

Nina Robinson

Racism, ethnicity, migration and decolonial studies (SLSP2690)

Module Convenor and Lecturer: Dr Ipek Demir

If you would like to cite this work, please use:

Robinson, Nina (2020) 'On Brexit' SLSP2690 Student Paper, University of Leeds

On the morning of the 24th June 2016, shockwaves were sent globally when it was announced that a small majority of 52% (BBC, n.d.) had voted to change Britain's relations with the European Union and leave. This unexpected result defied popular media and political commentators and hence sparked an extensive debate over the contributing factors for the Brexit camp's victory. Much of this debate tells us that a Brexit vote was a protest by individuals left behind in the dust by processes of globalisation and modernisation. A battle between the poor and the rich, the haves and the have nots, the winners and the losers.

It seems that this was not so much an orthodox political contest between the left and right, but a contest fought on cultural and racial values of liberalism versus authoritarianism (Swales, 2016; Goodwin and Heath, 2016b; Antonucci et al., 2017; Colantone and Stanig, 2016; Hakhverdian et al., 2013; Kriesi et al., 2008; Teney et al., 2013; Virdee and McGeever, 2017; Demir, 2017). A unique political confrontation where tangible differences between groups are somewhat meaningless in comparison to invisible differences between groups (Kaufmann, 2016).

Other reasons for caution include the lack of homogeneity within the leave vote that the phrase implies (Antonucci et al., 2017; Swales, 2016; Hobolt, 2016b; Bhambra, 2017; Dorling, 2016; Rhodes et al., 2019; Khan and Shaheen, 2017; Virdee and McGeever, 2017) and the exclusion of ethnic minorities (Bhambra, 2017; Swales, 2016; Rhodes et al., 2019; Khan and Shaheen, 2017). The layout and aims of this essay are as follows. Firstly, it addresses the rhetoric of the 'left-behinds gave us Brexit' in greater detail and identify some truth, albeit limited, to its claims. Then, the points of caution and flaws in this narrative are analysed and explored, with a specific focus on the importance of ideological values as a key driver, the wide-ranging profile of leave voters and lastly the overall exclusion of ethnic minorities from political commentary and debates. Finally, the essay analyses why we should cautiously approach the simplistic explanation that 'the left behinds gave us Brexit'.

Over the last decade, political commentary and literature have increasingly narrowed in on a cohort referred to as the 'left behind' (Rhodes et al., 2019; Antonucci et al., 2017). Ultimately, this term refers to a 'marginalised, predominately English white working class' (Rhodes et al., 2019, p.3) who have been displaced and disadvantaged as a result of recent socio-economic advancements. Most notably, globalisation that has seen the opening up of markets which has consequently sparked increasing economic competition, and ultimately resulted in the displacement of certain groups financial security and stability (Hakhverdian et al., 2013; Colantone and Stanig, 2016). Goodwin and Heath (2016b) claim that it is this group that lacks the appropriate and adaptable skills to succeed in a modern and globalised economy, hence why this cohort are often referred to as the 'losers of globalisation' (Goodwin and Heath, 2016a; Goodwin and Heath, 2016b; Hakhverdian et al., 2013; Kriesi et al., 2008). It is these 'losers' that are, as Kriesi et al. (2008) argues, much more likely to fall in favour of 'protectionist measures' (Hakhverdian et al., 2013, p.3), in an attempt to protect national economies from global competition, whilst also adopting a negative attitude towards European Union relations. It is this constituency that is both economically disadvantaged and where education levels are lower than average, that early literature pointed the finger at for producing the outcome of the European Union referendum (Goodwin and Heath, 2016b; Antonucci et al., 2017).

To some extent, there is some truth to this. A couple of academics have identified a correlation between education levels and attitudes to Europe, notably those of lower education are more likely to be Eurosceptic (Hakhverdian et al., 2013). This relationship is also evident when looking at the voter demographics which highlight that 'fifteen of the twenty "least educated" areas voted to leave the European Union, while every single one of the twenty "most educated" areas voted to remain.' (Goodwin and Heath, 2016b, p.326).

However, looking at the phrase the 'left behinds gave us Brexit' simply in an economic sense is wrong and far too simplistic for such a complex issue. Instead, more attention needs to be placed on the ideologies of Brexiteers and the culture of resentment towards social processes such as multiculturalism. This essay will seek to outline some of these cautions in more detail, in an attempt to highlight the danger in the ubiquity of the phrase 'the left behinds gave us Brexit'.

