



1968



2018

MANY RIVERS CROSSED

*Britain's attitudes to race and integration
50 years since 'Rivers of Blood'*

Edited by Steve Ballinger

British
Future...

Published April 2018 by:
British Future
Kean House
6 Kean Street
London WC2B 4AS

Editor: Steve Ballinger
Design: Andrew Roberts

About British Future:
British Future is an independent, non-partisan
thinktank engaging people's hopes and fears
about integration and migration, opportunity
and identity, so that we share a confident and
welcoming Britain, inclusive and fair to all.

www.britishfuture.org
Tel. +44 (0) 20 7632 9069
Twitter: @BritishFuture

Registered charity number: 1159291



Contents

1. Introduction: Many Rivers Crossed

THE WEST MIDLANDS THEN AND NOW

2. The girl with snow in her hair and the blue umbrella **5**
Angela Spence

3. What do people in the West Midlands today think about Powell and race? **6**
Steve Ballinger

4. ‘No ordinary primary’: The Wolverhampton school using Enoch Powell to help children understand race and diversity **10**
Steve Ballinger

5. Why I changed my mind on Enoch **13**
John Catley

6. Echoes of the past **14**
Paul Uppal

7. Engaging with anxieties in Dudley **15**
Ian Austin MP

8. STATE OF THE NATION: what does Britain think about race and diversity today? **17**
Steve Ballinger

9. TWELVE MOMENTS that defined race in Britain **33**

COMMENTARY AND ANALYSIS

10. Enoch and me – and us **37**
Sunder Katwala

11. Could Brexit turn the clock back on race relations? **41**
Professor Robert Ford and Dr Maria Sobolewska, University of Manchester

12. “I think they’re Muslim, but they’re really nice” **44**
Rabiha Hannan

13. On diversity, Conservatives are losing the generation game **46**
Andrew Cooper


14. “What I’d say to Enoch Powell” **48**
Sajid Javid, Vince Cable, Sara Khan, Tariq Modood, Herman Ouseley, Shamit Saggar, Keith Harrison, Arten Llazari, David Coleman

15. THE WORK AHEAD: what are the biggest challenges and how do we tackle them? **52**
Jill Rutter

16. Notes **55**

17. About British Future **56**

I. Introduction: Many Rivers Crossed



“I’m going to make a speech at the weekend and its going to go up like a rocket, but whereas all rockets fall to ground, this one is going to stay up,”

Wolverhampton MP Enoch Powell told the editor of the local Express and Star newspaper, two days before what became known as his ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech in Birmingham on April 20th 1968.

That was one prediction that Enoch did get right. No other speech in British political history created so much immediate controversy, nor reverberates so long through the years and the decades.

‘Rivers of Blood’ is mostly today remembered as a speech about immigration – especially when we still talk about whether we have the confidence to debate immigration openly or not. Powell did not just want large-scale immigration to stop: he aimed to shift the debate from curbing immigration to the need for mass repatriation of most of those who had come to Britain. Otherwise, he said, Britain would be ‘building its own funeral pyre’ – because Commonwealth immigrants would not want to integrate, so would fundamentally change Britain.

Fewer people remember that the speech was prompted by Powell’s opposition to the Race Relations Act, which would make it illegal to discriminate on grounds of race in jobs or housing. Powell feared that ‘in 15 or 20 years time, the black man will have the whip hand over the white man’.

He was sacked by Conservative leader Ted Heath, who found the speech ‘racialist in tone and liable to exacerbate racial tensions.’ The Times condemned it as ‘an evil speech.’ While Powell was buoyed by letters of support, seeing himself as a popular tribune, Britain’s ethnic minorities experienced an atmosphere in which racists felt legitimised.

Half a century later those passions may have faded, but the anniversary of the speech is a key moment in Britain’s story about race relations, immigration and integration. *Many Rivers Crossed* combines the local story of how people in Wolverhampton and the West Midlands today think about the changes of those fifty years, along with ‘State of the Nation’ findings about changing attitudes across the UK.

The debate in the West Midlands and nationally

about ‘Rivers of Blood’ today is very different from that of the 1970s or 1980s. “Was Enoch right?” is no longer a question asked by many. That is partly a story of generational change over the decades. Most people over 45 have heard of the ‘Rivers of Blood speech,’ while a majority of those under 45 know nothing about it at all.

The older generation – while more sceptical about the pace and scale of immigration today – had a clear view that Britain had changed for the better on race, praising pioneers like the late footballer Cyrille Regis for breaking down the public racism of the 1970s, seeing it as positive that their children had different attitudes today. Our younger participants held strongly anti-racist views but were not so sure we are making progress. It wasn’t just that those who had grown up with ethnic diversity couldn’t really judge what things were like before they were born – they also had stronger expectations of fair treatment today.

Half a century on, Enoch Powell’s arguments belong to the history books. 80% of us are comfortable with someone of a different race becoming their neighbour, their son or daughter-in-law or their Prime Minister. The ‘Rivers of Blood’ anniversary may be overshadowed by a country preparing to hang out the bunting for the wedding of Prince Harry and Meghan Markle, Britain’s first mixed-race princess. It seems fitting that the stories of social change, reflected in the many marriages and friendships across ethnic lines that we heard about throughout the West Midlands, should reach the top of society too.

Britain has proved Enoch wrong in his prediction of large-scale civil strife. Yet that can be no cause for complacency. *Many Rivers Crossed* also captures a clear sense that some big challenges – of tackling racism, prejudice and ensuring equal opportunity for all – have not gone away. Nor has the need to rebuild public confidence in how we make immigration and integration work. For that to happen, we must be able to have an open debate about the immigration policies we want, but one that keeps prejudice out. Fifty years on from ‘Rivers of Blood,’ immigration is still a topic on which people hold different views. That there must be no place for racism in Britain, however – and should work together to stamp it out – is now common ground that we share.

