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It is regularly noted that the first generation of theatre makers in Poland to produce work after the demise of communism have emphasized a concern with the fate of the individual over the collective that was markedly absent in previous generations. Maria Janion has argued that this generation represents the conclusion of the Polish Romantic paradigm, comprised of common values, fears and passions around which cultural identity was constituted during the Partitions[[1]](#footnote--1) and occupations of the country in nineteenth and twentieth centuries.[[2]](#footnote-0) Referred to in the 1990s as the JPII generation, a designation given to those born around 1978 when John Paul II began his papacy, Generation NIC (Nothing) is often cited as a more accurate term as no singular set of shared principles has replaced the Romantic tradition. This generation of directors and playwrights can be defined by a certain exhaustion with the promises of neoliberalism and the free market, and an adamant refusal to speak with a united voice. Roman Pawłowski has pointed out that pre-89 ‘generational theatre’ in the country traditionally functioned as a site of solidarity in its resistance to the totalitarian political system.[[3]](#footnote-1) While many critics have lamented this breakdown of social cohesion, there is no doubt a nascent pluralism and the cultivation of distinctive and personalized attitudes to national character, accepted morality and public discourse have lead to striking innovations in contemporary Polish theatre. The opening up of European borders and the prospect of easy emigration have been major contributors to changes in artistic output and are some of the most influential factors in the shaping of this generation’s cultural outlook. This study considers the transnational influences recent shifts in inter-EU migration have engendered in Poland and the UK, focusing on recent theatre productions that have grappled with intercultural tensions, growing prejudices and an increasing trend to identify between, rather than with, nations.

**Opening Borders**

The 2004 EU accession of 10 new member states, seven of which were former communist Central and East European (or CEE) countries, sparked an era of inter-European migration on a mass scale. Today, a new transnational economy, only partly associated with but not limited to the advent of the euro, indicates a form of citizenship in the EU that breaks down conventional political and geographical borders. Anne White has perspicaciously claimed that the term transnationalism transmutes traditional notions of migration between a host and receiving country into a capacity to spread across and through European nations.[[4]](#footnote-2) Though Poles have been drawn to new locations such as Sweden, Iceland, Spain, Belgium and Italy, established familial and social networks and language skills have concentrated highest levels of migration in the UK, Ireland and Germany. Statistics for the number of Polish migrants living in the UK are often disputed, largely due to the means with which varying censuses are considered. There is a discrepancy, for instance, in polls that tally numbers of registered workers, National Insurance statistics and the Polish embassy’s estimations.[[5]](#footnote-3) All the same, it is evident that Poland represented the largest population to migrate to the UK by 2009, making up 67 per cent of migrants from A8 countries.[[6]](#footnote-4) The Home Office was further able to certify that more than 540,000 Polish migrants had arrived by 2008, though other sources claim the figure was as high as 690,000 by the end of 2007.[[7]](#footnote-5) Three major studies have recently appeared that interrogate the dynamics of Polish family migration,[[8]](#footnote-6) East-West European mobility[[9]](#footnote-7) and representations of CEE countries in British culture[[10]](#footnote-8). These surveys contrast recent Polish arrivals with established Polish communities in the UK produced from former waves of Polish migration caused by land partitions in the nineteenth century, the outbreak of the Second World War and the privations and political subjugation associated with communist regimes. Though the Communist system was essentially modeled on immobility, more than two million Poles migrated in the 1980s alone.[[11]](#footnote-9) These examples of migration have strong associations with the figure of the ‘émigré’, a term that has overriding implications of exile and political emancipation. Generations of integration and a difference in the impetus to migrate (fleeing privation or seeking asylum as opposed to a search for economic prosperity unimpeded by political or national borders) have created cultural tensions between the established Anglo-Polish communities and post-2004 migrants. Attitudes in Poland are also split on the effect of mass migration at home: conservative and Catholic circles position the current wave of economically motivated migration as a meltdown of morality, an erosion of family values and an increase in acquisitiveness.[[12]](#footnote-10)

The so-called ‘brain drain’ is a term that has been coined to address the migration of younger Poles with tertiary-level education and advanced language skills seeking a more cosmopolitan lifestyle afforded by cities such as London, Dublin or Berlin; further indication that motivating factors for migration are multifarious and cannot be reduced purely to economic benefit. Kathy Burrell has elaborated on emerging studies seeking to define migration in temporal terms, permanent versus transitory movement, and a number of critics have commented on the discordance between the expectations and realities of migration.[[13]](#footnote-11) First confrontations with the host culture have proved difficult because of deficient language skills, intolerable working conditions, and a general exploitation by British employers and fellow countrymen alike. Joanna Rostek and Dirk Uffelmann titled their recent study ‘Can the Polish Migrant Speak?’, reflecting Gayatri Spivak’s pessimistic formulation that the subaltern is unable to be heard, integrated or represented. Spivak’s argument centres around the speech act, which requires both *hearing* and *speaking* to be formally enacted. The problem for the subaltern is not necessarily that she is unable to articulate her position, but rather that such articulations are not heard or attended to in dominant discourses. Despite a prevalence of negative attitudes towards newly arrived Polish communities,[[14]](#footnote-12) it is clear that British infrastructure is now reliant on migrant labor. As a result of EU enlargement, members of the British media, primarily the *Daily Mail*, have at times portrayed Polish migrants as homophobic, anti-Semitic, stealingBritish jobs, draining money from the UK economy, as well as claimingchild-support, healthcare and employment benefits they have not earned. Constant arguments in the media over the fear of increasing statistics ofimmigrants from Central and Eastern Europe coming into the UK have alsofanned public anxiety about EU integration. The programming of the Polska! Yearinitiative (2009-10) in nearly 30 cities across the UK intended to combat the practice of negative cultural stereotyping. The initiative, prepared jointly with British partners, was presented in British galleries, concert halls and theatres including the Barbican Centre, National Theatre, Tate Britain, V&A, Cadogan Hall and Southbank Centre. Perhaps the most tangible measure of the program's success are new projects and offers of cooperation from leading British cultural institutions, such as the Barbican Centre, Southbank Centre and London Jazz Festival.[[15]](#footnote-13)

