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Abstract. It has been argued that the ‘mobility turn’ is overcelebratory regarding human movement across space. Yet, critical studies of mobilities have emerged that refute this, demonstrating how various forms and aspects of mobility are bound up with unequal power relations. This paper engages with debates over migration and mobility through an in-depth analysis of three life history interviews recorded in England in 2011. The subjects of the interviews are all men in their fifties and sixties of South Asian heritage, who moved to England as minors, and who, as adults, worked in factories for at least three years. The stories in all their affectivity and sensuousness disrupt standard tropes regarding migration and contribute to our understanding of the relations between mobility, fixity, ‘race’, and class. The built-in historical perspective shows how, looking back, someone who may once have migrated across international borders does not necessarily see that as the most significant moment in their life; how someone’s past moves within a nation-state may have greater significance to them than their moves into it; how people who move at one point can also be stuck, reluctantly immobile, at another; and how both the representations and materiality of mobility and fixity are imbued with, and reproduce, class inequality and racisms.
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Introduction
Bridget Anderson begins her excellent book Us and Them: the Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control with what she calls ‘the migration fairy story’ in which a poor man sets off to find work across the border in a ‘wealthy kingdom’. The aim of the book is then stated as being “to disrupt this story and the categories that underpin it” (2013, pages 1–2). This paper, drawing on a study of mainly working-class residents of one provincial city in early 21st-century England, continues the disruption of some standard tropes of contemporary migration studies. It takes its lead from Doreen Massey’s conception of place. Massey, like Anderson, challenges the idea of a binary division between ‘us’ and ‘them’. For Massey, it is not only those seen as migrants, but long-term residents too, whose dynamic stories are part of what links a “place to places beyond” in a “particular constellation of social relations” (1991, pages 28–29). Further, writing two decades later, Massey (2011) used the historical example of the enclosure of the English countryside to demonstrate the dialectical relation between mobility and fixity.

I will argue in this paper that the notions of mobility and fixity and their interrelationship make the ‘new mobilities paradigm’ a conceptually more agile container for studies of the migration of people than currently prevalent framings in migration studies. However, in contrast to Anderson and Massey, my argument here will be based on an analysis of transcripts from oral recordings of people’s life histories. In relation to some standard tropes of transnational migration studies, I argue that biographical narratives contain a built-in historical perspective that, by situating international cross-border moves across an individual’s whole life, has its
own disruptive power. Thus, looking back, someone who may once have migrated across international borders does not necessarily see that as the most significant moment in his or her life; someone's past moves within a nation-state may have greater significance to them than their moves into it; someone who moves at one point can also be stuck, reluctantly immobile, at another. I further argue that a life history methodology can reveal how both the representations and materiality of mobility and fixity are imbued with, and reproduce, class inequality and racisms.

The paper begins by reviewing some key insights of the mobilities paradigm (Hannam et al, 2006, page 2) regarding the contingency and meaningfulness of spatial movement per se, of which international migration is just one kind of event. It then proceeds to discuss how life histories can be used to explore the connections between mobility/fixedness and structural inequality at multiple scales, and provides more details of the study on which this paper draws. The fourth section presents three in-depth case studies of middle-aged men of South Asian heritage, whose stories all contain international moves to the UK as minors, and whose contrasting experiences and representations of factory work in the UK raise important questions for debates around migration, ‘race’, class, and masculinities. The fifth section discusses the implications of these cases, taken together, for how migration is imagined. The sixth section concludes the paper.

Migration and the ‘new mobilities paradigm’

Mobility is now well established as a lens through which to analyse the social world, moving away from a prior ontological predisposition to dwelling and stasis (Adey, 2010, pages 40–42). The mobilities paradigm encompasses much more than spatial movement of human beings, including, for example, the movement of atoms, commodities, and air. However, mobility should not be taken to mean everything (Adey, 2006). Moreover, mobility is distinguished from mere movement by its meaningfulness. “[T]o ignore the way movement is entangled in all sorts of social significance is to simplify and strip out the complexity of reality as well as the importance of those meanings” (Adey, 2010, page 35).

At the scale of the individual, the mobilities paradigm enables a subject-based approach that prioritises how people characterise their own mobility and fixedness (McMorran, 2015). Contra some prominent critiques (eg, Faist, 2013), studies of mobilities need not necessarily be celebratory of movement; indeed, explicitly critical mobilities works have recently appeared (eg, Söderström et al, 2013). These challenge the ways in which caricatures and stereotypes emerge of “the manner in which people of different gender, class, ethnicity, wealth, age, sexuality or nationality are expected to occupy particular mobile subject positions, and eras[e] the differences of those same individuals” (Cresswell and Merriman, 2011, pages 9–10).

Nevertheless, recent comparative reviews of migration studies and the insights of the mobilities paradigm raise questions about the limitations of both (Fortier, 2014) and about how much the mobilities paradigm does in fact represent anything new (Waters, 2014). Waters is critical of the claim that migration studies tend to ignore fixity but concedes that in “Early work on diasporas and transnationalism [in migration studies] … a valorization of movement was most certainly occurring, which gave little credence to the fact that people could at once be physically mobile and anchored … in particular places” (page 26, original emphasis). Fortier concurs: “much of the migration and transnationalism scholarship … has largely neglected those who stay put”. Indeed, she applies the same critique to “much mobilities research” (Fortier, page 66). However, my concern here is with the analytical potential of the concepts rather than existing practice.

