After the enlargement of the EU in 2004, immigration from the new EU Member States to the United Kingdom has grown into what the Office for National Statistics has called “the largest single wave of foreign in-movement ever experienced by the UK.”\(^2\) To see this East to West migration process in Europe from the perspective of the British press reveals how the choices made by the media in their reporting can reinforce existing xenophobia, racism and prejudices and create a feeling of hostility among the population. Statistical characterisations like the above, for example, have been the perfect foil for sensationalist stories, which described an “invasion” of Britain by “floods” of immigrants who were going to “swamp” the country.\(^3\) Media reporting, however, can also encourage coexistence, by countering prejudices and fears and emphasizing the benefits that the arrival of the newcomers has yielded for the country. This article presents some of the most common perspectives that dominated in the British press regarding the Central and Eastern European newcomers who arrived after the EU enlargement in 2004.\(^4\)

There has been a clear division in how the issue of immigration from Central and Eastern Europe after the EU enlargement in 2004 has been covered by the British press. There were notable differences in which topics were covered and how they were reported in the ‘right-wing’, traditionally anti-EU and anti-immigration newspapers, such as the *Daily Telegraph* and the *Daily Mail*, and the more ‘liberal’ ones such as the *Independent* or the *Guardian*. The division, however, is not necessarily straightforward. Press coverage has been ambiguous and the debate has gone beyond traditional divisions. The tabloid press, however, has predictably adopted an extremely alarmist tone.

The “EU immigrants”: Differences and similarities with previous groups of immigrants

The current immigration from Eastern to Western Europe is similar to numerous other migration movements in many ways. The newcomers left their country mainly for economic reasons, speak an unfamiliar language and have to grapple with being “different” from the majority population. The immigrants are met with some suspicion, and social strains can emerge in the host country.

The immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe are, however, different from other immigrant groups in Britain in several ways. Such factors include the high number of people arriving within a very short time frame, the relatively smaller cultural differences between the immigrants and the British, and the relatively high number of migrants who come as temporary or seasonal migrants.

This particular influx is also different from historical migration flows from Eastern to Western Europe. Not only does it involve far larger numbers, it is also made up by people from a much larger variety of professional and social backgrounds.

This difference is largely the result of technological progress and the rapidly increasing globalisation and internationalisation of societies. Media networks and information technology help spread news of migration possibilities more easily, and help create migrant networks. Along with cheaper and less cumbersome travel links, they create closer links between the countries of origin and destination and make the break with the country of origin less definite.
and less complete. The major driver of the migration flow to Britain, however, was that the UK was one of only three EU countries that opened its labour market to workers from the new Member States completely. Not having to deal with the overly bureaucratic and administrative issues previous migrants faced made emigration relatively easy.

**A battle of numbers: Where does the truth lie?**

For all the above reasons, the migration of workers from Central and Eastern Europe to Britain in the first years after the enlargement soon involved much higher numbers than the British government had foreseen. Equally soon, these numbers started to play an important role in the way the British press framed the phenomenon. Counting the number of newcomers became a central focus of media coverage, and was often translated into alarmist headlines.5

The greatly differing numbers that were floated by newspapers as estimates of the likely number of immigrants often seemed to primarily reflect the views of the newspaper about the phenomenon. On the eve of the EU enlargement in May 2004, the *Daily Mail* predicted that four million immigrants would come to Britain;6 the *Daily Telegraph* pegged the number at 4.4 million.7 The *Evening Standard* estimated that “54,000 immigrants will seek work in Britain within a year of their countries joining the European Union.”8 The Home Office estimate, meanwhile, was four times lower than this figure and about four hundred times lower than the predictions of the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Telegraph*; it foresaw only 13,000 people moving to Britain.9

Even now that the original government assessments turn out to have greatly underestimated the number of migrants that were to come, the actual numbers still do not approach the initial alarmist warnings in the *Mail*. It is admittedly difficult to calculate the precise number of immigrants that came to Britain in the few years after enlargement, but the number of immigrants from the new Member States who registered on the Worker Registration Scheme between 1 May 2004 and 30 June 2007 was 683,000.10

The use of wildly varying numbers and the primary focus on the quantity of immigrants coming to Britain that characterised much of the press coverage has, at times, portrayed any number as alarmingly high. Headlines such as “UK lets in more Poles than there are in Warsaw”, “Britain taking in 1,500 immigrants a day” and “One immigrant a minute enters the UK” appeared in the *Daily Mail*, the *Times* and the *Daily Telegraph*.11 On February 19, 2004, the *Daily Mail* published a story headlined “4m ‘Will Head From the East’”.12 Such a headline instantly invokes a feeling of panic in the reader. What are we going to do with all these people? The reader who continued reading, however, actually found that these four million people were expected to come to all the EU countries in the next 25 years. A far cry from the initial suggestion that four million people would come within a couple of months after accession, or even on May 2, 2004, to ‘overrun’ Britain.