An unprecedented promotion of Polish culture featured at the 2008 Edinburgh Theatre Festival – in no small part due to artistic director Jonathon Mills’ decision to highlight Poland and other new EU countries – with more than eight productions from Polish directors and theatre companies, including Krzysztof Warlikowski’s *Dybuk* (Dybbuk) and Grzegorz Jarzyna’s *4.48 Psychosis*. Festival organizers emphasized the importance of Polish art in the UK given recent waves of mass immigration, leading Joanna Derkaczew to write that Poland had become a ‘brand’ in Edinburgh[[16]](#footnote-14). Romuald Wicza-Pokojski’s adaptation of Sławomir Mrożek’s 1974 play *Emigranci* (*Émigrés*), an acrimonious account of two Polish migrants living in a dingy basement apartment somewhere far from home in the West, also appeared as part of the Festival Fringe. The play, *the* iconic text of Polish emigration to the West in the late twentieth century, was adapted as a touring performance by the Torun-based Teatr Wiczy, a venue dedicated to cultural activism, the performance was initially invited to the UK as part of the Polska! Year initiative. The expansive European tour was implemented by the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage as well as the Adam Mickiewicz Institute in Warsaw.[[17]](#footnote-15) An English-version of the production proved extremely popular with the company performing over 50 times in just under three weeks.[[18]](#footnote-16)

There is very little action in Mrożek’s *Emigranci*, which is largely structured around a conversation between AA, a melancholic intellectual, and XX, an indolent and ‘lazy’ member of the proletariat, as they struggle to come to terms with the brutal reality of exile in the Promised Land. The play’s continuing popularity since its original production (1974) is largely due to uninterrupted waves of Polish emigration since the mid-1970s, which the critic Witold Mrozek – not related to the playwright Mrożek, the name is a mere coincidence – claims has again become the collective experience of the new generation.[[19]](#footnote-17) No longer a political émigré, Wicza-Pokojski observed, the Polish migrant now seeks financial gains.[[20]](#footnote-18) Wicza-Pokojski rewrote the title with the euro sign (*€migranci*) to align inter-European migration patterns with economic interests (so-called EuroMigrants), which calls to mind Jan Klata’s use of the dollar sign in his 2005 production of Juliusz Słowacki’s anti-Romantic comedy *Fanta$y* that criticized Polish participation in the Iraq war instigated by the US*.* One of the main draws of the performance was its mobile stage, a thirty-three year old Mercedes L 508 D, similar to a camper van in size, allowing a capacity of 11 audience members. On first sight of the vehicle Wicza-Pokojski remarked that the ‘mobile home’ made the perfect model for an emigrant’s house.[[21]](#footnote-19) What’s more, the mobile home corresponds with a fundamental shift of legislation regarding travel restrictions: Poles no longer have to emigrate if they wish to see the world. Entering the beaten-up Mercedes, the audience encounters the two protagonists in the middle of quotidian routines, such as bathing and making tea. Premiering in 2004 on the eve of EU accession, the initial goal for the project was to consider Poland’s new political reality. Originally proposed as a national tour, particularly orientated towards rural communities that have little or no exposure to theatre, subsequent funding allowed the company to come into contact with Polish communities in Germany, France, Ireland and the UK. Responses from these communities were positive on the whole, though this might largely be put down to cultural nostalgia rather than artistic innovation.

In contrast to Wicza-Pokojski’s emphasis on prolonged transitory states inhabited by emigrants, Wiktor Rubin’s 2011 production of *Emigranci* at the Teatr Łaźnia Nowa in the Nowa Huta district outside Cracow provided an anti-essentialist reading of identity which problematized the traditionally favored discourse in Poland that framed intellectuals as the inheritors of civic responsibility. Central to much Polish-Romanticliterature and philosophy is the transcendent positioning of an elite intelligentsia, a sublime identity inherited from noble ancestors who are charged with a moral duty to think for the masses and prompt social change. Emancipation of the peasantry was at the heart of the Polish intellectual project. The audience at the Teatr Łaźnia Nowa was seated in an intimate circle on stuffed gray burlap sacks. This repositioning of the hierarchy of theatre seats that are normally governed by proximity to the stage (first and last row, frontlines and sidelines, etc.) was an essential aspect of Rubin’s critique of a social, professional and class-based elite. As a result, the audience was directly included in the action of the play. In one particularly memorable scene, XX cups his hands, begging spectators for money, thus positioning them in the role of the rich Westerner who is expected to “patronize” the poor Polish worker.