The first caution that this essay approaches is evidence to suggest that those in the Brexit camp hold 'left behind' ideologies regarding sovereignty, nationalism, nostalgia for the past, threats posed and hostility towards multiculturalism and immigration. Yet, it is worth identifying a caution to this approach too, as in some ways the term 'left behind' provides a platform to which a dangerous form of nationalism can benefit from and be somewhat legitimised (Rhodes et al., 2019). Therefore, this is by no means a solution, however, what it does do is offer a more accurate insight into those who fell in favour of the Leave campaign.

Much of what underpins the Brexit ideology is that of a nostalgia for the past (Tomlinson and Dorling, 2016; Virdee and McGeever, 2017; Demir 2017). Historian Linda Colley (2016) claims that the Brexit campaign was nothing short of a vision established for, and by, 'nostalgics in search of a lost empire' (Colley, 2016). A group of individuals with an inability to come to terms with the realities of Britain today, a Britain that is the recipient of the effects of globalisation, multiculturalism, de-industrialisation and off shoring, and whose 'epicentre has shifted decisively towards Asia' (Virdee and McGeever, 2017, p.1806). Interestingly, Tomlinson and Dorling (2016, p.11) imply that perhaps Brexit is the last 'death throes of Empire working its way out of our systems'. A return back to the good old times when Britain was at the 'top of the table' (Demir, 2017) and untouched by the likes of the very socio-economic processes that define Britain today.

Another element that was core to the Brexit campaign was that of tapping into the notion of perceived threat that was associated with European Union integration (McLauren, 2002; Hobolt, 2016; Ford and Goodwin, 2014; Hakhverdian et al., 2013). Hobolt (2016) claims that with the pooling of sovereignty that comes with greater European Union relations, there is a strong potential for the erosion of national identity and sovereignty, resulting in native groups being under threat. The Brexit vote was in many ways used to highlight this fear (Goodwin and Heath, 2016b). A fear that the European Union will undermine Britain's culture, values and ways of life and ultimately result in the degradation of the nation, or otherwise seen as a display of identity politics (McLauren, 2002). Identity politics has become a popular and thrown around phrase in political literature which refers to people establishing political partiality based upon their perceived identity and cohorts they exist within (Heath and Richards, 2018). This is a stark contrast to British politics that typically focuses on traditional divides of social class and economic status.

This concept of fear is coupled with an overwhelming element of hostility. Hostility that is fuelled by strong 'nationalistic and culturally intolerant attitudes' (Hakhverdian et al., 2013, p.5) towards other nations and their beliefs (Hobolt, 2016). Virdee and McGeever (2017) refer to this concept of great hostility towards anyone or thing that is not regarded as English, as 'politics of Englishness' (Virdee and McGeever, 2017, p.1804), and in many ways greater emphasis should be placed on this seemingly indiscernible driver of the leave campaigns ultimate success. This concept of Englishness is an increasing feature of British politics, as the establishment of a more 'salient sense of English national Identity' (Kenny, n.d.) has developed over recent years. This perceived sense of national identity had a strong presence within the European Union referendum; however, it lacks the same coverage, and is rarely discussed in comparison with questions of class and economic status (Eichhorn, 2018). A clear link is evident between those who supported Brexit and those who identify as English rather than British (Heath and Richards, 2018). In fact, 87% of the leave votes were from England, 79% of individuals who claim to be English over British voted leave and 66% of those who claimed to be more English than British voted leave (Ashcroft, 2016). All of which highlights the compelling case of the important role the 'politics of Englishness' played in the European Union referendum.

One of the core messages of the Leave campaign was to 'take back control of our borders' (Goodwin and Heath, 2016b), a rhetoric that reflected a strong anti-immigrant sentiment among Brexit supporters. Nigel Farage, one of the leading figures of the Leave camp, figure headed this attitude and was seen to promote the idea that as a result of European Union regulations, uncontrolled, open-door immigration had been facilitated which had produced catastrophic socio-economic effects on the country (Farage, 2016). Complaints over a suppression of wages in unskilled