2. The girl with snow in her hair and the blue umbrella

ANGELA SPENCE



Angela Spence was just five when Enoch Powell thrust her school into the headlines. She reflects on growing up black and British in Wolverhampton in the shadow of Powell's speech.

As a small child I remember seeing my image on the television. It was the year before the moon landing. I have no recollection of the piece being filmed, but there I was: a little girl with snow in her hair, holding a light blue umbrella.

I was in the first cohort of five-year-olds who attended Wolverhampton's newly opened West Park Junior School, as it was called then. Enoch Powell had singled-out the school in his infamous 1968 Birmingham speech, as having classes with only one white child. That was a blatant misrepresentation: the school was diverse even then

with a mix of children learning and playing together. Jackie and Susan, two white girls, were among my friends.

I am the eldest of five children and we all went to West Park. We lived very locally in a house purchased by my parents in 1963, in a street with families from Fiji, Poland, South East Asia, the Indian sub-continent, Italy, Jamaica, Barbados, Montserrat and the UK. I enjoyed my school days.

I grew up knowing the content of the 'Rivers of Blood' speech but I have no recollection of an epiphany when I realised I was Black. I grew up in a very positive, pro black environment for which I cannot thank my parents enough. They were our first teachers.

There have been watershed moments in British history around the issue of race, racism and resistance. I recall the disturbances of the 80s and the Scarman Report. The death of Cynthia Jarret. The death of Clinton McCurbin. The death of Stephen Lawrence and the Macpherson Inquiry. After each occurrence we heard that "lessons will be learned." The disturbances of 2011 were a reminder that for many there was still a sense of hopelessness coupled with little or no improvement in their lives.

Last year I received a link via WhatsApp from my sister. It was the TV footage with me, a five year old child invested with hope and promise for a bright and happy future. Have things changed?

Yes they have. We have legislation that prohibits certain actions and words; people have become more sophisticated and the language has changed.

Have things improved? This depends how we measure improvement. Records show a black presence in the West Midlands in 1650 yet much is made of the election of the first black MP for the West Midlands in 2017. Our diversity is cause for celebration but I understand too that, for some, this is difficult to take on board. The current national and international landscapes do much to feed the fear of difference and otherness and gives licence to some to behave badly. Am I hopeful that things will get better? Yes, I am.

I am forever the girl with snow in her hair, now a permanent fixture, holding the blue umbrella.

© Angela Spence 2018



Five year old Angela Spence in the 1968 ATV Today film 'Immigration and Education'.

Our diversity is cause for celebration but I understand too that, for some, this is difficult to take on board.

3. What do people in the West Midlands today think about Powell and race?



Ian Halsey: Flickr CC BY-NC 2.0



STEVE BALLINGER reports on shifts and differences in attitudes across the generations from our research in Wolverhampton, Erdington and Dudley.

“He looks like someone off Peaky Blinders.”

When we showed local citizens in the West Midlands a picture of Enoch Powell, alongside other local politicians, only a few of the older participants could identify him. None of the under-30s recognised Powell and only a couple had heard of him – to them, the ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech happened in the distant past.

Older people, however, recalled the controversy around the ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech, including Powell’s repatriation offer of £1,000 to help people ‘go home.’ One person could even tell us the street that Enoch lived on. Yet they too felt his appeal was primarily to past generations. *“I think the older generation would say he was right but the younger generation, we’ve all integrated and we’ve all got friends of different backgrounds,”* said one participant.

Another added: *“I remember my gran talking about it and agreeing with it, my grandad as well, Enoch Powell was right, I remember all of that... Not so much now for me, people I speak to now, but for the older generation, immigration was new to them and it was a scary time for them.”*

In some respects this was to be expected – for anyone under 20, he had died before they were born – but the extent and the nature of the generational differences we encountered in the area were in many ways quite surprising.

The 50th anniversary of Powell’s ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech is a national moment, a chance to examine how far Britain has come on attitudes to race and integration. But it is a local and regional moment too. Powell was MP for Wolverhampton South West for 24 years, it was in Birmingham that he gave that infamous speech and it was from the increasing diversity of his constituency that he drew his apocalyptic conclusions for multi-racial Britain.

So, since the start of the year, British Future has been in the West Midlands, discussing race, prejudice and the challenges of integration and finding out what Powell’s speech means today.

***If someone says something racist
she'll call them up on it. Before,
she might have joined in.***

In Wolverhampton we met local stakeholders, from faith leaders and local schools to MPs and local councilors, trade unions and local charities. But it was from local citizens that we most wanted to hear, convening three citizens' panels in the city – including one made up of over-55s and another of people under 30 to find out more about how different generations approach the topic. We spoke to citizens in Erdington, a Birmingham suburb with levels of diversity closer to the national average (and low for a Birmingham suburb); and in Dudley, six miles up the road from Wolverhampton but notably less diverse and with its own distinct integration challenges, including activity from the far right. Here we specifically sought out the views of people with more negative views about immigration, to explore how they interacted with opinions on race and prejudice.

Bridging generational divides

In our West Midlands conversations, differences between generations were more striking than differences between these three quite varied locations – mirroring the findings of our national opinion polling for this report. That attitudes and knowledge differ across generations is well known but here it came with a twist: not only were older people very aware of how far attitudes to race and diversity have changed over the last 50 years, there was also a sense of pride in that change, and in the openness of their children and grandchildren to people from different backgrounds. In many ways, through family, friendship and work interactions, older people were part of the area's integration story too.