In an effort to challenge the social position of the intellectual and the symbolic mechanisms of power attributed to this figure, Rubin had AA wear a paper hat with the words ‘inteligentny AA’ (intelligent AA) that he passes to XX. The effect of this handover is a general destabilization for the actors, who, no longer able to remember lines, are reliant on a prompter. For Rubin, social roles, narrative and characterization are in conflict with one another, and his intention was to make the reality AA and XX inhabit simultaneously antagonistic and open-ended. The location of the performance in Nowa Huta was particularly significant in Rubin’s attempt to disarticulate Romantic ideology from the role of the intellectual. The town was built by communist authorities after the Second World War in direct opposition to the cultural and nationalist-oriented elite in nearby Cracow, who had put up strong resistance to the new regime. Cracow was famous for producing precisely the privileged middle-class ‘intellectual’ that Mrożek presents in *Emigranci*, and this contrast between the two cities was mirrored in Rubin’s decision to cast a well-known professional actor from Cracow, Krzysztof Zarzecki, in the role of AA, and Mariusz Cichoński, a local amateur from Nowa Huta, as the ‘prole’. The two were able to develop a common language which implicitly functioned as a coded protest against class divisions, though, as Bartosz Krawczyk noted, the swapping of identities in the middle of the performance was largely nominal as neither actor was convincing in the adoption of their new and opposing role.[[22]](#footnote-20) Witold Mrozek argued that the capacity to exchange identities went a long way to undermine the standard reading of AA and XX as Mrożek’s first genuine characters – no longer the stereotypes or representations of ideas one finds in his earlier work – highlighted by the actors’ incapacity to swap roles. However, I take issue with Mrozek’s contention that the dialectical tension between the professional and amateur actor worked as effectively as the class-based antagonism written in the dialogue. The reticence of the amateur and the professional to embody the opposing role did little to disrupt the conventional reading of the intellectual as a cultural elite. This undermines Mrozek’s further claim that the real insight of the production was the focus on communal responsibility, social activism and creative responsibility for the shaping of reality, which cannot be attributed to the intellectual, a mere social construction. *Emigranci* normally concludes with the discordant tones of XX snoring peacefully while AA loudly weeps, a clear sign that the Polish proletariat does not hear the stern advice of the intelligentsia, a theme Mrożek shares with the Polish Romantic playwright Stanisław Wyspiański.[[23]](#footnote-21) However, in Rubin’s reimaging of the text, emigration to the West, no longer the last vestige of asylum from a totalitarian regime, is brought into sharp relief. Joanna Targoń observed that in the 1970s the play resonated with audiences because the West was seen as distant, alien and capable of inducing fear.[[24]](#footnote-22) Today, however, in an era of cheap and frequent air travel, the West is a less exotic neighbor. Interestingly, predominant views of the Polish migrant in the UK mirror Mrożek’s distinction between the ‘prole’ (the Polish builder, plumber, cleaner) and the intellectual (the university student, filmmaker, maestro).

In opposition to Targoń’s view of ‘easy’ emigration, young playwright Paweł Demirski provided an intensely negative and oblique picture in *From Poland with love* (2005) produced at the Teatr Wybrzeże in Gdańsk. Michał Zadara directed this apocalyptic vision of an educated young couple unable to envision a future for themselves in Poland. Unlike conventional views of stress-free migration, funding for the couple’s move to the UK requires great sacrifice. Represented simply as He and She (On i Ona), these seemingly selfish and narcissistic twenty-somethings go to horror-inspiring lengths to secure funding for their emigration. He steals from pensioners while She makes an application for ten-thousand euro to the Simon Wiesenthal Centre, falsely claiming that her grandfather hid a Jew during the Nazi occupation of Poland. Offering an uncomplicated dramaturgy, their willingness to exploit the previous generation forsakes any notion of Polish solidarity in today’s youth. He and She debate the mutability of their national colors (red and white), which can be substituted to represent globalized consumerist emblems such as Coca Cola or Marlboro cigarettes as easily as Polish nationalism. Rather than reducing this to the couple’s obsessive consumerism and greed, the play counterpoises the homogeneity of previous Polish generations with the more diverse, transcultural identity of the ‘Generation Nothing’. Zadara is himself an interesting example of this modern cosmopolitanism, having left his native Poland to study in the US, Germany and Austria. Too young to own the companies set up at the demise of communism and too young to fully benefit from the political transformation post 1989, Demirski rejects NIC as a designation for his generation, preferring the more prosaic designation ‘the era of disappointed people.’[[25]](#footnote-23) Indeed despite the young couple’s duplicity in *From Poland with love*, Demirski and Zadara make sure the protagonists remain sympathetic, thus troubling assumptions that a strong will to emigrate is anti-patriotic. Demirski’s narrative does not offer a positive statement of new ideals around emigration, but gives voice to the disillusionment experienced by a generation constrained by limited economic prospects in Poland, the pressures of unemployment and a general mistrust of public institutions, hoping to escape the banality of small-town life in the mid-2000s at any price. This production was an important precursor to more multifarious visions of the UK as a ‘Promised Land’ that became increasingly pessimistic in their focus on the challenges and polemics of migration rather than its (false) promises.

