

Celebrating Uncontrolled Immigration in Britain

The Spectator (UK) loses its mind.



by Bruce Bawer

In 1961, there were 50,000 Muslims in all of Britain and a total of seven mosques. Twenty years later, the Islamic population had increased tenfold and the number of mosques had risen by almost 2000%. Today the official tally is closing in on five million. And the number of mosques? It's well into the four figures.

What kind of impact has this rampant growth had on Britain? Other statistics help paint the picture. Terrorism? Two examples: the 2005 London bombings killed 52 and injured 784; the Manchester Arena bombing killed 22 and injured 512. Grooming gangs? In the town of Rotherham alone (pop. 265,000), the rapes of 1400 English girls by Muslim gangs have been systematically covered up for decades by police, politicians, social workers, and the media. There's no reason to believe that the situation isn't just as bad in cities and towns all over England.

Politicians are no longer safe. In 2021, a Conservative Party MP, David Amess, was murdered by a jihadist at a meeting with constituents – and his pusillanimous colleagues collaborated with the media to turn the focus away from the dangers of Islam to the supposed perils of “online abuse.” Just the other day, another conservative MP, Mike Freer, who is gay and who represents a largely Jewish constituency, announced that he would be leaving the House of Commons in the wake of numerous threats from Muslims.

Members of other non-Western immigrant groups – notably Hindus – have done a spectacular job of integrating peacefully and prosperously into British society. But the record of Muslims in Britain, who outnumber Hindus in Britain by almost four to one, has been drastically different. Instead of assimilating, they've formed sharia enclaves where their imams preach hatred of the West. While their daughters wear hijabs symbolizing subordination and their sons terrorize the schools, the parents demand that those schools purge curricula of material that contradicts their religious teachings.

Meanwhile the ever-growing number of Muslims who live on the dole – and who've never so much as contemplated entering the job market – has placed an ever-growing burden on the British welfare state, necessitating ever more severe cutbacks in other public expenses. In one city after another, everyday barbarism – machete attacks, acid attacks, and rape statistics that have risen 340% nationwide in the last decade – native Britons feel increasingly unsafe, even as adherents of a faith whose holy book calls for their destruction receive preferential treatment in everything from housing to hiring to higher education. Hundreds – if not thousands – of native Brits have dared to state the truth about Islam only to be imprisoned for it. And in recent months, as the streets of British cities have filled weekend after weekend with rabid Muslims shouting antisemitic slogans, it has been hard not to imagine them doing to their infidel neighbors what Hamas did to Israelis on October 7.

How did all this start? In Britain, as in other countries throughout Western Europe, it began with government officials who decided that they needed to enlarge the workforce. Apparently it never occurred to them that importing people whose core values differed radically from those of their native-born citizens could lead to catastrophe. Nor did it occur to them, needless to say, to ask those citizens for their opinions about this cataclysmic policy decision.

For an example of the kind of thinking that, decades ago, set Britain – and the rest of Western Europe – on the road to disaster, consider these passages from an [editorial](#) published in a major U.K. periodical: in the West, the editorial warned, “the threat of population collapse” would cause “the welfare state model” to collapse as well, making one thing urgently important above all else – namely, *to welcome immigrants in large numbers.*

When did this article appear? In 1960? 1970? No. Believe it or not, it appeared in the February 3, 2024, issue of the *Spectator* (not to be confused with the *American Spectator*), the flagship publication of the British conservative establishment. Under the headline “Who’s Afraid of Population Growth?” the *Spectator*’s editors cited the fast-declining populations of South Korea and Japan as threats to those countries’ economic prospects, and further noted that “in almost every country in Europe the working-age population has already started to decrease.” In Britain, by contrast, “our working-age population is projected to keep rising.”

The *Spectator*’s editors presented this upward trend as a magnificent accomplishment. Note, however, the failure to distinguish between “working-age population” and *working population*. Yes, the editors acknowledged that Britain’s years of massive immigration have caused widespread alarm. But they then immediately posed the question: “which is the worse problem to have – too many people or too few?” And they made it clear that for them the answer is undebatable: “too few.”

The real answer, of course, is: *it depends*. It depends, that is, on *which people* you’re letting in. Are they entering legally – or not? Are they skilled workers and civilized souls in search of better paying work – or are they criminals, freeloaders, barbarians? Do they dream of enjoying the freedom of the West – or are they fierce, unshakable adherents of a religion that’s utterly irreconcilable with Western freedom?

The editors of the *Spectator* dance around all of these vital questions only to zero in on another. "Newcomers to the UK," they write, "tend to have larger families, which is the main factor in maintaining our birth rate. Almost a third of all British babies are born to immigrant mothers. In London, it's closer to 60 per cent. This has not prompted the country to come apart at the seams. Instead, we have created a multi-faith society whose cohesiveness is envied by much of Europe."