Power and inequality are central in understanding why some people do not have as many mobility/fixity options as others. As Massey showed in her work on power-geometry, “some people are more in charge of [mobility] than others; some initiate flows and movement,
others don’t; some are more on the receiving end of it than others; some are effectively imprisoned by it” (1993, page 61). So not moving can, at particular times and places, be forced, free, or a mixture of both (Gill et al, 2011).

So much for fixity. The openness of the ‘mobilities’ concept also avoids the scalar hierarchy that emerged in migration studies, whereby longer distance moves of residence have been assumed to be more important than shorter ones (Söderström et al, 2013). The term migration is regularly used to mean international migration without the qualifying adjective (Skeldon, 2006, page 17). Indeed, the specialised lexicon involving terms like ‘transnationalism’ and ‘integration’ appear to take for granted who ‘migrants’ are and how they may be distinguished from ‘locals’.

An important corrective here has come from studies of translocalism (Brickell and Datta, 2011; Greiner and Sakdapolrak, 2013). Once seen as a subset of transnationalism, the concept of translocalism has now evolved to “include migration in all its forms … translocal geographies are multi-sited and multi-scalar without subsuming these scales and sites within a hierarchy of the national or global” (Brickell and Datta 2011, pages 10, 16). Translocalism is thus a significant analytical move because it displaces international border-crossing as a taken-for-granted component of the geographies of migration. Katherine Brickell and Ayona Datta also stress the inclusion in studies of translocalism of people “who are ‘immobile’ and often viewed as parochial” (page 10).

Translocalism thus offers a language regarding migration and the connections between people across space that parallels some of the key advantages offered by the mobilities paradigm. In this paper, however, I argue that because the conceptual apparatus of the mobilities paradigm explicitly attends to the relationship between movement and moorings or fixity at a number of scales (Ahmed et al, 2003, page 1; Cresswell, 2010, page 29), it is best placed to explore the simultaneity between the two in relation to the migration of people, just as it is also uniquely engaged with the connection between migration and other mobilities.

In his study of workers in Japanese inns, Chris McMorran (2015) revealed how the simultaneity of mobility and fixity can extend to a single individual at one point in time. McMorran draws on the stories of three coworkers he encountered during a year-long workplace ethnography. He shows “how some employees with ‘nowhere to go’ besides [a specific type of inn] get stuck in a dead-end job, while simultaneously cherishing the freedom the [inn] provides, including freedom from domestic abuse” (page 84). McMorran thus combines analysis of paid work and workplaces with the family lives that workers have left behind. His argument is for a more nuanced analysis of how “people’s mobility at one scale can co-exist with their immobility at another” and hints at the importance of both classed and gendered processes in producing mobility and fixity.

The mobilities paradigm also explicitly incorporates analysis of the interrelation between different kinds of mobilities, for example that between the long-distance migration of bodies and everyday mobilities, such as daily commutes. “[W]e should be wary of neglecting forms of mobility that are enduring, predictable, habitual, repetitive and of brief duration and short distance” (Binnie et al, 2007, page 166). Francis Leo Collins’s (2012) research with construction workers in Singapore exemplifies this. He explored the relationship between the workers’ visa status and their mode of travel around the city. Workers’ everyday mobility was tightly constrained by the length and intensity of the working day and by low pay, all produced by the immigration regime that restricted who they were permitted to work for. Thus, people who from one perspective were internationally mobile, from another had their daily urban mobilities reduced to travelling to and from work on employer-provided buses.
Writing different mobilities and fixity together can contribute to better understanding of the relation both of them have to social class.\(^{(1)}\) Class is conceptualised in this paper both as an objective position in social space, indicated, for example, by occupation, education level, income, or wealth and as an identity or category which is subjectively experienced (see Devine et al, 2005; Humphry, 2014). The class positions and subjectivities of international migrants are complex because of the simultaneous and dynamic interplay of class structures and meanings both in an individual’s current place of residence and in his or her country of origin (Kelly, 2012). The same point can be extended to residential mobility within national space (eg, Rogaly and Coppard, 2003). Further, the class position and experience of an individual needs to be understood both in historical context and as intersecting with the dynamics of other social divisions and relations, particularly gender and ‘race’ (Anthias, 2005; McDowell, 2008).

**Hearing mobility and fixity through biographical oral history**

The interplay between mobility/fixity, social class, gender, and racialisation is explored in this paper through the life histories of three middle-aged men of South Asian heritage who migrated to the UK between the ages of nine and twelve, and who worked in factories for part of their adult lives. This biographical approach responds to Cresswell’s point that “[w]e cannot understand new mobilities without understanding old mobilities” (2010, page 29). I will return to the three men, the context of their international mobility, and the figure of the ‘Asian male factory worker’ later in this section. First it is important to establish how life histories can enable a more nuanced, but still critical, analysis of mobility and fixity and briefly to describe the study on which this paper draws.

The use of biographical oral history methods with mobile subjects has a long-established pedigree (see, for example, Blunt, 2007; Burrell and Panayi, 2006; Herbert, 2008; Lawson, 2000; Taylor and Sliwa, 2011). One major review found that migration, both internal and international, “emerges as one of the most important themes of oral history research” (Thomson, 1999, page 24). A key strength of the oral history approach is that, while “personal narratives are anchored in social history … the uniqueness of the subject is valued. … It produces a specific kind of knowledge … one that is attentive to the diversity of experiences (Herbert, 2008, pages 7–8). This gives oral history potentially important roles both in furthering understanding and in politically contesting stereotypes regarding migration, identity, ‘race’, and class. Oral testimonies not only “have the potential to actually challenge the categories and assumptions of official history” (Herbert and Rodger, 2007, page 7), they can “reshape[e] the ways in which migration is understood” as “individual migrants and their descendants struggle with the labels of identification” (Thomson, 1999, pages 25, 28).