The media also focused their attention on the Roma, who were “ready to flood in.”13 A title of a poll in the *Daily Express* in January 2004 asked its readers: “Should we let Gypsies invade England?” This was part of a larger media campaign against the Roma migration to Britain led by the tabloids.14

Coverage framed in these terms did not lend itself for a rational assessment of the real numbers involved. Instead, the random numbers and disturbing statistics touted in the tabloid newspapers only sought to evoke the impression of an imminent ‘invasion’ of the country, fostering a widespread negative perception of the immigrants.

**Are they similar enough?**

The characteristics of the immigrants from the former communist countries and their *sameness* or *otherness* from the British population were also a hot topic in the press. Conflicting patterns could be observed in the characterisation of the immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe. Traditional modes of portrayal of the immigrant as being (dangerously) different were interspersed with characterisations in which the Central and East European immigrants were used as foil in an argument explicitly or implicitly aimed at other, less ‘desirable’ immigrant groups.
An article in the *Times* published a month after the EU enlargement in 2004, for example, emphasised the importance of the similarity between the Polish and British cultures: “They [the Poles] are people who want to work and learn English quickly, who dress like us and who are not prone to strange religious fanaticism.”\(^{15}\) Such portrayals, though ostensibly praising the newcomers, mostly seem to speak to British fears of terrorism and Islamic fundamentalism and aversions to immigrants from developing countries. The East European immigrants, at least, are white and Christian, and therefore thought to be ‘less problematic’, and to assimilate easier than other immigrants. As Dan Tilles suggests: “Although it is not politically correct to mention it, the fact that they are white, Christian Europeans also surely helps them avoid standing out and attracting hostility.”\(^{16}\)

Andrew Green, chairman of *Migration Watch UK*, summed up this concept in a rather racist statement: “We have no problem with immigration from Poland, which is valuable to all sides… The government must make a reduction in numbers from elsewhere. What they could do is reduce the number of work permits for the rest of the world.”\(^{17}\) He emphasized this in an article in the *Daily Telegraph*, saying that EU immigration is “a distraction from the more serious problems stemming from a growing number of immigrants from the rest of the world.”\(^{18}\)

In short, in times of fraught relationships between the white majority population and some of the communities of immigrant descent, the perception on the part of the majority group that the immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe were less ‘different’ than other immigrants has helped the newcomers to be perceived as ‘good immigrants’. Positive characteristics that were attributed to them focused on their perceived unassuming diligence. A Scotsman quoted in the *Independent* said: “They are just the same as us, except maybe most of them are willing to work harder.”\(^{19}\)

In fact, while the primary media focus in these first years after the EU enlargement was on the estimates of how many people have arrived or will arrive, it was counter-weighed by a more favourable focus which highlighted the economic benefits the immigrants brought to the country. Reports along these lines would emphasize the enthusiasm and work ethic of the migrants.\(^{20}\) As one article in the *Spectator* put it: “The New Europeans are hard-working, presentable, well educated, and integrate so perfectly that they will disappear within a generation.”\(^{21}\) This perspective was reinforced by employers, such as the one who was interviewed for a research project and stressed the importance of the origin of immigrants: “The Poles have a strong work ethic, they are northern Europeans, they are Christians, their whole ethos – not to be racist – it’s a hard working culture that they come from. It’s also a hard drinking culture.”\(^{22}\) An alternate line of reporting reinforced this perspective as well from a different angle, with a number of articles describing the long working hours and poor living conditions of many immigrants.\(^{23}\)

Other articles, on the other hand, did emphasize the cultural difference of the Central and East European immigrants, warily describing how different the clothes the immigrants wear were, or how different the food they eat was. Examples include titles such as: “How Migrants Have Spiced up the Great British Dinner” or “Are Poles Apart or will we Take to this Tripe?”\(^{24}\) Specific attention was paid to how most of the immigrants were Catholic, and thus presented a divergence from the traditionally dominant Protestant religion in Britain.\(^{25}\)