*The Three Degrees:
Laurie Cunningham,
Cyril Regis and
Brendon Batson.
Photo courtesy West
Bromwich Albion.*



For younger participants, having grown up in a multi-racial city, diversity was so normal that they hardly noticed it – it is just how their local area looks. Yet several younger members spoke with empathy about how this could feel challenging for older generations.

“It has changed, the country... I think for a lot of people, I know for my mum for one, who grew up in white Britain before multiculturalism, it was a bit of a difficult pill to swallow. But certainly for me, I've grown up with it, and it seems the norm, the natural.”

Another young (white) participant told us how contact through his friends, who were mainly Asian, had gradually shifted attitudes within his own family: *“Over time I guess she learnt that there was no difference. My mum might have been racist at some point, but she's not any more, if someone says something racist she'll call them up on it. Before, she might have joined in.”*

Even among participants who held quite tough views on immigration, there was a degree of pride in how relaxed their children and grandchildren were about race. One man proudly recounted how his ten-year-old son had corrected his grandmother when she had said something prejudiced about Muslims after the recent terrorist attacks: *“He said to his nan, ‘look nan, there is good and bad in everybody, it's a minority who do bad things’ – which I thought was pretty cool.”*

Remembering ‘Rivers of Blood’

Looking back to Powell's time, older participants recalled just how prevalent racism and prejudice was when they were growing up. One of the Dudley group told us about an experience at a West Bromwich Albion football match:

“I remember going to a game at the Hawthorns, I was about six, and seeing bananas thrown at Cyril Regis. I asked my dad what they were doing, because they were doing the monkey chants because he was black and my dad told me it was disgusting and disgraceful but that's what they were doing.”

Many of this older group, however, shared stories of how prejudiced their own parents had been. *“I was told not to play with the monkeys,”* one of the Erdington group revealed. In Dudley a woman said *“My dad used to say to me, don't you ever go with a black man.”*

They were told not to mix with the new people who looked different, but they mixed all the same.

We often contrast older Britons with younger generations in terms of their less liberal attitudes to diversity without realizing that they have gone on a journey to get where they are today. They were told by their parents not to mix with the new people who looked different, but they mixed all the same. Most were able to share personal stories of integration, whether through interracial marriages in their family, in the workplace or through friendships, and this had helped reinforce strong anti-prejudice norms even among those who could hold quite negative views on immigration.

The shape of prejudice today

Our younger group in Wolverhampton did not share this strong sense that things had got better since Enoch Powell's day. Events a quarter-century before most of them were born were eclipsed by a more tangible sense that things had got worse after terrorist attacks on 9/11, 7/7 and more recently too. Young people in Wolverhampton today were very aware of racism where it exists and are rightly shocked when they see it – so it makes little difference to them that it may have been worse for their parents or grandparents.

Many had seen or experienced racism in recent years. The younger group felt confident that racists are very much a minority in their multi-ethnic city – but also that they do have a presence and had been emboldened by the Brexit vote, mistakenly feeling that it gave them a mandate to display their prejudice. One woman told us about being verbally abused by 'a skinhead' on the bus because her young child was mixed race. An Eastern European participant said that she and her family had felt an upsurge in prejudice since the referendum, leading to some of her relatives deciding to leave the UK: *"I have my own little boy, he is 6 years old, and girls in his class use bad words because he is Polish."*

Much of the discussion in the more anxious groups was about immigration from Eastern Europe. Some participants traded sweeping generalisations, mostly negative yet sometimes positive, based on one or two fleeting personal encounters – with rude taxi drivers or helpful NHS receptionists, for example – showing how contact between white Britons and East Europeans was often quite shallow, in contrast to the deeper contact between longer-settled ethnic groups over time, which has

broken down barriers through marriages and friendships. Others participants focused on the perceived failings of the immigration system today compared to that which had so exercised Enoch Powell: *"Back in the 60s it was predominantly West Indian, Indian, Pakistanis from the Commonwealth – we invited them in to do the menial jobs that at the time white people didn't want to do. Now we have a completely different set of immigration rules, it's everybody from Romania, Eastern Europeans, it's everybody. Let's face it, they're in France at the moment fighting to come into this country."*

We also encountered anxiety and some stereotypes about Muslim integration, particularly in Dudley, where plans to build a new mosque had been put on hold after local protests and activity by far right groups like the EDL. People talked about 'Politically Correct' teaching staff stopping schoolchildren from watching Christmas films about Mary and Joseph and that local Muslims wanted "their own community within a community rather than integration." Terrorist attacks in 2017 had certainly made community relations more strained. Two members of the younger Wolverhampton group, both Muslims, said that the atmosphere had worsened after the atrocities in Manchester and London:

"You mentioned the attacks and that's what changes people's perceptions. At one point I remember a time when I didn't have the feeling that when I go outside someone is going to say something, but I think once the media's perception changes, especially as a visible Muslim woman wearing a headscarf, I think that's when it changes for me."

Drawing the line

One local Wolverhampton stakeholder described an incident where someone had ripped her hijab off in the street – though also, more hearteningly, how a group of passers-by, of various ethnic backgrounds, had immediately come to her aid and told the assailant to get away from her. Whatever else they disagreed about, everybody was very clear this was out of order. Most people hoped they would step in personally if they saw something like it on the street – and that somebody should – but were honest about acknowledging that it would depend on their sense of personal safety.