Such disruption of migration stories through addressing “caricatures and stereotypes” connects with critical mobilities scholars’ concern with the power of representation (Cresswell, 2010, page 19). “[M]eanings given to mobilities make a difference. In fact they can make a big difference. They can shape social relationships … . For some people, labels have an intrusive and permanent presence which will simply not go away” (Adey, 2010, page 38). This paper uses life histories to explore the disjuncture between representations of certain mobile subjects, and the embodied experiences of such people. This is important precisely because representations and experiences are not separate, but rather are intensely related to each other.

In what follows I will be drawing on three biographical oral histories recorded as part of a wider study problematising the idea of place attachment in the small English city of

---

\(^{(1)}\) Although some more celebratory mobilities writers have assumed spatial mobility to be inherently correlated with upward movement in social class position (Adey, 2010, pages 37–38).
Peterborough. Many of Peterborough’s current residents (or their parents) were born outside the city. The population of the city doubled in the 1970s, when, as one of the UK government’s new towns, it sought to attract migrants from London and elsewhere in the UK. There is also a long history of movement to settle in the city from surrounding rural areas, particularly the Fens to the east, and tens of thousands of international migrants from Italy, Pakistan, India, the Caribbean, Kurdistan, Portugal, and central and eastern Europe moved to Peterborough to work over the last seventy years. The study involved ethnographic fieldwork and the recording of oral histories (two-thirds by me and one-third by Kaveri Qureshi) over two years in 2011 and 2012.\(^2\) In total, seventy-six oral histories were recorded, thirty-five with women and twenty-nine with men.

In contrast to migration-focused studies, we were as interested in the stories of people who had been born in the city and never moved out, as we were in those of the most recent arrivals. We were not seeking to study a particular ethnonational group, but rather to counter doubts being raised by politicians and the media regarding the national and local loyalties of recent migrants and long-settled ethnic minorities. The emotionality of oral history accounts related not only to the ‘disjuncture’ experienced by migrants (Rogaly and Taylor, 2009; Thomson, 1999, page 35) but also to the experiences of both recently arrived people and long-term residents in relation to fixity, whether chosen or forced.

It is no accident that of the seventy-six biographical oral histories, I have drawn on those of three people of South Asian heritage. My own relative fixity—a decade working as an academic at the University of Sussex in England—was produced by earlier periods of temporary mobility between the UK and the Indian subcontinent to study the seasonal migration within India of agricultural workers (Rogaly and Thieme, 2012, page 2089). My international mobility between the UK and India, shared with other, mostly white, UK-based academics, was itself intimately entangled in the history of colonial relations between the two countries.\(^3\)

If snapshots had been taken at single points in each of the three men’s lives in Britain, they might have been categorised as ‘factory workers’, for each did indeed work in a factory for a number of years. ‘Factory work’ could serve to fix their class position, and it might have been expected that their subjective experiences of it had much in common (see Ahmad, 2008; Gardner, 2002; Kalra, 2000; Qureshi, 2012). The classed positionality and experiences of New Commonwealth immigrants to Britain between the 1950s and 1970s emerged out of a longer history of British colonialism (Hesse and Sayyid, 2006), which produced racialised hierarchies (Brah, 1996, page 13). Objective class position involving, for many, reliance on hard, low-status work in the manufacturing sector was also a consequence of existing societal inequalities of “material wealth, power and privilege” (Brah, 1996, page 26), with the vast majority of New Commonwealth immigrants among those at the bottom of the scale.

Yet contemporary analysis of the intersection of ‘race’ and class in that period posited the racialised incomers to a national society as not fitting into any class framework (but see Miles, 1982). So New Commonwealth immigrants to Britain in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s were viewed as an ‘underclass’ by one influential sociological study (Rex, 1973), and by others as a separate ‘class fraction’ (Phizacklea and Miles, 1980) or ‘class stratum’ (Castles and Kosack, 1985). Immigrants of South Asian heritage—either born in South Asia itself or in the diaspora, including East Africa—were the largest group of New Commonwealth migrants (Peach, 2006, pages 168–169). While most who came from South Asia itself were

\(^2\) For more information on the whole project, see www.placesforall.co.uk and, for a description of the research methods, see Rogaly and Qureshi (2013, pages 425–426).

\(^3\) I have written briefly elsewhere on the classed and gendered reproduction of my academic position, and my immersion in British Punjabi culture through my long-term partner, children, and extended family (Rogaly and Taylor, 2009, pages 24–26).
men, later joined by women and children, the ‘Asians’ who were expelled from Uganda by Idi Amin in 1972 moved to Britain as whole families. A high proportion of South Asian men and women arriving in Britain found work in the manufacturing sector (Brah, 1996, pages 2, 35; Kalra, 2000, page 2). Many South Asians were “at the bottom of the racial ladder [which] ensured their designation to the most unpleasant, physically taxing jobs that involved heavy lifting and other gruelling tasks” (Ahmad, 2008, pages 156–157).