labour markets, ultimately resulting in a poorer standard of living, have been a key argument to those who claim to have been displaced and disadvantaged as a result of the arrival of immigrant workers to Britain (Virdee and McGeever, 2017). All of which has left some, largely economically disadvantaged, groups to construct the migrant as a 'symbolic threat' (Ford and Goodwin, 2014, p.188) not only to the economic security of those considered as the domestic working class, but also to the economy as a whole. Goodwin and Heath's (2016a) research reflects this ideology by noting that just under 90% of individuals who regarded immigration as bad for the economy fell in favour of the Leave campaign (Goodwin and Heath, 2016a). However, immigrants are not just constructed as a threat in simply economic terms, the feeling of threat is far more complex than this and extends back to this idea of identity, nationalism and sovereignty. Clarke (2009) writes that immigrants pose a severe threat to the 'emotional construction of white identity' (Antonucci et al., 2017, p.216) that is constructed around, firstly, a nostalgia for the past, the good old days, and, secondly, around the fictitious glory days of the English white communities (Ibid).

To put it in more simple terms, it is multiculturalism, that is where the perceived threat lies: resentment towards it as a process, its effects on society and the ideals that it promotes. This is reflected in 81% of leave voters regarding multiculturalism as a 'force of ill' (Ashcroft, 2016). It would be fair to say that 'Brexit and multiculturalism are polar opposites' (Gutierrez, 2018) from each other, both holding starkly contrasting ideas of society and nation. The Brexit campaign by no means promotes an inclusive and diverse society, both of which are considered key principles to the definition of multiculturalism. This clear resentment towards multiculturalism is highlighted by Demir (2017) who identifies two fundamental factors for this distaste, which ultimately play a role in a reduction of privilege for selective cohorts of society and displace this need for a uniform population. Firstly, the resistance by immigrants to adopt the 'assimilationist policies of the old order' (Demir, 2017) in favour of their own traditional culture and, secondly, a call for an equal treatment of all citizens. It is clear from this why the Brexit camp have such nationalistic and anti-immigrant tones and rhetoric's in its campaign material and overall claims. As Hobolt (2016, p.1263) notes 84% of Brexit voters believed there would be less immigration into Britain if we voted to leave the European Union.

However, Colantone and Stanig (2016) make an interesting discovery that regions that were subject to high numbers of immigrant arrivals were much more likely to vote Remain, whereas regions with fewer new arrivals supported the Leave camp. Further to this, a comparison shows that the Tees Valley and Durham, areas with the lowest number of new arrivals, supported Brexit by a 60%, whilst London which is home to the five most popular regions for new arrivals, voted Remain (Colantone and Stanig, 2016). This work does raise some questions regarding the significance of the relationship between immigration attitudes and Brexit. With that being said, it would seem that the anti-immigrant sentiment, held by many of the Brexiteers, it is not so much based on reality and true experience, but instead is the product of a blame game, a scape goat and a focal point to release frustration.

All of the above sheds light on why the view the 'left behinds' gave us Brexit is rhetoric that should be approached with caution. By viewing the phrase simply in terms of economics, is not only too simplistic but inaccurate as this essay now discusses. It seems more accurate to say that Brexiteers hold 'left behind' ideologies and values, and it was these invisible factors that drove the Leave vote to success.

A second key caution that must be noted is that the Leave vote was by no means uniform (Antonucci et al., 2017; Swales, 2016; Hobolt, 2016b; Bhambra, 2017; Dorling, 2016; Rhodes et al., 2019; Khan and Shaheen, 2017; Virdee and McGeever, 2017). Instead, Brexit was supported by a substantially less socially homogeneous constituency than popular media would think, due to its representation of a much more 'general malaise amongst the ordinary' (Antonucci et al., 2017, p.214). Arguably, it was this diverse range of coalition of voters, not just the 'left behind', that underpinned the Leave campaigns ultimate success in delivering Brexit (Swales, 2016). Contrary to both popular media coverage and commentary, the terminology of the 'left behind' implies that Brexit was

delivered simply and only by the voices of a displaced and marginalised segment of the population, considered by some as the product of a white working-class revolt (Khan and Shaheen, 2017; Antonucci et al., 2017). This intense focus on this small group has, as a result, overstated the 'numerical significance' (Rhodes et al., 2019, p.3) of the 'left behind' voters and consequently much less attention has been placed on the other Brexit supporters (Bhambra, 2017). In fact, Dorling (2016) offers a useful insight into the voter demographics by noting that only '24% of Leave voters were located in the lowest two social classes' (Rhodes et al., 2019, p.3) and '59% of Leave voters were in the middle classes' (Ibid). Bhambra (2017) thus argues, that Brexit was arguably delivered by the 'proper- tied, pensioned, well-off, white middle class based in southern England' (Bhambra, 2017, p.215) instead of the 'left behinds' located in the north who have typically been held responsible for the result. However, this by no means suggests that the result was delivered entirely and only by affluent Eurosceptics with anti-globalisation and anti-immigration sentiments, but also by a small number of economically disadvantaged and displaced individuals too (Swales, 2016). Therefore, what the Leave campaign succeeded in doing was harnessing a broad coalition of voters, unlike what the titled phrase of 'the left behinds gave us Brexit' implies, that ultimately pushed them to victory at the end of the day.