Their children used to come round my house and ask for a cheese sandwich and my children used to go round theirs and ask for a pakora.

People were proud of how Wolverhampton had stood up to racists, with the EDL ‘told where to go’ by a counter-demonstration that dwarfed their attempted rally.

There was a more general sense of pride in how Wolverhampton had adapted to the changes in its population over the last 50 years. When we asked how the region had changed, increasing diversity was mentioned by every group. In Wolverhampton, people said the city was well-integrated with different ethnicities and nationalities living side-by-side – which they contrasted with Birmingham where, they felt, some areas remained quite segregated.

In Wolverhampton and the other locations we visited, and across generations too, we found that people’s basic commitment to anti-prejudice norms on race was strong, though more work is needed to extend those anti-prejudice principles to include Muslims and Eastern Europeans. While we encountered many negative views about immigration among our groups, particularly in Dudley where we had actively sought out participants who were anxious about immigration, the overwhelming majority were keen to draw the line at racism. *“I think there is a difference between discriminating against someone because of the colour of their skin and managing immigration,”* one of the Dudley group told us.

Opposition to racism is something on which we can find common ground if we give those who need it the space to air their anxieties about immigration, in a civil way, without pandering to prejudice or shutting down the conversation.

Commemorating Enoch?

The debate in local media about whether Wolverhampton should have a blue plaque to commemorate Enoch Powell, which has become quite heated and polarised, may not be the most productive way for the city to have this conversation. Only a minority of our groups were aware of the debate at all.

Our under-30s group, despite their strong opposition to racism, were not at all bothered by the idea, feeling it may be worse to fuel the sense of grievance of those who wanted it: *“They give anybody a plaque,”* one person said. Older

participants, who had a clearer sense of the significance of commemorating Powell, were more divided – a few found it odd that such a well-known connection to the city was not marked; more felt that it would be divisive and hence unwise. It certainly was not an issue that our groups cared a lot about either way.

Living together

Looking to the future, promoting more mixing between people from different backgrounds was seen as vital to making integration work in the West Midlands. People wanted more community centres where people could meet. The younger participants felt that the closure of local youth clubs, where different ethnic groups had previously met and mixed over games of pool, was a big setback. Those that exist, they said, are now often run by faith groups and hence attracted a narrower audience.

Schools were also a vital place of integration, where children could meet and make friends with others from different backgrounds. Having a shared language was also seen as essential. But it is social contact between different races, faiths and nationalities, where people get to know each other and find common ground, that holds the key to integration for the future. It also explains why Enoch Powell was so wrong in his cataclysmic predictions for the future of multi-racial Britain. One white woman in our Dudley group told us a little about her own experience of integration:

“When I first got married 30 years ago we moved to a new housing estate and realised, when the house was built, we were on an estate full of Asian couples. It was the best place I’ve lived with the best neighbours, and I lived there 14 years and we are still friends today. That’s just who I knew: I’m not saying they are all brilliant – we are not all brilliant – but we did live very happily. My neighbours had kids who were the same age as mine, their children used to come round my house and ask for a cheese sandwich and my children used to go round theirs and ask for a pakora.”

In that simple story of shared everyday living, she may have summed up why Powell’s ‘Rivers of Blood’ never flowed in this part of Britain.

Steve Ballinger is Director of Communications at British Future

4. 'No ordinary primary'



STEVE BALLINGER reports from West Park Primary, the diverse Wolverhampton school engaging with its role in the 'Rivers of blood' story to help children understand racism and inclusion today.

Wolverhampton Wanderers' strikers seem to find the net more often than not at the moment, but a badly mis-hit shot at the club's Molineux ground could almost make it to the playground of West Park Primary school, in the city's Whitmore Reans neighbourhood. In times gone by, when the school was nearer still to Molineux, players would walk past the school gates on the way to training.

In 1968 West Park Primary found itself at the centre of a political and social controversy. Enoch Powell, in a February speech in Walsall where he rehearsed the arguments of his infamous "Rivers of Blood" speech, cited a constituent's letter claiming their child was the only white student in their class.

The school logbook records the impact when reporters surmised that the school must have been West Park:

Feb 16th 1968. Following a speech of Mr Enoch Powell MP for Wolverhampton South West in which he stated that the daughter of one of his constituents was the only white child in a class, the national and local press have been rather troublesome. West Park School has been named as the school referred to, and reporters have tried on more than one occasion to get interviews with parents, children and staff and also to photograph the children. All enquiries however have been referred to the LEA.

How Wolverhampton should approach the 50th anniversary of that speech has proved divisive. For some, Powell's position as a major figure in the history of the city and the nation merits recognition. Others wish the past to remain the past, feeling there is nothing to be gained by re-opening divisions from which Wolverhampton has largely moved on. West Park Primary has

Rather than hiding from it, the school has embraced its past at the centre of the controversy whipped-up by Powell.



chosen to engage with its past and explore how its diversity was seen in 1968 and how that contrasts with the experience of its young students today.

The class I meet has been learning about the history of their school and their city. *"We learned how our school has welcomed people from other countries,"* one pupil tells me, *"And about that man who said those things about our school."*

"Enoch Powell," her classmate says. *"He wanted people to go back to other countries."* Another girl says: *"He was very racist."*

I ask them what they would think if someone said that now. *"It's very bad,"* says one girl, *"You should treat all people the same."* Another asks: *"What if someone said that to him, would he like it?"*

The children – aged from nine to 11 and who want to be respectively a doctor, a footballer and an "actor/singer/dancer" when they grow up – also spoke to Mike Edwards, a pupil at the school back in 1968. The project to explore West Park Primary's history of welcoming and accommodating newcomers to Wolverhampton, and the controversy sparked by Powell's speech, came about when he contacted the school to help set up a 'Class of '68' reunion.