This context is common to the three men whose life histories are discussed in this paper, but the three individual narratives have also been selected to exemplify diversity and thus continue a long-established scholarly tradition of problematising the category Asian/South Asian in Britain (see, for example, Alexander and Kim, 2013; Brah, 1996) as well as the figure of the ‘Asian factory worker’. Moreover, although manufacturing continued to be the dominant sector for working-class employment, Britain’s society, economy, and legislation on immigration and ‘race relations’ underwent profound change between the mid-1950s and the early 1970s, the period when the three men (then boys) moved to the UK.

Apart from their different ages, the men have followed distinct employment trajectories and have contrasting histories of family relations. In all three of the stories, the men’s relationships with, and/or the absence of, their fathers are telling. Family relations are thus key for these men’s identities and occupational trajectories: theirs are not simply stories of paid work (see also Thompson, 1993). The stories all speak of gender relations and masculinities. As Katy Gardner (2002) showed in her work on older Bangladeshi migrants in east London, masculinities, and how they are narrated, are in flux over the course of people’s lives; gender is always wrapped up in intersectional relations with class, ethnicity, and other social divisions (see also Anthias, 2005). In a study of Pakistani male former industrial workers in Britain, Ahmad (2008) too insists on an intersectional approach, exploring “the specific set of constraints that position Pakistani males as economically and politically marginalized and racialized subjects in British society, as well as beneficiaries of their power over women” (2008, page 155–156).

My focus is not on gendered identities per se but on the complexity of the relationship between mobility and fixity and on the contingent connections between both of these, racialisation, racism, and social class. At the same time, the stories raise questions about the very category ‘migrant’, suggesting that categorising people in this way should be done only with alertness to the particular discursive and political context. They also caution us against too easily boxing people into class categories, and are strongly suggestive of the significance of short-distance and internal moves, and of fixedness-in-place, whether chosen or to some degree caused by necessity.

Manak moved to the UK from India in 1954, aged nine; Amin was the same age when he was expelled from Uganda in 1972, and Pakzaad arrived from Pakistan in 1966, aged twelve. For each of them, recalling childhoods, close family, places of short-term and long-term residence, and significant journeys was emotionally charged and sensuous. All faced adversity at certain points, including encounters with racism of varying intensity. None simply moved from one place in South Asia or east Africa to another place in Britain, but rather their lives entailed both mobility and fixity at a number of scales.

(4) Though, as Tariq Jazeel (2006) emphasises in his study of upper-middle-class Sri Lankans to Britain, some immigrants from South Asia maintained high socioeconomic status.

(5) There was a shift from late-1950s and early 1960s assimilationism to the ‘race relations paradigm of the late 1960s and 1970s, embodied in four Race Relations Acts and aimed at protecting existing residents from racial discrimination. At the same time, immigration became increasingly racialised and restrictive through the Commonwealth Immigration Acts of 1962 and 1968 (Bloch et al, 2013, pages 24–25, 55–57).

(6) Research participants’ names have been changed.
Pakzaad
I interviewed Pakzaad in 2011 in the police station where he worked. He talked a lot about his father, with a feeling of longing, admiration, and a lingering guilt that he had not been able to satisfy the ambitions his father had had for him. Tellingly, he remembered exactly how long his father had served in the British army:

“He was based in North Africa, he was there for four years, eleven months and thirty days.

That’s what his discharge certificate says. I read it with my own eyes.”
Pakzaad’s father had sent his military earnings back to his wife; they used the money to build the family home a mile and a half from Jhelum city. It was, he said, “a very spacious house like a lot of the houses are in the Punjab, large forecourt, had animals like buffalo and cow and goats and chickens and the like”. Yet Pakzaad, perhaps betraying a sense of class inferiority on behalf of his father, described him as “a labourer basically”. He contrasted his father’s family, whose land was apparently squandered by a not-too-distant ancestor, with that of Pakzaad’s mother—“proper Punjabis … rural people who have got lots of land and do proper farming.”

Pakzaad’s narrative of his own spatial mobility, and later lack of it, between Pakistan and the UK, is loaded with references to class and especially his father’s concern with socioeconomic status. When twelve-year-old Pakzaad arrived in England in 1966, the first place he moved to live was Bedford, where his father had just been made redundant from his labouring job in the brickyards.

Unlike his sisters, Pakzaad had not grown up with the expectation of participating in manual work. He had been excited by the thought of travelling to England mainly, he recalled, because of the humiliation he received as a child at the hands of teachers who regularly caned and swore at students.

“And the irony is that, when I left Pakistan, I didn’t really think too much about leaving my mother and brothers and sisters. … All I was thinking about was no more school … .”
The irony stemmed from his experience of the school he went to in 1960s Bedford, speaking no English and subjected both to racist bullying by other pupils and to caning by teachers. In response bonds soon developed between Indian and Pakistani boys, in spite of fresh memories of the 1965 Indo-Pakistani war.

“I was in Pakistan when [the war] happened … and I remember having to dig trenches in our garden. … Nationalistic feeling was very strong in both the Indian boys and the Pakistani boys. … The Pakistani boys, we had a superiority complex. But … because we were being targeted by the English boys and the Italian boys and the rest, we actually gelled together, and we forgot our differences. And the commonality was our skin colour, our language, because we all spoke in Punjabi, and it didn’t matter that we were Pakistanis and Indians.”

After just over a year in Bedford, Pakzaad’s father found employment in St Ives in Cambridgeshire, a much smaller town thirty miles to the northeast, and the two of them moved there together. Pakzaad had vividly depicted the actual process of travelling from Jhelum to Karachi and then by plane, ‘puking up’, from Karachi to “very, very cold, very, very dark England”. The vomiting, he clarified, “wasn’t because I’d never been on a plane, but because of the sprays which the air hostesses were using, I had never been subjected to that kind of smell”. Having lived apart for three years, he had been “very, very pleased to see [his] father”.