The final caution that this essay looks at in regard to the phrase 'the left behinds gave us Brexit' is the systematic exclusion of ethnic minorities throughout the events, campaigns and analysis surrounding the European Union referendum and Brexit result. In order to do this, we must firstly consider Britain's history, and relations with ethnic minorities, as a means of painting an accurate picture to highlight the extent of exclusion these groups have faced. The unfortunate reality is that ethnic minorities have been the 'left behinds' throughout Britain's history and in most cases have experienced worse conditions (Fisher and Nandi, 2015; Bhambra, 2017; Khan and Shaheen, 2017). Fisher and Nandi (2015) identify that, since the 1990s, the majority of ethnic minority groups have been significantly more economically disadvantaged than that of the white majority group. This is also supported by Bhambra (2017) who claims that most ethnic groups have come out worse during periods of economic uncertainty, such as the recession, due to higher rates of unemployment, lower employment earnings and savings, coupled with higher day to day living costs. Further to this in 2012/13 individuals from ethnic groups (excluding Indians) were more likely to live in the 'most deprived 10%' of regions within England than white British individuals (GOV.UK, 2018) and in 2011, on average 'one in four black Caribbean and Bangladeshi households did not have a family member in employment' (Institute of Race Relations, n.d.). All of this reflects the extent and persistence of racial inequalities that exist within nearly all avenues of British society, 'from birth to death' (Khan and Shaheen, 2017, p.4), particularly in the sectors of employment and housing which have experienced increases in recent years (Rhodes et al., 2019). Therefore, arguably, it would seem more appropriate given this data and research, to declare that ethnic minorities fit the rhetoric of the 'left behinds' to a much greater extent than the majority white population, despite what popular media attempts to convey.

Yet, despite all of this, ethnic minorities voted overwhelmingly to remain in the EU referendum, a reality that starkly contrasts with the phrase 'the left behinds gave us Brexit' (Bhambra, 2017; Swales, 2016). In fact, 67% of individuals defining themselves as from ethnic minority backgrounds voted to remain, along with 73% of black voters, compared with just 47% of whites voting to leave (Ashcroft, 2016). These are populations that should be fundamentally considered as being within the category of the 'left behind', who disproportionately voted to remain in the European Union, much more so than the majority white population. Their absence from the 'left behind' accounts is wrong, as more often than not it is the ethnic minorities that are bearing the brunt of the country's socio-economic problems.

The assumption that the 'left behinds gave us Brexit' being a rhetoric dominated by the white working class is inaccurate (Mondon and Winter, 2018; Rhodes et al., 2019; Bhambra, 2017; Khan, 2017). Yet, it would seem that this idea that working class people are exclusively white and indigenous is based simply upon an 'ideological racialised construction' (Mondon and Winter, 2018, p.511) of