Edwards, a white British boy, and his best friend Raymond Comrie, who is black, were pictured together in a photo that was published by newspapers in the aftermath of the Powell speech. *"They said Mike was the only white boy in his class but that wasn't true, they exaggerated,"* one pupil tells me. The children relate a story about the boys kicking their football into the neighbouring grammar school: *"Raymond couldn't go and get his ball because they would have said things to him that were racist."*

Today the school remains a cultural melting pot. At assembly children of every colour and creed giggle and chat before sitting cross-legged in neat rows to watch a performance by the Year Five and Six students. Rather than hiding from it, the school has embraced its past at the centre of the controversy whipped-up by Powell. West Park Primary's diversity, and the way it engages its pupils in managing it, has become a source of pride – and shows how a school can be a place not just of learning but of mixing and integration, for the pupils and their parents too.



Many people will proudly talk of how colour-blind their kids are.

New arrivals at the school are paired up with a ‘Young interpreter’ to help them through some of the challenges of settling in. When I talk to the children after assembly, they’re very keen to tell me about this new responsibility. *“We help people who are new to the school and help them with English,”* one girl tells me. I ask if that’s ever difficult – *“Sometimes it’s quite hard if you’re trying to explain something and they don’t speak any English.”* The boy opposite chips in: *“When I arrived here from Spain she helped me,”* he says.

The assembly today is a special one: the school is the first in Wolverhampton to be awarded ‘School of Sanctuary’ status and Inderjit Singh Bhogal, founder and President of the City of Sanctuary movement, is there to make the presentation. Bhogal knows all too well the tensions that followed the ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech in the West Midlands. His family came to Dudley from Nairobi in 1964 and he later became the Methodist minister for a Wolverhampton Parish

where support for the National Front was strong. He baptised over 400 children in the area, he says, but insisted on visiting each family first in their home, in part so they would actually meet and talk to someone who was Asian.

“It’s really everyone’s job, we should all be kind to each other,” he tells the assembled children. *“That’s the kind of city we want to live in.”* One of the parents who speaks in the assembly is a refugee, another an asylum-seeker. Another parent, Mohammed, whose kids are at the local secondary now, sought sanctuary in Britain after fleeing Aleppo in Syria. He stands up and gives an embarrassed wave when he’s name-checked during the performance.

We’re quite used to children mixing in today’s multi-racial classrooms. Many of the people we’ve spoken to in our West Midlands focus groups, including those who are anxious about immigration, will proudly talk of how colour-blind their kids are. That’s not always the case with parents though – while the school-gate can be a place to meet and mix, it can also reinforce divisions, with hurried parents only taking time to speak to those they already know.

A group of ‘Parent ambassadors’ at West Park Primary volunteer to make new parents feel welcome and connected to others at the school, with weekly coffee mornings where people meet to share food, conversation and the worries of parenting. One of them, Shenaz Hafeez, tells me more about it. *“Sometimes people just need somewhere they can let off a bit of steam,”* she says. *“They still have to muck in and make the coffee, though.”*

Issues of race and integration can feel like difficult topics to address. One could easily understand a multi-ethnic school like West Park Primary seeking to put its past links to Enoch Powell’s divisive speech well behind it. But instead the school has made that history a part of its efforts to integrate children and parents alike in Whitmore Reans, and to build a strong sense of community in an area of different nationalities, languages and religious backgrounds. It has used this troubled past to tell a different story about Wolverhampton today, and the future that its students will help to build.

Steve Ballinger



5. Why I changed my mind on Enoch

JOHN CATLEY

John Catley, from Wolverhampton, on the chance encounter and unlikely friendship that made him realise Enoch was wrong.

I was born in the Black Country in the early 1940's. At that time my father was a factory worker and my mother a housewife. I vaguely remember incidents in the war, but my parents protected me from the reality and the hardships. At the age of eleven I started to attend a local secondary modern school. Looking back to my time there I can't remember any non-white pupils attending the school - hardly surprising just a few years after the Empire Windrush arrived in 1948.

As I grew up I did see a few black people, but I never had the opportunity, or desire, to talk to them. Even when I started work at fifteen black people were a rarity. This state of affairs was normal, it never occurred to me that things were changing. I was a white Englishman, interacting with white English people and the word racism never entered my world.

By 1968 I was applauding Mr Powell over his Rivers of Blood speech.

In my early twenties I was married with a son and living in Dorset. Once again I was living in a totally white area. The first time I realised things were changing was when a good friend was slightly injured in the Dudley race riots of 1962. My reaction was, "How dare these people come to my country and attack my friend". I did start to take notice of media reports of the growing friction, and by 1968 I was applauding Mr Powell over his Rivers of Blood speech.

By this time we had moved back to the Midlands, our second son had arrived and I was concentrating on my career. During this period there was no 'Political Correctness'. The television hits were Alf Garnet and the Black and White Minstrels. I believed what I was being told by our politicians and the media.

Things changed in 2005, while I was employed as company secretary to a Midlands engineering company. One day a black lady arrived to clean my office. As the weeks went by I really enjoyed our



daily five minute chats. I learned about her family and her dreadful life. I was impressed by her work ethic: one time she walked six miles to work for two hours pay at minimum rate, then walked home again. I later found out that she had lost her purse with all her money.

Then one day she wasn't there any more. She had been arrested and taken to the notorious Yarl's Wood Detention Centre. I found out that she was an asylum seeker and the Home Office planned to remove her to the very city where a gang planned to kill her.