Yet Pakzaad’s narrative seemed to give his later short-distance teenage move from Bedford to St Ives at least as much significance as his move from Pakistan to England, both in terms of how he felt about it and in terms of the access it turned out to give him to a higher-quality education that contained the possibility of intergenerational advancement in
occupation and income. It was also significant that, while unhappily stuck in Bedford, fixed in place, crying himself to sleep each night when he thought of the mother and sisters he missed, he had lived with a cousin of his father’s, his English wife, and their children, and with this level of immersion he learned English much faster.

In St Ives, befriended by another white English person, this time one of his teachers, Pakzaad gained admission, and free transport, to a sixth form in St Neots, where he studied for the A-levels that would eventually take him to Newcastle University to read Chemical Engineering. This move happened in spite of racism experienced during his school days. Pakzaad had persevered, not wanting to disappoint his father:

“My father actually got me over here if you want to use that terminology … because he wanted me to get a good education. … He didn’t get me over, he didn’t call me to England … so that I could work in a factory and help him out with the family finances.”

And though Pakzaad did come to work in an electronics factory for three years following graduation, it gained only the smallest mention in his narrative. Yet he expressed regrets about not having worked for a wage while at university. This was because his father, in Pakzaad’s words,

“worked in two places, one … where chickens were slaughtered and basically they just prepare them … [the other] where they make large concrete underground pipes for sewers, et cetera. In fact he was working there when he had an accident … and his hand was crushed, so he wasn’t able to open his hand again.”

In 1984 Pakzaad, who at one stage had wanted to go to medical school, one of the most class-protected routes to economic security in the UK, ended up joining the police in Peterborough. He has had a long career but been professionally frustrated at a lack of appreciation for his skills at mediating between different ethnic groups in the city, and is looking forward to early retirement.

**Manak**

It was in the year of Pakzaad’s birth, 1954, that nine-year-old Manak set off from Patiala to join his father in England. He travelled with his mother, his sister, and an uncle. Manak’s father, a university-educated writer, traded in goods for a living and was mobile across international borders, coming and going from England long before large numbers of Indian Punjabis moved over to England to settle. Manak remembers how his father would arrive on his visits home laden with new things, and how he regularly tried to coax Manak’s mother and grandfather to join him in England. However, this was deemed impossible; they were immobile. Manak’s grandfather refused to go because “in England they don’t use logs to cremate”.

Manak’s father had done well financially in England. He would buy clothes and other items in London and sell them in prisoner-of-war and refugee camps elsewhere in the country:

“They were ready-made shirts, ties, runners, TV runners and so forth and bed-clothing and clothes like that, and they did very good business. And then when my dad came over, went back to India, I must have been only six or seven or something like that, I can remember he bought a brand new car, Vauxhall, I’ve got some photos somewhere ….”

Manak’s family’s class position was complex. They were comparatively rich but could not avoid manual work; his father was a university-educated writer but worked as a trader. Manak’s wife, who had come to England as a very young child in 1948 and was present at the first sitting for Manak’s life history interview (conducted jointly by Kaveri Qureshi and me) in 2011 at their substantial suburban house in Peterborough, chipped in, using repetition to emphasise the subtle class difference between her own family, and Manak’s:

“Our parents were similar, university people, my husband’s grandfather was a country person, whereas my grandfather had come to England, had business in England, so that’s why my father was more confident to come over to England. So we came over in 1948,
and the difference was our grandfathers. My grandfather was a business person, coming and going from England and India, and my husband’s grandfather, bless him, he was a \textit{country person}.”

Like Pakzaad, Manak had a vivid, sensuous memory of the sea journey from India to England. Bread was baked on board the ship—a smell which still brought intense memories of the voyage back to him almost sixty years later.

“Either we had a third class or fourth class or whatever, I don’t know, but [on the upper decks] there were upper market people having their lunches and whatever, and we were down below, and I can remember staying down there and playing out on the ship and so forth, and one time the boat was going like that and [my mother] had a Chunni, the scarf, and it blew and because it was blowing I was trying to grab hold of it, and I was going down there and Mum was saying, ‘No, no, no, let it go, let it go!’ And there’s me trying to get hold of it while the scarf went overboard!”

It surprised Manak that when the boat docked at an Italian port, people on shore threw coins to the passengers. Thinking back, he believes they must have appeared quite ragged after the long journey and been perceived as poor—which was not his self-image.

Like Pakzaad, Manak would find himself moving within England while he was still a young teenager, a move which for very different reasons continued to exercise an affective hold over him as he remembered and narrated it. The family first lived in the small rural town of March, where Manak’s father had started a poultry business. A visit to March that Manak and his wife had made, a few weeks before the interview, brought back memories of being part of the local gang of mainly white English boys.

As he grew older, Manak toured other towns as a member of March Amateur Boxing Club, would run errands for elderly neighbours, and help his father deliver chickens to the Italian brickyard workers who had begun to move to Peterborough in large numbers. He recited some of the Italian patter he developed for this work to Kaveri Qureshi and me. The pleasure radiated by Manak as he remembered his moorings in March and these accompanying mobilities may have been heightened by the contrast with the disappointment he expressed over his parents’ decision to move house to Peterborough when he was fifteen. It was, in particular, his desire to fly with the British Royal Air Force, a dream that had depended on continuing with the air cadets he had joined in March, that he felt was being torn apart. He holds his father, rather than his mother, responsible:

“It was a shock. It was such a shock! I complained. I can remember saying to Dad, ‘But Dad, I’m joining this … I’m getting my equipment soon and everything. What do I tell them? Why are we doing it? You didn’t tell us that you was going to go to Peterborough.’”