what the working class represents, instead of an accurate and real representation of the British working class of today. Ultimately, the exclusion of ethnic minorities is an 'obvious but often forgotten fact' (Rhodes et al., 2019, p.56) that working classes have always been diverse in terms of their composition and their political views and alignments. In fact, Sandhu (2018) even claims that it is ethnic minorities that make up the very 'fabric of Britain's working-class history and struggles' (Sandhu, 2018). Further to this, it is worth noting that the racial and ethnic minorities within Britain are not just recent immigrants, but individuals who have both a long-standing legacy and citizenship to the country (Bhambra, 2017), which overtime has resulted in the formation of a multi-ethnic and multiracial working class, that originated during the industrial and imperial period of our history (Rhodes et al., 2019). Despite this, ethnic minorities are largely non-existent in the rhetoric of the 'left behinds gave us Brexit', and the negative effects of recent socio-economic developments that ethnic minorities have faced, coupled with a long-standing history of racism are similarly silenced in the debates and commentary (Rhodes et al., 2019). This distorted account of Brexit that is not only oblivious to the history of the real working class, but it also seeks to promote and justify 'white self-interest', which is otherwise known as racism and prejudice (Sandhu, 2018). Bhambra (2017) refers to these ideas as 'methodological whiteness' which she claims is an approach to looking at the world that 'fails to acknowledge the role played by race in the very structuring of that world' (Taylor, 2017). Furthermore, it regards the 'white experience as the universal standard' (Sandhu, 2018) which ultimately detaches the experiences of ethnic minority working classes, by claiming that the white working classes have been 'uniquely disadvantaged' (Rhodes et al., 2019, p.4) during these periods of socio-economic change. Defining this group by race, through the promotion of the white working-class rhetoric, does nothing more than maintain the current system of discrimination and deny the recognition of the conditions under which ethnic minorities are forced to live with (Joshi, 2019; Sandhu, 2018). Instead, we need to reconsider what represents a working-class individual in Britain today, and move away from our outdated images of 'flat cap-wearing factory workers' (Joshi, 2019) and more towards the reality of an increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-racial working-class community.

After a turbulent political campaign, Britain voted to leave the European Union by a small majority of 52% (BBC, n.d.). Shortly after the result was announced, shockwaves were sent globally as political commentators and media outlets began to process the result and what it would entail for the future social, economic and political state of the country. It was during this early stage that the Leave campaigns success was attributed to the 'left behinds' and deemed as a white working-class revolt against multiculturalism, globalisation and economic instability. However, whilst the term 'the left-behind gave us Brexit' gained in popularity, there began to be a growing debate among academics regarding the accuracy of this rhetoric, resulting in many starting to question its meaning and cautions surrounding it.

In conclusion, it would seem fair to deem 'the left behinds gave us Brexit' as an inaccurate narrative, phrase and rhetoric, promoted by mass media, political commentary and early literature, due to the reasons that this essay has attempted to highlight. The first caution that this essay examines is that whilst there was a small number of economically disadvantaged that voted for Brexit, looking at the term the 'left behinds' in simply economic terms is far too simplistic for a much more complex issue. Instead, a greater emphasis should be placed on the role of ideology, culture and values, to which many of the Brexiteers reflected a 'left behind' ideology specifically with regards to immigration, multiculturalism, sovereignty and nationalism. A conservative ideology that was fundamentally underpinned by both threat and hostility towards anything that did not meet the criteria of what they deemed as acceptable and prosperous for the country. A second caution that this essay looks at is that the Leave campaign managed to capture a much wider spectrum of the population that cut across traditional socio-economic pointers than the phrase 'the left behinds gave us Brexit' implies. The Leave campaigns ability to gain support from such a diverse range of voters was to some academics the key to its ultimate success at the end of the day. The last caution that this essay looks at is the overall exclusion of minorities throughout the campaign, debate and

commentary. A community that has been 'left behind' for decades and often experienced worse living and financial conditions than that of the majority white population, yet voted overwhelmingly to remain, a contrasting reality to what the titled phrase implies. Therefore, despite its popularity, the term 'the left behinds gave us Brexit' should be approached with extreme caution.

References

Antonucci, L., Horvath, L., Kutiyski, Y. and Krouwel, A., 2017. 'The malaise of the squeezed middle: Challenging the narrative of the "left behind" Brexiter', *Competition & Change*, [online] 21(3),