**Scotland Bound**

In 2007, two important exhibitions were funded by Polish Art Scotland whose titles indicate the cultural stereotyping many migrants experience in the UK: ‘We are Working’ and ‘I don’t want to talk about Communism’. The following year Catherine Grosvenor’s *Cherry Blossom,* jointly produced by the Traverse Theatre and Teatr Polski Bydgoszcz, opened in Edinburgh, a project that attempted to respond to Polish immigration in the UK from the perspective of a middle-aged female migrant. In 2008, an estimated 86,000 Poles had come to live and work in Scotland, making up 10% of Edinburgh’s total population. Lorne Campbell, artistic director of the Traverse in 2008, observed that Polish migration has significantly marked the city, pointing out the frequency of Polish beer on menus, Polish theatre posters on the walls of the Traverse, and the omnipresence of the Polish language.[[26]](#footnote-24) Lorne also mentioned that Scotland was more ethnically uniform than the rest of Great Britain; the lower proportion of ethnic minorities in the country has raised key questions about the mode in which Scots define cultural and national distinctiveness.[[27]](#footnote-25) The play’s title derives from a pejorative reference to Polish migrants in the 1960s, referring to a shoe polish – thus a play on the words polish/Polish – popular in Glasgow at the time. The Traverse approached a number of city theatres in Poland before consolidating a partnership with Bydgoszcz. This city lies in the north of Poland and has seen elevated rates of emigration – upwards of 30,000 by 2008 – since EU accession. Paweł Łysak, artistic director of the Teatr Polski in Bydgoszcz, felt this issue was one of the most pressing in recent times.[[28]](#footnote-26) Nearly two years of research was invested into the project with Grosvenor interviewing a spectrum of Polish migrants from architects and journalists to factory workers and shopkeepers. Quotations from these interviews are embedded in the dialogue, interwoven with English and Polish in an effort to produce the same sense of disorientation in the audience a newly settled migrant might experience on arrival in a host country. Four actors (two Polish and two Scottish) played a host of characters, performing in both languages, which led to a number of comic interactions based on linguistic mishaps.

Without a sufficient grasp of English, many migrants struggle to adapt in Ireland and the UK. It is not simply a question of grammar and vocabulary, of course, but also of cultural codes that are affixed to language. Campbell decided to make the four actors share the main roles, irrespective of gender or nationality, in an effort to expose the pressures of communication experienced by newly arrived migrants.[[29]](#footnote-27) Taking miscommunication as a main trope, critics tended to focus on the language of technology and the digitization of the space by video artists Mark Grimmer and Leo Warner.[[30]](#footnote-28) Creating a dynamic conversation between the spoken and written word, white oblong surfaces became screens for visual input and subtitles on which translations often disappeared before they could be read in their entirety. Appreciating the nuances of multicasting and the decision not to translate the entirety of the text into either language, Roman Pawłowski argued that Polish and UK audiences equally experienced the diegetic world of the play from the perspective of a visitor from a foreign country.[[31]](#footnote-29) Writing on a similar theme, Mark Fisher commented, ‘Grosvenor weaves [an economic migrant’s] sense of confusion – of only understanding one side of the conversation – into the very fabric of the play’,[[32]](#footnote-30) thus making a monoglot spectator acutely conscious of their linguistic limitations. In the printed translation, unfortunately, the dynamic fusion of languages was largely lost with Polish overshadowed by English. Incongruously, the domination of the latter language not only failed to correspond with Grosvenor’s intention to give voice to the migrant, this also reinforced an inherent privileging of the host culture that the play sought to challenge.

Grosvenor’s narrative primarily focuses on Grażyna Antkiewicz, the mother of two children, who migrates from Bydgoszcz to Edinburgh in place of her feckless husband, who is forced to cancel his trip when he is unable to locate his ID a few days before his flight. The performance also included an account of the real-life migrant Robert Dziekanski, who arrived in Vancouver with no knowledge of English. Dziekanski was caught on CCTV wandering aimlessly through the immigration hall for over 10 hours before erupting in a violent fit that tragically ended in his death after being tasered by airport police. The chronology of this event is reported in deadpan voices with the actors reading from clipboards, a technique that gestured towards reportage that tended to be less gripping than the more personal, embodied performance of Grażyna’s story.