Suggesting that his relation with his father was very different from Pakzaad’s, Manak explained that in Peterborough he could not continue with the air cadets:

“I couldn’t go—father dictated everything. He was the guy in charge and we were just kids, and whatever he said went.”

Manak’s parents opened a grocery shop in 1960 to serve the Italian community and the growing numbers of Pakistanis who had also arrived seeking work in the brickyards and in Peterborough’s food factories. In his late teens Manak followed his brother to a factory job at Towgood and Beckwith paper mill at Helpston. In contrast to Pakzaad, he described the intensity of the work there in detail:

“We used to see stars as we went to work and then when we came out … we used to see stars coming back. So we never saw daylight ’cause we spent most of the time at work, twelve hours a day.”

Manak’s father did not object to the factory work his sons were doing and Manak became known as one of the best workers in the paper mill. He left because of an experience of
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favouritism with racist undertones that blocked his own progress and any further social mobility that might have been found through that job:

“And then what happened, I left then, ’cause I was one of the top workers at Towgood and Beckwith, ’cause I worked there for six years and I became the top earner, but what had happened, there was an opening in Germany and my foreman at that time gave it to one of his blue-eyed boys and not me you see, ’cause I was qualified to do that job, to go to Germany to set up a machine. And because I didn’t get the job I created a bit of a … a commotion about it, to say ‘Look, it’s grossly unfair!’ to my foreman. And I called him names and said, ‘You’ve got favouritism’ and this, that and the other, and ‘you’ve let me down ’cause it should have been me’ and because I swore at him [laughs]. I was then taken into the big manager who was his brother. And he said to me, ‘Look son, what you need to do is to apologise to him and everything will be forgotten and you can have your job back’, and I said, ‘No, what I said, I meant.’ So therefore I got the sack.”

Over the decades that followed, often operating jointly with his elder brother, and latterly with the next generation of the family, Manak developed a number of successful businesses in the city, which made him and his family relatively rich. When their terraced house became too small, they moved to a large detached one just outside Peterborough. At one stage they also bought land in Portugal. A helicopter was used for one of his sons’ weddings.

Amin

Like Pakzaad’s father, Amin’s paternal grandfather had moved to Africa through British colonial networks, in his case as part of the labour force brought over by the British to build a railroad. Amin himself, one of six children, was four years old when his father died in 1967 aged only 37. Forced out of Uganda along with all other ‘Asians’, Amin’s family were moved around, first from one former army barracks (in London) to another (in Lincolnshire) and subsequently to Scotland, where they stayed for just under two years. Interviewed late one evening by Kaveri Qureshi, he remembered being struck by the strangeness of London, the number of white faces, the cold, and an ‘horrific’ journey up to Scotland:

“It was by coach and there were loads of families being moved to different towns from the refugee place so we were the last drop …”

But he also remembers the ‘absolutely fantastic’ house the family was provided with to live in there:

“We got there really late and there was two couples there to greet us, there was a house ready for us and it was fully done. There was sofas in there, there was beds made up, the fire was on because it was a cold night, the kitchen had food in it, there was pots and pans … . What had happened is we were the … first ever foreign family to stay there. There was no black people, Chinese people, no nothing, so it was quite strange and we’d already made the newspapers before we’d arrived. So they’d all got together … and donated all sorts of things to the house and it was fully kitted! [laughs] It was, you didn’t need anything! You just walked into the house and this is yours. Ornaments, everything … .”

However, worry about whether Amin’s sisters would marry white men caused his mother and grandmother to consider a move. “I’ve got photographs of my sisters in the ‘70s and they’re all in miniskirts and platform shoes, you know? And [Mum] thought, ‘Wow, this is not good.’” Neighbours told them of Peterborough’s New Town expansion and a local political leader’s championing of Ugandan Asian refugees. Amin’s family moved there in 1974, something his mother soon regretted, as “all of a sudden it wasn’t the Western culture; it was like the Pakistani lads and everything.”

Yet, Amin remembers a complex mix of ethnic and national heritages at his Peterborough primary school, including a large number of Italians, rather than Pakistanis alone. Amin felt
an affinity with the Italians’ family-based sociality. Like Pakzaad’s South Asian gang of boys, it was a case of common interests arising out of adversity:

“The cultures were different but similar sort of thing. … The same you know at your mother’s, dinner is dinner. If you go and knock for him, ‘Come in, come in, sit down, eat.’ If you go to an English friend’s … it’s ‘Can you come back? He’s having his tea.’ And you’d say, ‘OK’, and you’d come home and Mum says ‘Why aren’t you at Kevin’s house?’ ‘Oh, he’s having his tea.’ ‘What do you mean? They didn’t invite you in?’ I said, ‘No.’ ‘What?’ [laughs] They don’t understand it.”

However, these mostly sweet memories were combined with strongly negative memories of secondary school. This was a formative time for Amin—the racism he was on the receiving end of, and his resolute response to it, meant the educational path up the social-class ladder was being closed off:

“My first year [at secondary school], the first word that came out was ‘Paki’ and I thought ‘What’s that?’ And I had a lot of problems there. … I was spat on and I got into a lot of trouble, a lot of fights, stood my ground. … Luckily I came out on top most of the time.”

