requirements have never been defined, with the result that:

> "Since 2006, hundreds if not thousands of children over the age of 10, predominantly from BME backgrounds, as well as those growing up in care or with learning difficulties, have been discouraged from applying for British citizenship, or deprived of citizenship, because of some form of (often minor) contact with the criminal justice system." [p11]

This chapter argues that the 'good character' requirements should be removed; barriers to gaining citizenship need to be addressed; and that:

> "[…] there needs to be new guidance for all public authorities to identify children who may be entitled to British citizenship but are currently not registered – either because they are unaware of their entitlement or because they have been discouraged from applying for it because of concerns around meeting good character requirements." [p12]

The second chapter, by barrister Colin Yeo, is "Citizens in waiting: The case for reforming citizenship", which looks at one of the outcomes of the UK's immigration policies:

"[…] the creation of a significant population of long-term resident non-citizens. They include members of the Windrush generation – settled migrants who have either been unable to apply or for other reasons have not applied for citizenship – and unauthorised migrants. Today, there are an estimated 600,000 to 1.2 million unauthorised migrants living in the UK […] Worse still, this includes an estimated 215,000 children and a further 117,000 young people between the ages of 18 and 24 who were born in the country or brought here as children." [p14]

The chapter looks at some of the processes involved to become a UK citizen, and how people 'slip through the cracks', and concludes that:

"Finally, politicians need to face up to the consequences of years of failed immigration and citizenship policies: the creation of a large population of non-citizens and unauthorised migrants. At present, settled status and citizenship are beyond the reach of many in this group. They are not going to be detained and forcibly removed, nor are they going to be persuaded to 'self-deport' through the disastrous hostile environment policy. A large-scale regularisation programme is needed to set these individuals on the road to citizenship." [p17]

Section 3 is called "COVID-19 and the case for an immigration and asylum system overhaul". This also includes two chapters.

The first of these, "Lockdown: Immigration detention in the Covid-19 crisis and beyond", is by Matthew Leidecker (Campaigns Manager at Detention Action) and highlights, via the impact of COVID-19, just how poorly the detention processes work. However, the chapter ends with a note of cautious optimism:

"At the time of writing, immigration detention in the UK is down to its lowest level in 10 years and the stage is set for fundamental reform." [p22]

The second chapter is "Sisters not strangers: refugee women, Covid-19 and destitution" by Priscilla Dudhia (Policy and Research Coordinator, Women for Refugee Women). This highlights the inhumanity of the UK immigration system:

"British governments, past and present, have heralded the UK as a country where survivors of persecution are protected and treated with dignity. But these assertions are a far cry from reality. Vulnerable people who have fled war or persecution are made hungry and homeless because of a deliberate government policy designed to push them out of the UK. Women who have already suffered horrific acts of sexual violence in their countries of origin are often sexually abused again in the country they thought would provide them with safety." [p24]

It argues that:

- "There is no question that the laws which make up the hostile environment, and which enforce destitution, must be challenged. But for more durable change we need a fundamental shift in the way our politicians and the public think about migration." [p27]

- "[…] there needs to be a shift in the narrative surrounding migration, so that it is perceived no longer as a new threat but instead as something that has long been a part of the UK's rich and complex history." [p27]

- "At the same time, changing the narrative requires that those who are marginalised be heard. We must support asylum-seeking people, particularly women who are often deprived of a platform, to speak up about their experiences and advocate. There is a need for those who are more privileged, who have access to greater opportunities and resources, to become allies with these women and to be bold – not speaking on their behalf but creating spaces for their stories to be represented in the media, challenging law and policymaking where women are not meaningfully consulted and ensuring that women are supported to lead campaigns that have the potential to impact so greatly upon their lives." [p27]

Section 4 is called "Organising for change" and also includes two chapters. The first of these is Akram Salhab and Neha Shah (from Migrants Organise) "Building the migrant justice movement" – this looks critically at the growth of the notions of 'community organising' and 'movement building'.

In terms of 'community organising', for example, the authors argue that:

"[…] there are a number of disconcerting elements to how community organising is currently conceived. Community organising is often spoken about as a 'pioneering' approach, hitherto unheard of and without precedent. Knowledge of its rarefied method is the domain of organisers, who impart information to those they are teaching via formulaic training that looks at power analysis, active listening, strategy and action planning." [p29]

In addition, much of the work on this in the UK has been taken from the US, which the authors argue is used uncritically:

"Out of context quotations are used to equate systemic analyses of oppression with interpersonal manifestations of discrimination, exclusion and insult. State racism and colonialism become reduced to individual 'white privilege', capitalist exploitation transformed into just another social oppression […] A serious analysis of discrimination and exploitation, both internationally and within Britain, is neglected in favour of an uncritical transposition of US specific conceptions of race and anti-blackness." [p30]

All of this leads to an "erasure of historical struggles" [p30].