- pp.211-229. Available online at:
<<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1024529417704135>> [Accessed 5 May 2020].
- Ashcroft, 2016. 'How the United Kingdom Voted on Thursday... and Why', *Lord Ashcroft Polls*, 24 June. [online] Lordashcrofthpolls.com. Available at:
<<https://lordashcrofthpolls.com/2016/06/how-the-united-kingdom-voted-and-why/>> [Accessed 8 May 2020].
- BBC, 2016. 'EU Referendum Results', [online] BBC News. Available at:
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/politics/eu_referendum/results> [Accessed 16 May 2020].
- Bhambra, G., 2017. 'Brexit, Trump, and 'methodological whiteness': on the misrecognition of race and class', *The British Journal of Sociology*, [online] 68, pp.215-217. Available at:
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323618782_Brexit_Trump_and_'methodological_whiteness'_on_the_misrecognition_of_race_and_class_Brexit_Trump_and_'methodological_whiteness'> [Accessed 14 May 2020].
- Colantone, I. and Stanig, P., 2016. 'The Real Reason the U.K. Voted for Brexit? Jobs Lost to Chinese Competition', [online] The Washington Post. Available at:
<<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2016/07/07/the-real-reason-the-u-k-voted-for-brexit-economics-not-identity/>> [Accessed 14 May 2020].
- Colley, L., 2016. *Brexiters are Nostalgics in Search of a Lost Empire*. [online] Ft.com. Available at:
<<https://www.ft.com/content/63de3610-07b0-11e6-9b51-0fb5e65703ce>> [Accessed 16 May 2020].
- Demir, I., 2017. *Brexit as a Backlash Against 'Loss of Privilege' And Multiculturalism*. [online] Discover Society. Available at: <<https://discoversociety.org/2017/02/01/brexit-as-a-backlash-against-loss-of-privilege-and-multiculturalism/>> [Accessed 16 May 2020].
- Dorling, D., 2016. Brexit: the decision of a divided country. *BMJ*, [online] pp.1-4. Available at:
<http://www.dannydorling.org/wp-content/files/dannydorling_publication_id5564.pdf> [Accessed 4 May 2020].
- Farage, N., 2016. *NIGEL FARAGE: Why We Must Vote LEAVE in The EU Referendum*. [online] Express.co.uk. Available at:
<<https://www.express.co.uk/comment/expresscomment/681776/nigel-farage-eu-referendum-brexit-vote-leave-independence-ukip>> [Accessed 16 May 2020].
- Finney, N. and Lymperopoulou, K., 2015. Ethnic Differences in Education, Employment, Health and Housing in Districts of England and Wales, 2001–2011. *Local Ethnic Inequalities*, [online] pp.5-22. Available at: <<https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/Inequalities%20report-final%20v2.pdf>> [Accessed 14 May 2020].
- Fisher, P. and Nandi, A., 2020. POVERTY ACROSS ETHNIC GROUPS THROUGH RECESSION AND AUSTERITY. *Joseph Rowntree Foundation*, [online] p.8. Available at:
<<https://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/default/files/jrf/migrated/files/poverty-ethnic-groups-recession-full.pdf>> [Accessed 15 May 2020].
- Ford, R. and Goodwin, M., 2014. *Revolt on the Right*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, p.188.
- Goodwin, M. and Heath, O., 2016a. *Brexit Vote Explained: Poverty, Low Skills and Lack of Opportunities*. [online] JRF. Available at: <<https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/brexit-vote-explained-poverty-low-skills-and-lack-opportunities>> [Accessed 14 May 2020].

- Goodwin, M. and Heath, O., 2016b. The 2016 Referendum, Brexit and the Left Behind: An Aggregate-level Analysis of the Result. *The Political Quarterly*, [online] 87(3), pp.323-332. Available at: <<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/1467-923X.12285>> [Accessed 2 May 2020].
- GOV. UK, 2018. *People Living in Deprived Neighbourhoods*. [online] Ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk. Available at: <<https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/uk-population-by-ethnicity/demographics/people-living-in-deprived-neighbourhoods/latest>> [Accessed 20 May 2020].
- Hakhverdian, A., van Elsas, E., van der Brug, W. and Kuhn, T., 2013. Euroscepticism and education: A longitudinal study of 12 EU member states, 1973–2010. *European Union Politics*, [online] 14(4), pp.2-5. Available at: <<http://gini-research.org/system/uploads/590/original/92.pdf?1385131386>> [Accessed 4 May 2020].
- Heath, A. and Richards, L., 2018. *Nationalism, Racism, And Identity: What Connects Englishness to a Preference for Hard Brexit? | British Politics and Policy At LSE*. [online] Blogs.lse.ac.uk. Available at: <<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/englishness-racism-brexit/>> [Accessed 17 May 2020].
- Hobolt, S., 2016. The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, [online] 23(9), pp.1263-1265. Available at: <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13501763.2016.1225785?needAccess=true>> [Accessed 14 May 2020].
- Institute of Race Relations, n.d. *Inequality, Housing and Employment Statistics*. [online] Irr.org.uk. Available at: <<http://www.irr.org.uk/research/statistics/poverty/>> [Accessed 14 May 2020].
- Joshi, P., 2019. 'Why the Term 'White Working Class' is so Problematic', [online] Huffingtonpost.co.uk. Available at: <https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/white-working-class_uk_5ceb90c8e4b00b599157dae3?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZ29vZ2xlLmNvbS8&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAFyxuRtzhufmTEs52zGKrbQUyt1r1faF1fUVplwNxcENTwH6Cc8m-zzLWTo8tVtf81aHgglohW-ru_YHphHyQrgPJzOLX2WbT3XaeobGR0U8Jx4XiIB9-LzVYonlU0EWEHPxe4EIZMn4v_SPT3FqUPDrmta7JLLFshOshqoSaNb> [Accessed 18 May 2020].
- Kaufmann, E., 2016. *It's NOT the Economy, Stupid: Brexit as a Story Of Personal Values | British Politics And Policy At LSE*. [online] Blogs.lse.ac.uk. Available at: <<https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/personal-values-brexit-vote/>> [Accessed 14 May 2020].
- Kenny, M., n.d. *The Rise of a Political Englishness?*. [online] The Political Studies Association (PSA). Available at: <<https://www.psa.ac.uk/insight-plus/rise-political-englishness>> [Accessed 17 May 2020].
- Khan, O., 2017. 'There Is no White Working Class', *Right To Remain*. [online] Right to Remain. Available at: <<https://righttoremain.org.uk/there-is-no-white-working-class/>> [Accessed 16 May 2020].
- Khan, O. and Shaheen, F., 2017. 'Introduction: Analysing and Responding to Racial and Class Inequalities', *Minority Report Race and Class in post-Brexit Britain*, [online] p.4. Available at: <<https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/publications/pdfs/Race%20and%20Class%20Post-Brexit%20Perspectives%20report%20v5.pdf>> [Accessed 15 May 2020].
- Kriesi, H., Grande, E., Lachat, R., Dolezal, M., Bornscher, S. and Frey, T., 2008. *West European Politics in The Age Of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.3-35.