Amin said he experienced prejudice and violence, not only from white English peers but from Pakistani communities in Peterborough, who did not, he said, “consider [him] a Muslim Muslim, because I’m different, I’ve got tattoos and things like that and I’ve been brought up a different way …”. Yet he blames himself for not studying, for fighting, taking drugs, drinking, and going out with girls from a young age. At school Amin remembered being set apart from the rest of the class with a small group of special needs children that was effectively left without support. The structures were working against him. Inequality was being produced and entrenched.

Amin eventually walked out of school after hitting a teacher, left with no qualifications, and, since then, in his own words, has been a ‘wheeler and dealer’. This in no way sums up his varied working life, however. Like both Manak and Pakzaad he has worked in factories; and like Manak he got to a position where, in his own assessment, he was one of the most prized workers. But, in his adult life, Amin has been both more stuck, more unable to move away from Peterborough than either Manak or Pakzaad, and, in his wheeling and dealing, more mobile than either of them.

At various different points Amin was a restaurant worker in Essex, a travelling market stallholder specialising in women’s clothing, and a trader in jewellery between India and the UK:

“Every month, twice a month I used to fly from England to either Delhi or Bombay and I loved it, absolutely at that time, India’s my heart, and I know I’m an Indian … even though I felt like a tourist.”

Amin got married in his late twenties and “had one little girl and a second one on the way” when he and his wife broke up. Having grown up without a father himself, he was determined to remain available to his daughters. The struggle for access, and then taking over their upbringing when his wife was unable to, are the forces, along with a not unrelated lack of money, that he sees as having kept him in Peterborough. This period was most intense in the early 1990s, when he was out of work. For Amin, the factory job he obtained in 1995 was a lifeline:

“So I found a job near Cambridge, Barhill, 1995 …. I travelled all the way there and it was £3.60 an hour, basic pay and I was cutting bits of metal. A very technical place, Cambridge is full of high tech and I used to make photonic lamps and laser lamps and you had to cut this tungsten wire. So I used to go there and still battle on and to fight to see my children.”

This work turned out to be crucial for Amin and the source of a kind of greater economic security, at least in the short term.
“I got into the work and really started doing well there … and I became, from cutting wires and everything, to actually doing freehand glasswork … And from the glasswork I started to train how to become a glass blower and before I knew it I was there for ten years. I am blowing my own trumpet here … And I became a qualified scientific glassblower and became supervisor, resource manager, production manager.”

Amin used various mobilities to get on, just as he simultaneously experienced an involuntary, tie to place—at least for a period. He was still living in Peterborough running a small workers’ café in 2013, after both his daughters had gone off to university, although he has expressed a desire for his ashes to be scattered in Uganda, to join his father’s after his death. In the meantime his elderly mother’s continued presence in Peterborough, along with other strong relationships, kept him in the city.

Discussion

Pakzaad, Manak, and Amin each arrived in Britain in a different decade. The end of empire, ‘race’, and immigration were all subjects of intense and shifting national debate over this period, culminating with Enoch Powell’s notorious ‘rivers of blood’ speech in 1968. Yet, the place-specificity of the men’s small-town experiences as boys militate against any easy reading off of trends in racism and prejudice. Indeed, Amin’s story resonates both (through his stories of schooldays in Peterborough) with the right-wing backlash against New Commonwealth immigration in the 1970s and with the welcoming reception some Ugandan Asians experienced at the start of that decade (Kushner and Knox, 2001, pages 270, 273).

In Massey’s terms, Peterborough, like other places, was the site of multiple stories and unfinished trajectories. In the 1970s tens of thousands of mainly white Londoners moved to the city under the New and Expanded Towns programme. Yet, the migration ‘problem’ continued to be represented in public discourse as caused by the presence of immigrants from the New Commonwealth. This could feed into embodied experience through the perpetuation of racialised hierarchies, which, like Pakzaad’s, Manak’s, and Amin’s stories, had deep roots in British colonialism.

Pakzaad’s silence about his own experience of factory work and the details he provided on his father’s workplace injury and enforced retirement fit with the racialised hierarchy of job roles in British manufacturing in the 1960s and 1970s, with New Commonwealth immigrants being expected to accept greater danger at work and the lowest-status roles (Ahmad, 2008, pages 156–157; Castles and Kosack, 1985, pages 86–87). Manak’s story illustrates workplace racism, with a blocked promotion, but also a pride in resistance, in this case through exit, which, coming from a relatively well-resourced family, Manak could afford. Both men thus encountered structural inequalities, but their subjective experiences and individual trajectories diverged. Class and ‘race’ intersected but not in predetermined ways. Amin’s experience of factory work twenty years later was different again. Like Manak, Amin narrated the skills and responsibilities he developed with pride, but for Amin factory work was critical for fulfilling his gendered identity. Having lost his own father as a small child, it was especially important to him to be there for his children in spite of the breakup of his relationship with their mother.

The individual men’s life histories thus help to move away from the stereotyped figure of the ‘Asian factory worker’, just as they simultaneously illustrate the production and maintenance of structural inequalities through the intersection of class inequality and racialisation. The combination of a historical perspective, attentiveness to place, and the agility of the concepts of mobilities and fixity reveal much about the men’s class position over time, their subjective experience of class, and how these were gendered, racialised, and simultaneously location-specific and stretched across space.
In the context of the men’s whole lives, international migration at one point and factory work for a few years at another were put into perspective as components of stories that contained diverse, often simultaneously experienced forms of spatial mobility and fixity. Rather than celebrating spatial mobility, mobilities and fixity can be seen through these stories as integral to understanding both representations and embodied experiences of class, ‘race’, and gender, and the intersections between them.