Over the months I had come to like and respect this lady. The thought of her being forcibly returned, to a place where she felt sure she would be murdered, horrified me. So I decided to help her. I was shocked to find that our asylum system just assumed her story was fiction. I even travelled to her home country to help get proof of her claims.

Meeting an asylum seeker and getting to know her, and witnessing the trauma that she had to endure, changed my views completely. I am now involved in a City of Sanctuary organisation. I spend my time helping asylum seekers and refugees in the Midlands. I hear some dreadful stories and do all I can to ease their worries and help with their cases.

Not everyone is going to have a chance meeting like mine. But we can all make the effort to get to know someone from a different background to our own – the Eastern European fella at work or the mum in a headscarf at the school gate. For me, getting to know an asylum seeker changed my life.

6. Echoes of the past

PAUL UPPAL



PAUL UPPAL, the first ethnic minority MP to win Enoch Powell's seat, questions the motives behind the 'Rivers of Blood' speech.

"That's spooky!" Looking at the historical election results for Wolverhampton South West on a Friday morning in May 2010 my wife had noticed that Enoch Powell had won the seat from Labour for the first time in 1950 with a majority of 691.

"Spooky, but why?" I replied. Because I too had won the seat from Labour with a majority of 691 – me the son of Kenyan Sikh immigrants, whose family had moved to Britain in the early 1960s. The irony was now both acute and vivid to me.

Having spoken with Pamela Powell and constituents who had been living in the area during Enoch's time I was well aware of the build-up and history to Powell's "Rivers of blood" speech. Its delivery had been planned to generate maximum coverage and exposure, timed for 20 April 1968 at the Midland Hotel in Birmingham. The content and timing of the speech all came together that Saturday afternoon resulting in an inordinate amount of coverage by the Sunday papers and shored up by the news and current affairs television programmes of the day.

I'm convinced Enoch Powell had made the speech in a bid to become Prime Minister. Powell had recognised the power of the media and was aware that when he spoke about race and immigration he would be inundated with supportive letters from across the country, hardly surprising if you look at the social climate and culture of Britain at that time.

Earlier in 1968 television screens had captured and shown African-Asians fleeing from Kenya to Britain. What perhaps went unnoticed was that weeks earlier Powell had delivered a speech in Walsall about immigration but it had failed to gain national traction. By comparison his subsequent speech was laced with emotive language and designed to be hard hitting, stating that 'in this country in 15 or 20 years' time the black man will hold the whip hand over the white man', and epitomised by his reference to the poet Virgil describing a Roman seeing "the River Tiber foaming with much blood!"

My parents have often spoken to me about how they felt things changed when they heard those words. Real life became far more tense, mistrust spread and there was a palpable feeling of being unwelcome, something which they felt hadn't existed before in Britain. As a modern-day Briton of East African heritage it was therefore particularly satisfying for me to win the seat of MP for Wolverhampton South West in 2010 with that "spooky" numerical majority. It's tempting to say that things had come full circle but the truth is that had already happened.

In any given weekend in Wolverhampton Punjabi weddings occur with people from all backgrounds dancing to traditional Indian music mixed with a modern British beat eating a feast of Punjabi and British cuisine. Powell had underestimated the ability of the British people – whatever their heritage – to come together in the realisation that culture isn't static but always changing and evolving. Although Enoch was undoubtedly a very bright academic he had missed the 'human' perspective.

The human aspect has often been a failing of politicians for as long as I can remember. During my time representing my constituents in Wolverhampton South West the same question would continue to arise of how to win over black, Asian, and minority ethnic voters. Surely a piece of seminal legislation or a dramatic speech would provide the solution or so people thought.

The reality is that black, Asian and minority ethnic voters are no different to any other voters. They want a good education for their children and better public services and healthcare for their families, and a future they can build on. They can spot lip service too, but will respect politicians who are genuinely open, approachable and above all consistent in whatever environment they find themselves.

In my time in Parliament I was undoubtedly surrounded by some of the smartest people I'd ever met. Many simply echoing what they think people want to hear. But like Enoch, just because you're smart don't assume that those around you aren't clever enough to see through your motives – it may come back to haunt you.

Paul Uppal was MP for Wolverhampton South West 2010-2015

7. Engaging with anxieties in Dudley

IAN AUSTIN MP



The far right took nearly a tenth of the vote in Dudley North in 2005. IAN AUSTIN MP says listening to people's concerns about immigration and proposing practical solutions, without pandering to prejudice, is the way to offer voters something better.

The contrast between Enoch Powell's terrible predictions and the reality of life in the West Midlands could not be more stark.

People have come from all over the world, from different backgrounds and cultures to work together and build a better society and stronger communities for us all. They have made a huge contribution to the Black Country, to our NHS and other public services and, by setting up businesses and creating jobs, our economy too. Our diversity has strengthened our country and enriched our communities.

No one would have objected if he'd said immigration can put pressure on schools, housing or hospitals.

Powell's defenders say he was simply voicing concerns about immigration but it's just not true. No one would have objected if he'd said immigration can put pressure on schools, housing or hospitals. There's nothing racist about that. What Powell aimed to do was divide communities based on the colour of people's skin. He wanted immigrants to leave the country, abused black children and predicted race wars.

Whatever he claimed afterwards, he knew exactly the impact his speech would have. It was a dreadful attempt to whip up the worst prejudices and fifty years later, immigration remains a potent issue in communities which have seen traditional industries decline and struggled to attract new jobs to replace them.