**Notes of criticism**

The most critical notes in the media coverage during the initial period, however, were not aimed at the Eastern and Central European immigrants themselves, but at the British government. As the numbers of newcomers did not correspond to the predictions, the government was said to have no control over immigration.\(^{26}\)

Other sceptical notes were sounded on the topic of the impact that the migration flow was having on the countries of origin. This impact is diverse in character, and includes both positive and negative effects. For example, money sent back home by emigrants can be of significant benefit to the economy of the country of origin. However, the British press emphasized the negative effects of the outflow of qualified individuals. The *Guardian*, for instance, reported about the number of doctors that were leaving Poland for Britain, and the
report emphasised that it was the best ones that were leaving, as doctors wanting to work in
the UK had to pass a tough examination process.27 A year later the Guardian published an
article about a patient who had died in a Polish hospital due to the lack of anaesthetists, many
of whom have moved to Britain.28 In a similar tone, reports criticised ‘greedy’ parents
‘abandoning’ their children in the country of origin in search of riches in Britain.29

Conclusion

Positive themes that were regularly emphasized in the British press coverage of the
immigration of East and Central Europeans were the benefits that the newcomers bring to the
British economy, their attitudes towards work (working long hours, doing jobs that British
people do not want, etc.) and their similarity with the British culture. Negative themes, beyond
the often sensationalist focus on the sheer numbers involved, were related to the struggle
over public housing, sharing public space and schooling, language barriers and the perceived
inability or unwillingness to be or become ‘like us.’

A major flaw of the British press coverage of the immigrants from the new Member States is
how they were often described and considered collectively, as one unitary mass of
immigrants. Despite the range of educational backgrounds, and despite many of the
immigrants already having been in Britain before, the immigrants became collectively
associated with the iconic “Polish plumber”. Often, no distinction was made between
the countries of origin; it did not matter whether the immigrants came from Latvia, Poland or
Slovenia, they were all simply East European immigrants.

Several articles did present the personal experiences of newcomers, introducing immigrants
by name (if often misspelled) and recounting specific individual stories of workers who arrived
after May 2004. Nevertheless the impression that prevailed was all too often of one common
category of workers. The personal story of a Polish waitress or painter became an
indispensable element in such articles, reinforcing the standard image.30 In reality, although
most immigrants work in low-skilled manual trades, Home Office figures from the Worker
Registration Scheme show immigrants from the new member states working in an
extraordinary variety of jobs.31 The Independent even cited “research showing that one in
three immigrants from “new Europe” into the UK was taking up Office Managerial Posts.”32

In as far as the immigrants from Central and Eastern Europe were portrayed in a positive light
this was largely connected to two themes, both of which effectively tied their portrayal to
domestic debates predating their arrival. One focused on their ‘usefulness’ for the British
economy. The praise for the work ethic and ambition of these enthusiastic new immigrants
and their willingness to work even in low-paid jobs was often implicitly related to running
arguments about the structure of the British labour market and the social problems associated
with the “native” unemployed.33 In the other, related, theme, the perceived personal
characteristics of the immigrants were often reported in terms of how they were different from
other immigrants. Their portrayal as ‘hard-working’ and not too different often suggested an
implicit rebuke to other immigrant groups. But as Swiss writer and novelist Max Frisch noted
regarding the Turkish guest worker immigrants in Germany: ‘We called for a workforce, but
we got humans.’34 It is important to take their social and cultural identities into account when
regarding the newcomers and their place and role in society, not to simply see them as
‘labour units’ that improve the country’s economic figures.

The articles analysed for this study covered a broad sphere of topics, including both social
and economic aspects and varying from praise to criticism of the immigrants. However, it is
clear that there were dominant narratives in the media coverage, and that they have played a
unique role in determining the perception of Eastern European migration in Britain. Initial
alarmism about the imminent “flood” of immigrants has over time tended to give way
somewhat to an emphasis on their role as hard-working contributors to the national economy.
In as far as the British press came to reluctantly accept this influx of immigrants in such a
way, however, it would be hard to argue that this would also have been the case if they had
come from South Asia, the Middle East or the Caribbean.
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