For Amin, the move to Peterborough, explained as being due to his mother’s fear of her daughters marrying white Scottish men if they stayed put, was painful to remember because he experienced a form of racism at school that involved abuse from both white British and Pakistani children. He was also separated off as part of a ‘special needs’ group. Both of these experiences negatively affected his future class position. Amin makes sense of his story, in particular not getting on well at school, in terms of the moves he had made over a few formative years, whether as a forced migrant or being moved by his mother after arrival in the UK.

Fixity has a major role in the story. Amin spoke of his continued base in Peterborough as enforced, following the breakup of his marriage. And yet he expressed a positive affective tie to Peterborough because of his mother’s presence there; he once told me that, in 2012, a highlight of his week was going over to his mother’s on a Sunday afternoon and falling asleep on her settee. Nevertheless, Amin’s fixity and his mobilities worked concurrently and were interrelated. It was his commuting to Cambridge for work, for example, that enabled his residential moorings in Peterborough.

The majority of immigrants (initially mainly men) from the Indian subcontinent who resided in Britain in the mid-1960s lived in six major conurbations (Castles and Kosack, 1985, page 49). Yet Pakzaad and Manak started their periods of residence in the UK in small towns, as did Amin through the dispersal of ‘East African Asians’ in the 1970s (Brah, 1996, page 34). Not only was their mobility within the UK narrated as highly significant, but it was bound up with fixity. Pakzaad’s enforced immobility in Bedford coincided with his immersion in English thanks to residence with a native speaker, providing the grounds for educational success and future spatial mobility. Manak’s positive experience of fixity in March was based on ongoing everyday mobilities. Indeed his later fixity in Peterborough, and access to new mobilities—wedding helicopter, land purchase in Portugal—were enabled by businesses that profited from the international mobility of other immigrants.

Class representations and embodied experiences of class also interweave in Manak’s narrative of the journey by ship from India to Europe in the 1950s. Here he encountered the decks with different levels of comfort arranged by class—a relatively wealthy boy in Indian terms experiencing being in a lower-class deck, a process akin to “railways [that] reinforce class-based social distinctions through the categorization of travellers into first, second or third class” (Binnie et al, 2007, page 171). As a passenger on a ship sailing from India he also experienced being seen as poor by coin-throwing Italians at the port of arrival.

**Conclusion**

This paper began by invoking Anderson’s (2013) migration fairy story, a figurative construction familiar in public discourse on immigration in much of the Global North. While the attention to transnationalism in migration studies has enhanced scholarly understanding of the stretched-out lives of international migrants and the people they are connected to, migration studies often shares with the fairy story a focus on international border-crossers and on the significance of cross-border moves and networks in people’s lives. The effect of this is to create a scalar hierarchy in which long-distance and international moves of

(7) Racialisation of children of colour was very common at the time (see Grosvenor, 1987).
residence are by implication considered more significant than short-distance ones or moves within national borders.

Yet, it was in writing on internal migration that Keith Halfacree and Paul Boyle (1993) rightly argued for a biographical approach to understanding the migration of individuals. The authors held that this could help avoid the fetishising of migration itself, seeing it rather from the more distanced perspective of an individual’s whole life. However, they paid insufficient attention to the power of representation so that, for example, working-class people in Britain could be summed up as relatively ‘immobile’ (1993, page 342)—inadvertently confirming the popular association of working-class people with nativity and as threatened by a migrant other (Rogaly and Taylor, 2009).

This paper has analysed the life histories of three people who, at one point or another in their trajectories might have been seen as working-class, whether in terms of their class position (for example, occupation) or their subjective experience of class. The biographical approach has another advantage: it avoids boxing people into class categories. Class remains mutable even in the face of massive structural inequality. Using concepts drawn from critical mobilities studies, the paper has illustrated ways in which people may be involved throughout their lives, and during particular phases of them, in moves across space involving a range of spatiotemporalities. There is no necessary hierarchy in people’s experience of spatial mobility; a short-distance move or a set of everyday mobilities might be remembered as just as meaningful to an individual as an earlier international move. The mobilities paradigm best enables these different mobilities to be analysed alongside each other and across time, and its explicit attention to fixity—times when people do not move—permits a closer analysis of power geometries (Massey, 1993) that make it impossible for some people to make certain moves, while it is easy for others; and that enable some to stay still and prosper, while others must move.

A critical mobilities approach thus reveals relations of power across scales and social divisions, including social class and its intersection with ‘race’ and gender. Class is increasingly examined in transnational migration studies too (see, for example, Kelly, 2012) and influential migration scholars have called convincingly for an intersectional approach (for example, McDowell, 2008). Moreover, migration studies has frequently used an oral history methodology to understand better the subjective experiences of individual migrants (see, for example, Ahmad, 2008; Blunt, 2007; Gardner, 2002). This paper has extended this through showing how mobilities and fixity interrelate and often coexist at the same moment in time for the same person. Critical mobilities studies both focus attention on connections between mobility–fixity and structural inequalities and provide a more nuanced account of individual subjecthood that militates against caricatures and stereotypes that can themselves contribute to experiences of inequality and oppression.
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