

A Brief Look at Immigration to UK

When did the Irish become “a problem”?

Mid-19th century onward, especially:

- **1840s–1850s:** The Great Famine triggered mass migration to Britain. Irish migrants were stereotyped as violent, drunken, criminal, or diseased — a mix of anti-Catholic prejudice and class hostility.
- **1860s–1880s:** Fenian bombings and political agitation intensified anti-Irish sentiment.
- **Early 20th century:** Signs like “*No Irish Need Apply*” and later “*No Blacks, No Dogs, No Irish*” reflected discrimination in housing and employment.

Jewish migrants

When were Jews considered “a problem”? Shakespeare – *The Merchant of Venice* (1598) featured Shylock the money lender or Usurer who wanted his ‘pound of flesh’ literally.

Late 19th to early 20th century, especially:

- **1880s–1910s:** Large numbers of Eastern European Jews arrived fleeing pogroms. British newspapers and politicians framed them as “undesirable aliens.”
- **1905 Aliens Act:** Britain’s first modern immigration law — widely understood as targeting Jewish refugees.
- **1930s:** Antisemitism rose again with the British Union of Fascists and economic depression. Oswald Mosley and the Blackshirts predicting Hitler and the Nazis to come.

Why?

- Economic competition in trades and small businesses
- Religious and cultural difference
- Imported European antisemitic tropes

Caribbean migrants (Windrush generation)

When did Windrush become “a problem”?

Immediately after arrival in 1948, but intensifying in the 1950s–1960s:

- **1948:** The *Empire Windrush* arrives. Some politicians and newspapers warn of “coloured immigration.”

- **1950s:** Housing discrimination becomes widespread — the infamous signs appear. “*No Blacks, No Dogs, No Irish*” led to Enoch Powell delivering his controversial “Rivers of Blood” speech on **April 20, 1968**.
- **1958:** Notting Hill and Nottingham race riots.
- **1962, 1968, 1971:** Immigration Acts aimed at restricting Commonwealth migration.

Why?

- Postwar housing shortages
- Racial prejudice and unfamiliarity with Black communities
- Fear of cultural change
- Economic competition in working-class areas

South Asian migrants

When did they become “a problem”?

1960s–1970s, especially:

- Migration from India, Pakistan, and later East African Asians.
- Enoch Powell’s 1968 “*Rivers of Blood*” speech framed South Asian and Caribbean migration as a threat.
- Discrimination in housing, employment, and policing.

Why?

- Visible cultural and religious difference
- Rapid demographic change in certain towns
- Political exploitation of racial anxieties

Muslims

When did Muslims become “a problem”?

A more modern shift:

- **1980s–1990s:** Tensions around Salman Rushdie, cultural integration debates.
- **2001–2005:** 9/11, the Bradford riots, and the London bombings intensified Islamophobia.
- **2010s–present:** Media narratives around extremism, grooming gangs, and immigration continue to shape public perception.

Why?

- Global geopolitics
- Cultural misunderstanding
- Media sensationalism

Other groups historically treated as “a problem”

Britain has, at different times, expressed hostility toward:

- **Huguenots** Protestants from France persecuted by Catholics in 17th century — initially feared, later fully integrated.
- **Chinese sailors** (19th–early 20th century) — targeted in port cities.
- **Black Africans** (19th century) — colonial-era racial prejudice.
- **Refugees from Uganda (1972) Expelled by Idi Amin** — initial hostility before later acceptance. **Counthill School** received its first black children in 1973. We had two, lovely lads who went on to work in the clothing industry in Manchester. They are both millionaires now and drive round in Rolls Royces. I remember one was called *Amjad*. We used to call him *Jamjar*. He loved it.
- **Syrian refugees (2010s)** — political controversy around resettlement.

The ‘Prominence’ of Jews in Britain

Thatcher had five Jewish members in a Cabinet of around twenty

Now, it would not be true to assert that Jews hold many seats of power within the British state and establishment. That **claim itself rests on a long-standing stereotype rather than evidence.**

1. Jews make up just 0.5% of the UK population

That’s about **1 in 200 people**. A group that small cannot, statistically, “hold many seats of power” across a modern state unless there is overwhelming evidence — and there isn’t.

Across recent UK governments:

- **Thatcher** had an unusually high number of Jewish Cabinet ministers (about 5 at one point).
- **Major, Blair, Brown, Cameron, May, Johnson, Sunak, and Starmer** had **very few or none** in Cabinet at various times.

- Jewish MPs appear across parties, but always in **small numbers**, broadly proportional to population size.

There is **no pattern** of sustained or disproportionate Jewish control of political power.

The claim itself has a historical origin

The idea that Jews secretly control governments or institutions is a **classic conspiracy theory** dating back centuries. It has been used to justify discrimination and violence, and it reappears whenever people look for simple explanations for complex political systems.

Modern political science, sociology, and demographic data all show:

There is no evidence of Jewish control or disproportionate influence in the British state.

Individual Jewish politicians may be influential — just like individual Catholics, Muslims, Atheists, or Anglicans — but that's normal in a democracy.

Andy Burnham

Andy Burnham has massive experience at Westminster from when he was an MP the first time from 2001 - 2017. He held major cabinet roles:

- Health Secretary
- Home Secretary
- Culture Secretary

He is on the soft Left of the party and has a broad appeal. He is grounded in Manchester, The North and The Working Class.

I identify with him because, like me, he did an English Degree and, like me, he loves Philip Larkin, the Hull poet.

Nobody is perfect. We all make mistakes. What matters is where those mistakes come from. Burnham is unlikely to be enriching himself. He genuinely cares about the people he came from in the North of England. If he makes mistakes it will be in pushing too hard to get policies through which others don't want to see. Already, the idea that Manchester could be favoured before London isn't going too well in the South.