Each scene begins with an updated exchange rate between the Polish złoty and UK pound sterling, stressing the steady growth of the Polish economy between 2007 and 2008. What starts out at nearly 6:1 soon dips down to nearly 4:1, at which point a large proportion of migrants, no longer able to benefit from the favorable exchange rate, threaten to return home. Money and exchange value are constant sources of worry for Grażyna, which is signified in one extended monologue that delineates the amount of hours she must work in the factory in order to buy her son a Sony Playstation 2, her husband a TV and laptop and her daughter the books required for her expensive private university course. Grażyna is employed at an abattoir, and her labor, punctuated by blood, entrails and the high-pitched squeals of dying animals, is painstakingly depicted in one scene that stands in stark contrast with the portrayal of her family’s easy comfort back at home in Bydgoszcz. This contrast serves as a reminder that, as an immigrant living in the UK, Grażyna amounts to little more than a source of funding for her family, and every telephone conversation is dominated by her children and husband’s pleas for more money to buy luxury items. As a result, Grażyna slowly loses her bond with home and begins a tentative relationship with a local Scottish man. Her sense of alienation and loneliness at the outset of her immigration is epitomized by her apartment, which is so damp mushrooms flourish in the grimy carpet. When she asks her landlord for help in Polish he ignores her. Her Scottish boyfriend then gives her a pamphlet explaining her rights as a tenant. Language renders Grażyna impotent in her adopted country, emblematically representing Rostek & Uffelmann’s argument that ‘the Polish migrant’s voice alone does not suffice’,[[33]](#footnote-31) but requires a local supplement.

Grosvenor offers a sobering recognition of pressing topics around immigration, such as the establishment of ethnic boundaries abroad, anxiety over Polish masculinity and the formation of inter-ethnic relationships. At one point, Paweł, Grażyna’s husband, having never travelled outside of Poland, questions the need for a passport. Grażyna insists that an international ID is tantamount to earning money in today’s global economy. In the family dynamics it is the women who have a stronger sense of the rules and conventions of international travel in the 21st century while the men are not even able to cope with the local and familiar. Gender relations and generational values are renegotiated throughout the play. Grażyna works primarily to fund her daughter Ewa’s finance and economics degree in the hope that she will become a successful businesswoman. Ewa is resistant to take on any of the maternal duties while her mother is away and Grażyna’s explicit encouragement of Ewa’s studies is undermined by Paweł’s disinterest in his daughter’s ambitions. A series of dialogues between Paweł and Ewa threaten to sabotage conventional social hierarchies that privilege the father as the head of the family. While the women are portrayed as clever, industrious and determined, the men are lazy and inept, spending entire days at home addicted to violent videogames, neither able to perform menial tasks, such as cooking and cleaning, nor able to provide an income for the household. Although studies have focused on the crisis of sexual and cultural identity for Polish male migrants living in the UK,[[34]](#footnote-32) *Cherry Blossom* firmlyresituates this anxiety at home in Poland. Grażyna initially defends Paweł’s ineptitude, but her return from the UK is marked by punitive recriminations against her useless husband. Migration itself is framed within highly gendered parameters. Paweł expresses concern about his wife’s ability to migrate, because he equates work in the UK with employment on building sites. Though he does not state it outright, there is an implication that migrant women are dependent upon the employment skills of their male relatives. Grażyna’s migration, however, is successful precisely because she escapes her uneducated husband and is able to adapt quickly to a new environment and learn English. Grażyna’s achievements set her apart from the parallel tragic narrative of Robert Dziekanski. In his review, Mark Fisher disappointingly reverts to the conventional formulation that the rotation of actors in different roles turns the story from the individual to the universal,[[35]](#footnote-33) but Grosvenor’s use of Dziekanski resists precisely such an easy formulation. There is not a universal immigrant; rather, *Cherry Blossom* reminds us that experiences of migration are shaped by, amongst other things, gender, age, linguistic ability, sexuality and education.

Recent studies around migration have also been interested in families who can only afford to send one parent abroad. In most cases, the pressure to migrate is placed on the father. However, there has been evidence of a recent surge in mothers immigrating and sending money home to support their partner and children. The anxiety that accompanies such separations between mother and children is expressed in the play in a humorous dialogue between Grażyna and the Virgin Mary (Maria) wherein Grażyna admits her anxiety about abandoning her children. Crucially, the verb ‘abandon’ is only used in relation to the mother. A father’s migration is communicated, however obliquely, as conscientious, responsible and adhering to gender norms. Maria offers a corrective to this paradigm. ‘You are doing this for your children,’ she consoles Grażyna, ‘You are a good mother. Your children will love you and bless you.’[[36]](#footnote-34) The imbrications of the highly gendered divide between parents is indicative of a tendency in more conservative Polish press to condemn mothers who choose to migrate without their children, thus sparking unfounded rumors that child suicide rates have increased.[[37]](#footnote-35) On the whole, *Cherry Blossom* was reviewed more favorably in the UK than in Poland, suggesting that audiences from the host country are drawn in by tales of migration that the sending country wish to problematize or interrogate with more nuance. Michalina Łubecka points out that while this story is familiar to many families in Bydgoszcz, there is an over reliance on stereotypes (the strong mother, inept father, noble and hard-working daughter and spoiled son) to depict gender and familial identities.[[38]](#footnote-36) Nevertheless, Łubecka’s critique fails to reflect accurately the rotation of actors playing the roles of the four family members, which went far in its troubling of gender stereotypes ostensibly couched in the writing.