"Multi-faith society"? It's more accurate to refer to the U.K. as "a society in which Christianity is shriveling and virtually every institution has capitulated to Islam." "Cohesiveness"? British elites have long since come to understand that when Islam is part of the mix, there's no cohesiveness except on its own draconian terms. Just look at London, which, as many longtime inhabitants lament, no longer remotely resembles its former self: entire neighborhoods now look like Kabul or Karachi; police arrest critics of Islam but ignore Muslim violence; politicians wink at urban rot while mouthing insipid pieties about "cultural enrichment"; and the mainstream media demonize anyone who dares to speak honestly about what is, in fact, an existential nightmare in the making.

The editors of the *Spectator* did mention the "great replacement" theory – but only to dismiss it out of hand. "Some European populists," they wrote, "advance the idea of a 'great replacement' plot by political masters to deliberately swap natives for lower-paid, more biddable migrants. But another explanation is that we now live in a world where people are on the move. Every day, 1,400 people emigrate from Britain and 3,200 newcomers arrive. Is this a great replacement – or the demographic response to a globalised world?"

Observe that the editors didn't even try to seriously challenge the "great replacement" theory; they just moved past

it to their cockamamie alternative “explanation” – namely, that people are just kind of “on the move” as part of some “demographic response” to globalism. What could be more of an insult to readers’ intelligence? And what could be more chillingly technocratic, more remote from individual human reality? Reading this bilge, you find yourself picturing one Muslim saying to another: “Hey, it’s a globalized world, let’s respond to it demographically. Which way is the English Channel?”

The *Spectator* editors seem to want their readers to see certain things as being inevitable, set in stone – to see globalism as a *fait accompli* and revolutionary demographic change as a force of nature. Reading such nonsense, you’d think that there’s no such thing as the possibility of a country – acting upon the wishes of its own people – imposing, and enforcing, sensible immigration controls.

After all, British citizens voted in 2016 to leave the EU so that they might be able to do precisely that. But though the Brexiteers won, both the Tories and Labourites have refused to give them what they wanted on the immigration front. The insane, massive influx has continued – consisting largely of boats packed with young Muslim males who are coming ashore illegally.

And it’s not only on the immigration issue that ordinary voters feel ignored by their major political parties. Largely because of the unending flood of newcomers, young British natives can’t get decent jobs or buy homes, and older folks are denied vitally important medical treatments or are put on long waiting lists for them. Meanwhile illegal immigrants are first in line for many of the goodies.

And the *Spectator* editors acknowledged absolutely none of this. No, as far as they’re concerned, “[t]he problems arise when more people leave than arrive: a decline in population numbers is what brings crisis.” Full stop. But only a few

sentences later the editors conceded that the U.K. does indeed have a crisis – namely, a “welfare crisis.” Over five million people, they admitted, are collecting “out-of-work benefits during a worker shortage” that’s “drawing in a million migrants a year.” Hmm, food for thought: why are so many people in the U.K. collecting unemployment when there aren’t enough workers to fill the available jobs? Could the explanation be that a great many of the Muslims in Britain have absolutely no interest in finding employment when they can continue to live very well on government handouts? Certainly that’s the case in many other parts of Western Europe. Needless to say, the *Spectator* editors don’t want to go there.

Approaching their conclusion, the editors offer yet another dishonest touch: “many” of the “current high number of immigrants to the UK,” they maintain, are “highly skilled people who are more likely to work and pay taxes than native Britons.” Ah, the wonderfulness of the word “many,” which can mean ten or a hundred or a few thousand out of, well, a multitude. The editors then slip in a brief-as-possible admission that, yes, “[w]e need to build more homes and manage integration better” – only to add quickly, by way of wrapping up, that “these are issues that arise as a result of the country’s success.”

What to make of this editorial? Think of it this way: it’s just one more proof that while mass immigration has ravaged the lives of many Western Europeans, it has yet to harm the elites who run key institutions like the *Spectator* – which, I guess, is why they’re able to convince themselves that that immigration has actually been a triumph rather than a horror show.

To be sure, drastic population decline is problematic, too. But the kind of population growth that will ultimately transform Britain into a sharia state is something only an Iranian mullah could celebrate. For the editors of

the *Spectator* to cheer this dire development isn't entirely surprising – plenty of nominally conservative periodicals seem unable to shake the libertarian credo that importing armies of riffraff is *always* a socioeconomic good – but it's disappointing, to say the least. Indeed, to read such drivel in the year 2024 is to recognize just how few allies ordinary Western Europeans – people who, with fewer and fewer exceptions, are profoundly alarmed by the course their continent is taking – have among their powerful elites.

First published in [Frontpage](#).