As far back as 2005, the BNP gained almost ten per cent of the votes in Dudley North. In 2014, UKIP won council seats and identified the seat as one of their top targets for the forthcoming election. I refused to accept that the far right could have better answers to local people's questions.

I've always thought there is no point ignoring people's concerns or, worse still, telling them what they should or should not be worried about. Trying to change the subject doesn't work, because the topic of conversation isn't up to politicians, but the people they want to represent.



Craig Rodway: Flickr CC BY-NC 2.0



Katy Blackwood: CC BY-SA 4.0

After all, politics would be easy if all you had to do was tell people what you think, but what you have to do is come up with fair and reasonable answers to their concerns, based on your values. That certainly doesn't mean pandering to prejudice, but it does mean listening to tough questions and working out proper answers.

Changing the subject pushes people with concerns about immigration towards extreme parties.

You can't say *"I'm not listening to you, now listen to me"*. People won't listen to your ideas on the NHS or education until you've listened to them. Even worse, changing the subject pushes people with concerns about immigration towards extreme parties that are not afraid to talk about the issue.

We sent thousands of detailed surveys asking serious questions about immigration. We booked dozens of rooms in community centres, school halls and working men's clubs and invited residents to local meetings to tell us what they thought.

The process took 18 months of hard work but proved what I'd always felt, that most people are reasonable, fair and pragmatic when it comes to immigration and other contentious or complex issues.

Our work echoed British Future's research which showed that most people are in the 'anxious middle' wanting, for example, fair controls on immigration but not a closed border.

I used our survey and meetings to draw up a detailed plan on immigration that addressed local people's concerns but was fair and progressive. It included taking on more border guards, ending

the exploitation of foreign workers and forcing companies to take on a local apprentice for every skilled foreign worker they hired. I stood up in Parliament and called all parties to listen to people in Dudley.

Lots of the ideas local people put forward became Labour policy at the subsequent election.

This is just one example. Our approach built trust with local people and opened the door for conversations on issues like the NHS, jobs and education. We carried out these two-way listening exercises constantly by post, email, canvassing, meetings and even regular casework. It meant our pledges in Dudley had real credibility, putting local people's priorities and concerns ahead of party policy. The result was that in an election where UKIP got nearly four million votes and came second in 120 constituencies, they were beaten into a very poor third in Dudley North, a seat they had thought was one of their strongest prospects in the country.

Populist parties and politicians, Powell included, often claim to be speaking for the people, 'saying what people are thinking but not allowed to say.' The best response is to let people speak for themselves. Shutting-down conversations about immigration, dismissing reasonable concerns as racist, will get us nowhere. Anxieties can then fester and turn to resentment, the very atmosphere that the far-right seeks to exploit. Brexit will lead to changes in our immigration system and it is only right that citizens are an integral part of the debate over what comes next. We should have a little more confidence that they will make fair and sensible choices – and remain sceptical of those politicians who claim to speak on their behalf.

Ian Austin is MP for Dudley North

8. State of the nation: what does Britain think about race and diversity today?

Survation's new, nationwide poll for British Future is the most up-to-date survey of public attitudes to race and integration in Britain, including among ethnic minorities.

We found out how people today think about race and diversity – in their families, in the workplace and on the street – and how far we have come since ‘Rivers of Blood’.

Fifty years on from Enoch Powell’s ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech, British Future set out to uncover the ‘state of the nation’ on attitudes to race and diversity today. As well as a series of focus groups with local citizens in the West Midlands, our Survation poll posed a range of questions to a nationally representative sample of 2,000 people across the UK, with an additional 1,000 people from an ethnic minority background and a further 500 in the West Midlands.

We asked people their views about race relations and how they have changed over the years; about past and the future challenges; and about who faces prejudice today. We looked at views across the generations and compared the opinions of white British and ethnic minority citizens, who are too often invisible in opinion polling, as we felt it important to survey both majority and minority views in order to find common ground on race, on fairness and on integration.

Among the population as a whole, just over a third of people (36%) could identify Enoch Powell.

Does Powell matter today?

Fifty years on from his infamous ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech, does Enoch Powell’s name still loom large over today’s debates on race and immigration? Among the population as a whole, just over a third of people (36%) could identify Enoch Powell from a picture, with only 9% of ethnic minority respondents identifying the politician who suggested that their forbears could never integrate in Britain. In the West Midlands, where he served as MP for Wolverhampton for 24 years, three in ten (29%) could recognise his face. These figures



may not seem high but, for comparison, in our best-informed West Midlands focus group (older people in Wolverhampton) only one-third could identify Sajid Javid, a cabinet minister and West Midlands MP. In other groups few could name West Midlands mayor Andy Street or indeed identify their own MP. Powell was sacked in 1968 and died thirty years ago.

Our survey also found stark differences between generations. Asked with which politician they associate the phrase ‘Rivers of Blood,’ fewer than one in five 18-24 year olds (17%) picked him out of a list – and nearly one in ten under-34s thought it came from Churchill. Only 18% of 25-34s and 30% of 35-44 year olds identified Powell with the phrase. Only among 55-64s (69%) and those aged over 65 (82%) was recognition more widespread.

The same is true among ethnic minority Britons. Those who were alive at the time of the speech recall Powell, with 91% of over-65s and 76% of 55-64-year old minority respondents picking out his name. For their children and grandchildren, however, ‘Rivers of Blood’ has little meaning: just 12% of 18-24s knew that the phrase came from Powell.

Across the whole UK, the difference between men and women is also striking. Men were twice as likely as women to identify the politician most associated with ‘Rivers of Blood’, with two-thirds (65%) correctly choosing Enoch Powell compared to a third (32%) of women.