In the last scene of *Cherry Blossom* Jasiek joins his mother in Scotland. He is unable to adapt to his new environment and treats his move to the UK as if he were a fictional player in a videogame. The fantasy world he constructs for himself enables him to shed his sense of powerlessness in an imaginary space that is not geographically bound. In his imagination, Jasiek is neither in Scotland nor Poland, and this displacement is foregrounded when the four actors recite a series of conditional phrases: ‘If we are always moving. If we are here and there. If we are always and never. If here is there.’[[39]](#footnote-37) These lines are not attributed to a particular character in the family, but are representative of the dislocating process of migration that is no longer conceived of as permanent or fixed, long term or short term. Rather, migration is so deeply embedded in national discourse that one cannot escape the sense of disorientation associated with its processes, even if one never leaves Poland.

In March 2008 *Zabić superwajzora jak 14 tysięcy kurczaków* (*Kill the Supervisor just like 14,000 Chickens*) opened at the Teatr im Stefana Żeromskiego in Kielce. Written by Łukasz Ripper, a migrant employed as a forklift operator for three years in Sterling, and directed by Dawid Żłobiński, this play focused, like *Cherry Blossom*, on Polish immigrants in Scotland working at a meat processing plant. The title offers a grim description of the labor involved in the slaughter of up to 14,000 chickens per day. The horror of this job is augmented by the fact that one of the migrants, Cherlawy (meaning ‘sickly’ in Polish), is a vegetarian, although, motivated by a pay bonus, he is a better butcher than his meat-eating companion Woda. The two men are well educated, but unable to find jobs that match their training. After a grueling workweek, the pair spend their scant leisure time excessively watching pornography and drinking vodka. The underlying tension behind the rather flat, though often obscene, dialogue centered around the factory supervisor relentlessly bullying her migrant employees.

The thematic conceits of the play were criticized as offering only a superficial level of reflection on a fashionable topic.[[40]](#footnote-38) Controversially, Ripper is the son of the artistic director of the Kielce theatre, Piotr Szczerski, which provoked a backlash of accusations of nepotism from many reviewers,[[41]](#footnote-39) though Szczerski insisted that the play, which beat two-hundred other submissions for the Gdynia Dramatic Award, was selected entirely because of its merit.[[42]](#footnote-40) Agnieszka Kozłowska-Piasta maintained that the audience in Kielce was ‘waiting for a fuller, more mature image of Polish emigration.’[[43]](#footnote-41) Grzegorz Cuper found the writing similarly disordered and accused Ripper of communicating his dissatisfaction with the failed promise of migration through an accumulation of vulgar expressions and a sweeping prosecution of Polish and British society.[[44]](#footnote-42) In his careless

formulation, Dominik Ferenc claims that the migrants’ experience in the chicken factory is equitable to the ‘gray world of exile’ that the protagonists endure in Sofia Coppola’s *Lost in Translation* (2003). This argument entirely neglects the motivating factor behind economic migration, which demands fourteen-hour workdays, compared to the casual tourism of wealthy Americans staying in a five-star Tokyo hotel portrayed in Coppola’s film. Unfavorable comparisons were drawn between Ripper and more esteemed playwrights such as You +1'd this publicly. [Undo](http://www.google.co.uk/search?q=Mrozek+&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a)Sławomir Mrożek and Janusz Glowacki, who also wrote significant works about the immigrant experience. Monika Rosmanowska, however, does not over extend this comparison, arguing that very little has changed since Mrożek wrote *Emigranci* in 1974.[[45]](#footnote-43) Rosmanowska’s conclusion seems out of date: the move from the term émigré to migrant in the thirty years that separates the playwrights could also be interpreted as a renegotiation of the migrant’s social status, and Ripper’s preoccupation with both the humiliating working conditions and the ability to adapt to them so quickly offers a very different reading of immigration than what we find in Mrożek.

The setting, made up of grimy white-tiled walls lit by cold blue-green filters, was derivative of Małgorzata Szczęśniak’sclinical aesthetics in Krzysztof Warlikowski’s 2002 production of Sarah Kane’s *Cleansed.* The semantic fabric of the story was revealed through white costumes onto which actors wipe blood-smeared gloves, and a padded table on wheels, also reminiscent of Warlikowski’s use of hospital gurneys that made an implicit link between the passivity imposed on a patient in a mental asylum and the victimhood of a migrant bullied by an authoritative supervisor, who could easily be interpreted as a doctor in white scrubs. The meat-processing plant is thus recalibrated as a detention or holding centre that dismantles the promise of the UK as a destination of economic prosperity. The passivity prescribed by the setting is undermined at the climax of the play when Cherlowy murders his overbearing boss whom the audience view through a reflection of distorted mirrors. Perhaps the most problematic decision was the clear division set up between the two acting styles: naturalism (the two migrants) and the more dynamic expressionistic depiction of the supervisor. While the world the migrants inhabit before the murder is recognizable, this is followed by an over-extended departure into an alcohol and drug-fuelled hallucination that concludes in sexual intercourse between Cherlowy and a female co-worker, making it unclear if the supervisor’s death was imagined or real. This shift in genre was compounded by the abrupt use of rhyming verse. The delirium Cherlowy experiences is a familiar trope in Romantic Polish drama, such as in Stanisław Wyspiański *The Wedding* (*Wesele*) and Adam Mickieiwicz’s *Dziady* (Forefather’s Eve).[[46]](#footnote-44)Unfortunately, rather than creating a dynamic intertextual relationship with Wyspiański, this provocative overlap of form is reduced to a reliance on a kitsch use of lighting and multimedia, and overly suggestive sexual poses that do nothing to elaborate the themes. Dominik Ferenc ended his review with the sobering observation that the play, despite its faults, is suggestive of the stories one hears in Kielce from friends who have emigrated. Ferenc ominously concludes that Poles on the British Isles are just a labour force to torment and bully.[[47]](#footnote-45)