In terms of 'movement building', the authors look briefly at how a Black 'movement' grew in the UK in the 1950s and 1960s, but then became de-radicalised from the 1970s onwards – and the effect that this had:

"The black community previously organised on the understanding that anti-racism was a collective response to attacks against those most

oppressed and marginalised by the state. Increasingly, however, racism is no longer understood as a global structure underpinning systems of exploitation at home and abroad. Campaigns instead set their sights much lower, orienting themselves only against personal racism or bigotry, leaving structural and institutional racism intact. In turn, this leaves so-called 'antidiscrimination' campaigns vulnerable to co-optation by the very institutions that create and enact racist policies […] The movement's previous focus on black 'issues' – matters of national (and often international) importance that connected communities in common struggle – has been flattened into a focus on individual, exceptionalised 'cases': phenomena that only merit attention or resistance from a handful of 'stakeholders' or that advance only the most minimal policy demands." [p31]

Instead, the authors conclude that:

"The task ahead is to forge a new internationalist anti-racism built around shared principles – a shared ideology – that draws on and combines progressive traditions from within migrant communities and among British internationalists." [p32]

The second chapter in this section is "Organising against data sharing" by Gracie Mae Bradley (Policy Manager, Liberty). This looks at the data-sharing practices whereby:

"[…] personal data collected by essential public services is being shared with the Home Office for two purposes: first, to check a person's immigration status and their entitlement to a particular good or service; and second, to allow the Home Office to better target people for immigration enforcement." [p33]

The conclusion is particularly significant:

"It has taken a long time for the technological underpinnings of the hostile environment to be fully unearthed, and their impact on human rights, as well as the impact on public services and society, is still not as widely known or understood as it should be. However, we have learned several things from the last few years of campaigning. First, migrant rights activists, and indeed all social justice activists, should work towards digital literacy. New technologies are the means by which old state logics and practices are implemented. Second, a multifaceted, coalition-based approach has – through teaming up with grassroots groups, strategic legal challenges, creative protest, political lobbying and uncompromising messaging – achieved impressive wins in the face of an unpromising public mood and difficult parliamentary arithmetic. Third, working at the intersections of what are often traditionally understood as totally siloed areas (data protection, immigration, policing) is absolutely vital in order to get out ahead of harmful policies. Lastly, policies and practices that have an especially negative impact on racialised groups are all too often trials in state practice with a hugely negative impact on the civil liberties of all of us and must be resisted on these grounds too." [p36]

The final Section, "Looking to the future", has just one chapter – "Movement minus discrimination: a global migration lottery?" by Omar Khan (formerly Director, Runnymede Trust).

This takes a critical look at political stances, for example, immigration targets:

> "Take the 'immigration target', ostensibly UK government policy for nearly a decade. This 'tens of thousands' target – that immigration should remain at net 99,000 or below – never came close to being met, with net migration exceeding 200,000 for most of this period and peaking at 336,000 […] If the government had been serious about this 'tens of thousands' figure, they would have had to implement much more severe restrictionist policies. They knew this would cause economic damage and human suffering and so didn't implement the policies that would have achieved their magic number." [p37]

It also looks at the effects of leaving the EU:

> "Leaving the European Union appears a major setback to achieving a more liberal immigration policy. However, we should not overstate the progressive nature of the EU. Free movement does not address the question of how free movement for Europeans connects to the global movement of people beyond Europe in the medium- to longer-term." [p38]

Although we are a long way from this, Omar Khan wonders whether "[…] more pluralist (including diasporic) conceptions of membership and belonging" [p38] might be something to aim for.

He then goes on to look at racial discrimination in immigration, arguing that current policy results in direct or indirect discrimination, and that:

> "Many would go further and say that the *intent* of immigration policy is racially discriminatory […]" [p38 – emphasis his]

Omar Khan identifies a number of actions that need to be taken to dismantle these policies and processes, and argues that:

> "Finally, there is a need to consider how far any migration controls can be non-discriminatory, particularly in light of Britain's colonial history and the wider consequences of European colonialism – namely, that global economic inequalities are extensive and are not randomly distributed. When the UK or any other country adopts economic criteria for migrant entry, the effect is to prefer migrants from wealthier countries. And given that global inequalities of wealth are (in part) a consequence of colonialism, which itself was a political and economic system underpinned by racial inequalities and racism, such migration policies are tainted by racial discrimination and its ongoing consequences." [p39]

In outlining what a "new plank of migration policy" might look like, he argues that we need to stop differentiating between 'economic migrants' and refugees and asylum-seekers:

"Two policy proposals are possible: first, to seek to expand the notion of 'refugee' to encompass a much wider group of people, namely all of those living below a certain income threshold (a global poverty line? The global median?) around the world; second, to acknowledge the injustice of current global inequalities and to seek an alternative migration route or policy in response to it." [pp39-40]

He acknowledges that, at the current time, this may be 'blue sky thinking', however:

"We need to redouble our efforts to defend refugee and asylum policy, to support the principle of humanitarianism and duties of aid. But we also need to be bolder in affirming the basic fact that 'people move, they always have and they always will'. We can and should view migration policy as a way of achieving global justice, including tackling racial discrimination, without which we cannot achieve justice at home." [p40]

This is an important report which deserves wide readership – and with ideas that we can develop and issues that we need to debate and take on urgently.[16]

Abbreviations and acronyms

JRF = Joseph Rowntree Foundation
NEET = Not in Education, Employment or Training

.

This Newsletter was compiled by John Vincent, and all items are written by him, unless otherwise stated. Please send any comments or items for the next issue to:

John Vincent
Wisteria Cottage
Nadderwater
Exeter EX4 2JQ

Tel/fax: 01392 256045
E-mail: john@nadder.org.uk   June 2020

---

[16] Source: email from the Runnymede Trust, 31 Jul 2020.