- McLaren, L., 2002. Public Support for the European Union: Cost/Benefit Analysis or Perceived Cultural Threat?. *The Journal of Politics*, [online] 64(2), pp.551-554. Available at: <<https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1111%2F1468-2508.00139>> [Accessed 14 May 2020].
- Mondon, A. and Winter, A., 2018. Whiteness, populism and the racialisation of the working class in the United Kingdom and the United States. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, [online] 26(5), pp.511-512. Available at: <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/1070289X.2018.1552440?needAccess=true>> [Accessed 16 May 2020].
- Rhodes, J., Ashe, S. and Valluvan, S., 2019. Reframing the 'Left Behind' Race and Class in Post-Brexit Oldham. [online] pp.3-56. Available at: <<https://hummedia.manchester.ac.uk/institutes/code/research/projects/left-behind/oldham-report-2-september-2019.pdf>> [Accessed 14 May 2020].
- Sandhu, K., 2018. *Working Class in Britain? You Must Be White*. [online] New Internationalist. Available at: <<https://newint.org/features/2018/03/01/working-class-in-britain>> [Accessed 16 May 2020].
- Swales, K., 2016. Understanding the Leave vote. *NatCen Social Research*, [online] pp.5-27. Available at: <https://whatukthinks.org/eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/NatCen_Brexplanations-report-FINAL-WEB2.pdf> [Accessed 15 May 2020].
- Taylor, R., 2017. *Why Are The White Working Classes Still Being Held Responsible For Brexit And Trump? - LSE Research Online*. [online] Eprints.lse.ac.uk. Available at: <<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/86206/>> [Accessed 18 May 2020].
- Teney, C., Lacewell, O. and De Wilde, P., 2013. Winners and losers of globalization in Europe: attitudes and ideologies. *European Political Science Review*, [online] 6(4), pp.575-577. Available at: <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/147B6E287DA180FA32A5A57A45829CB3/S1755773913000246a.pdf/winners_and_losers_of_globalization_in_europe_attitudes_and_ideologies.pdf> [Accessed 13 May 2020].
- Tomlinson and Dorling, 2016. Brexit has its roots in the British Empire – so how do we explain it to the young?. [Blog] *The New Statesman*, Available at: <<https://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/transformations/gis/papers/BrexitHasItsRootsInTheBritishEmpire.pdf>> [Accessed 7 May 2020].
- Virdee, S. and McGeever, B., 2017. Racism, Crisis, Brexit. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, [online] 41(10), pp.1803-1806. Available at: <<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01419870.2017.1361544?needAccess=true>> [Accessed 12 May 2020].