**The View from the Inside**

Equally crucial to this discussion is a consideration of the recent phenomenon of immigration into Poland. Aneta Kyzioł suggested that *A Couple of Poor, Polish-Speaking Romanians* (*Dwoje biednych Rumunów mówiących po polsku*) flawlessly addressed contemporary national complexes.[[48]](#footnote-46) The play was the first drama written by the then 24-year-old Dorota Masłowska, whose first two novels won Poland’s most prestigious literary prizes. Controversial for her direct style and use of street vernacular, Masłowska was commissioned to write the play as part of the 2006 TR/PL festival at the TR Warszawa designed to diagnose new social, political and moral challenges for Poland in the wake of EU accession. The action follows two young Poles (Parcha, a television actor, and Dżina, an unemployed single mother) pretending to be Romanian migrants on an all-night drug-fuelled road trip. In Warsaw, *APPSR* was initially given a staged reading, starring Masłowska herself as the teenage mother, and directed by Przemysław Wojcieszek, who saw the text as a manifesto for the dispossessed generation born in the 1980s. Roman Pawłowski, a strong proponent of Masłowska, saluted the inexhaustible deposits of humor in her work, which allows an audience ‘to look deep into the psyche of an average Pole, shaped by television, the Church and the Catholic family.’[[49]](#footnote-47) The young novelist’s celebrity attracted a large and enthusiastic crowd at the reading, and the play was formally produced at the TR later that year.

Lisa Goldman, London Soho Theatre’s then artistic director, was drawn to the dark humor of the play, which, despite certain provocative overlaps with in-yer-face aesthetics, went far to reinterpret the political at the level of the personal in opposition to the prototypical British tendency to make political theatre that is ‘sociological’, ‘issue-based’ and concerned with newspaper headlines,[[50]](#footnote-48) and produced it in the UK in 2008. Goldman looked to the TR for provocative new writing from a contemporary controversial Polish voice. Originally looking over the American translation, Goldman decided to work on her own adaptation with Paul Sirett, apprehensive that the US vernacular would not appeal to London audiences. Masłowska is known for her dismantling of the Polish language through the deliberate misuse of grammatical structures, the appropriation of slang, club culture and television jargon, as well as the invention of neologisms, puns and other linguistic tricks, all of which makes her writing notoriously difficult to translate. The perspective of the narration changes rapidly and somewhat inexpertly, and what begins as a dark comedy turns abruptly to a brutal tragedy. Polish critics did not agree over the heterogeneity of the structure, some seeing it as a comedic art grappling with a serious tone[[51]](#footnote-49) and others as a structural defect[[52]](#footnote-50). This is certainly the first-time work of a novelist-turned-playwright. Counterpoising young Poles as Romanian migrants, however, Goldman argued that although this was ostensibly a play that examined Polish xenophobia, it spoke elliptically about what it means to be an outsider in a society, group or even in a relationship between two people.[[53]](#footnote-51)

At many turns in the play the plausibility of the existence of ‘Polish-speaking Romanians’ is called into question. Rather than remarking on a scarcity of economic migrants in Poland, the ‘Polish-speaking Romanian’ functions as a structural social fantasy through which Masłowska critiques a deeply embedded intolerance towards heterogeneity. ‘Romanian’ thus stands in for an imaginary figure that is the opposite of a refined or middle-class Pole: unconcerned with social etiquette, obsessed with material wealth and defined by an ability to live by one’s wits. Later, when Parcha grumbles that ‘We’re Polish-speaking Romanians, we’re lesbians, queers, Jews, we work in an advertising agency’,[[54]](#footnote-52) we see how the Romanian is simply a metonym for prejudice and misplaced social anxiety. Similar to her award-winning novel *White and Red* (*Wojna polsko-ruska pod flagą biało-czerwoną*;2002), Pawłowski seems to delight in the way Polish insecurity complexes are compensated for by stereotypes in Masłowska’s writing.[[55]](#footnote-53) Embracing the theme of the fancy-dress party (‘dirt, stench and disease’), Parcha dresses in a filthy shell suit and blackens his teeth with a marker, while Dżina disguises herself as a pregnant teenager. When referring to their lives back in Romania a number of ridiculous and farfetched details are invented, from living in huts and gathering grain from the fields to working in a dog and monkey factory and surviving solely on scraps of meat. The Romanian language is equally trivialized. Parcha speaks in a patois made up of fragments of Latin-derived terminology associated with alcohol and drugs (‘aspirina’, ‘caffeina’, ‘martini’, ‘codeinea’), cheap Italian cars (‘seicento’) and sex (‘fellatio’). The pair leaves the party early, ending up stranded on a rural highway without a means to travel back to Warsaw, the ultimate point of geographical identification. The capital city is a respite from the travails of traveling through the countryside, which is inscribed in the setting and dialogue as mystifying, dark and, ultimately, dangerous, represented as a series of dark vignettes that are hidden behind a series of panels in Miriam Buether’s set at the Soho Theatre. After unsuccessfully begging for a lift at a petrol station, Parcha breaks down and takes a man hostage. The drive that ensues is punctuated by sudden outbursts of violence. Under the influence of narcotics, Parcha and Dżina fully assume the identity of the mythical ‘Romanians’, a murderer and a thief (she tries to steal the driver’s air freshener), temporarily capable of committing transgressions that are precluded in their normal, law-abiding lives. The scene oscillates between pleas for help and threats of aggression and brutality, drawing attention to the various configurations of victimhood the West places on the subaltern, epitomized here by the Romanian. This is matched by a temporary loss of linguistic ability through flawed, repetitive syntax, indicating that socialization and politeness values are entrenched in the Polish language. Most of the characters the protagonists meet on their nighttime escapade are taken in by the illusion that they are migrants, which grows out of Parcha and Dżina’s refusal or inability to function as normal members of society. Masłowska plays masterfully with expectation – it is only in the second scene that the audience is made aware that they have been equally deceived, that the pair are Poles and not Romanian migrants – thus placing spectators on an equal footing with the characters Parcha and Dżina encounter.

Paul Taylor noted that this depiction of post-communist Poland presents ‘a world where new wealth fails to take notice of destitution and where identity is established by differentiation from undesirable strangers.’[[56]](#footnote-54) Role-paying itself becomes a central preoccupation when Parcha admits that he is not a Polish-speaking Romanian, but a Pole on a comedown who plays a priest on a popular television soap opera, *Plebania*. His role as Father Grzegorz is as real to him in the second half of the play as his role as a Romanian in the first two scenes was under the influence of drugs and alcohol. The anti-essentialist diagnosis offered by Masłowska is twofold: not only is the constructedness of national identity a subject for circumspection, the stability of the ego is overshadowed by a compulsion to both act out *and be conditioned by* a ‘theatrical’ role. The guilt Parcha experiences for his illicit behavior is directly attributable to the fact that he plays a respectable and well-loved Catholic priest on TV; though, it should be stressed, Catholicism itself does not provide an adequate communal fabric but rather stands as an adversary for Parcha, who is plagued by its ‘dogmas, confessions and fasts.’[[57]](#footnote-55) There are a number of insightful conclusions that can be drawn from this performance, not least of which is the inversion of the typical question: to what extent does the host culture shape the migrant? This can be reformulated as: how far is the host culture’s self-identity reliant on its determination of the figure of the migrant ‘Other’? This new framework of interpretation leads Parcha to declare that Poland is ‘worse than Romania. A bad dream; a bad dream that isn’t a dream.’[[58]](#footnote-56)

Rather than soliciting empathy with the protagonists that absolves them of responsibility, Masłowska challenges spectators to consider how emerging trends in cosmopolitan Polish life have produced a generation, generous and violent in turns, that is self-centered, materially driven and immature. By the conclusion of the play, Parcha admits that his imagined Romania is indeed a paradise in contrast with the new Poland. Perhaps this very fixed focus on the complexities and instabilities of Polish culture led the production to receive mixed reviews from the British media, many of whom expressed anxiety that the play probably held greater significance for home audiences.[[59]](#footnote-57) Here one is confronted by the striking fact that, on the whole, the British public knows very little about the country that has given them half a million migrants over the past decade.[[60]](#footnote-58)

Łukasz Drewniak claimed that foreigners in Poland have been traditionally depicted in art as evil or threatening perpetrators in contrast to Polish innocence, bravery or victimization.[[61]](#footnote-59) In opposition to this long-established trope, Masłowska takes part in corresponding processes of national examination that do not seek to conform to conventional unifying doctrines but reveal the ways in which foreigners have been shaped by stereotypes in national discourse. What the productions examined in this article have in common is a formal rejection of a singular approach to history or a cohesive articulation of national identity. According to Roman Pawłowski, the pressure of unemployment and a general lack of prospects has resulted in younger Poles losing an emotional attachment to their native language and country, and he cites the scene from Demirski’s *From Poland with love* in which a woman is prepared to sell Poland’s tragic past in exchange for a ticket to London as one of the most brutal in recent years.[[62]](#footnote-60) Increasingly unstable categories of ethnicity and geography fail to serve as strongholds for nationhood and the experience of emigration on a mass scale has not only allowed ‘Generation Nothing’ to reflect on the politics of new European and transcultural paradigms, it has also opened up radical questions around the historical constructions of their own particular cultural inheritances that continue to define Poland in the EU.
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