**Asked with which politician they associate
'Rivers of Blood,' fewer than one in five
18-24 year olds (17%) chose Powell**

**Shown a list of politicians, which did most associate with the phrase
'Rivers of blood'?**

1. All UK respondents.

	Enoch Powell	Wrong answer	Don't know
Total	48%	18%	34%
Male	65%	17%	18%
Female	32%	20%	48%
18-24	17%	34%	49%
25-34	18%	37%	45%
35-44	30%	22%	48%
45-54	53%	12%	35%
55-64	69%	8%	23%
65+	82%	6%	12%

2. Ethnic minority respondents.

	Enoch Powell	Wrong answer	Don't know
Total	34%	28%	38%
Male	39%	29%	32%
Female	28%	29%	43%
18-24	12%	41%	47%
25-34	18%	41%	41%
35-44	25%	29%	46%
45-54	49%	18%	33%
55-64	76%	6%	18%
65+	91%	0%	9%

Respondents were asked to choose from: Tony Blair, Winston Churchill, Nigel Farage, Ted Heath, Enoch Powell, Norman Tebbit, Margaret Thatcher and Donald Trump.

Most of us agree that things have got better: six in ten (59%) say that there was more racial prejudice back in 1968.

HAVE WE MOVED ON?

Do people feel that Britain has moved on in the 50 years from the racial tensions stirred up by the Rivers of Blood speech? Most of us agree that things have got better: six in ten (59%) say that there was more racial prejudice back in 1968, and two-thirds (67%) of those who are over 65, old enough to remember what it was like after Powell's speech.

Among ethnic minorities themselves, age is an even bigger factor. Two-thirds (66%) of over-65s and 73% of 55-64s feel that racial prejudice was worse 50 years ago but younger minority Britons aren't so sure: about half think things

were worse back then but others think it may have been about the same or even better.

We also asked whether things had got better since 1993, when Stephen Lawrence's murder put race relations back at the top of the political agenda. Across the UK as a whole, 44% think levels of racial prejudice were higher 25 years ago, 18% think they were lower and 33% say they are about the same. Asked whether there has been progress over the last quarter-century, 43% of ethnic minority respondents thought levels of racial prejudice were higher 25 years ago; 16% said they were lower and a third (33%) felt things were about the same.

Are we more or less prejudiced today than in 1968?

Thinking about general levels of racial prejudice in Britain, do you think that levels of racial prejudice 50 years ago (in 1968) were higher, lower, or about the same as they are today?

3. All UK opinion. (By age)

	Higher than today	About the same as today	Lower than today	Don't know
Total	59%	20%	16%	5%
18-24	53%	21%	15%	11%
25-34	52%	29%	12%	7%
35-44	51%	22%	21%	7%
45-54	61%	18%	15%	6%
55-64	68%	15%	13%	3%
65+	67%	14%	18%	2%

4. Ethnic minority opinion. (By age)

	Higher than today	About the same as today	Lower than today	Don't know
Total	54%	24%	14%	8%
18-24	50%	22%	18%	10%
25-34	47%	33%	13%	7%
35-44	50%	26%	14%	10%
45-54	59%	23%	8%	10%
55-64	73%	9%	11%	7%
65+	66%	7%	22%	5%

For most Britons, the fact that Prince Harry is marrying someone of mixed race simply isn't important.



Mark Jones: CC BY 2.0

THE BRITAIN OF HARRY AND MEGHAN, NOT ENOCH

The marriage next month of Prince Harry, perhaps Britain's most-popular Royal, to the American actress Meghan Markle, who is mixed race, follows shortly after the 50th anniversary of Powell's speech insisting that a multi-ethnic Britain would end in disaster. That most Britons will barely notice the ethnic background of Megan, already much-liked by the British public, as she becomes the nation's first mixed-race Royal, could hardly be a more potent rebuttal of Powell's Birmingham speech.

For most Britons, the fact that Prince Harry is marrying someone of mixed race simply isn't important: three quarters of the public are either welcoming or unbothered by this royal match. Indeed, two-thirds (66%) of us simply don't notice mixed-race relationships at all any more, agreeing with the statement: *"These days, people don't really notice when they see a mixed race couple in public."*

Ethnic minority Britons and 18-24s are more likely to see someone of mixed race marrying into the royal family as an actively positive symbol, but among minorities too, the most likely response is 'so what?'

A small minority, however, won't be joining in the celebrations in May: 12% of people think it's bad that someone of mixed race is joining the royal family. It's important to note that racism hasn't gone away, and many in this minority may even share the sentiments of Jo Marney, former girlfriend of ex-UKIP leader Henry Bolton, who was criticized for sending racist messages about Meghan Markle.

Whatever their motivations, most of us will be happy for the royal couple in May – and would say the same if it was their own son or daughter marrying someone of a different race or faith. Three-quarters (75%) of Britons would be comfortable if their child or grandchild married or had a serious relationship with someone from a different race or ethnicity to their own. 70% would look similarly positively on a marriage or relationship to someone of a different faith. Ethnic minority Britons feel the same, with 82% comfortable with mixed-race relationships and 68% happy for their child or grandchild to marry or have a serious relationship with someone of another faith.

5. What do people think about Harry and Meghan?

In May of this year, Prince Harry is due to marry the actress and campaigner Meghan Markle, who is mixed race. Which of the following statements is closest to your view? If someone of mixed race is marrying into the Royal Family...

	All UK	BME	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+	Leave	Remain
<i>I think it's good</i>	22%	38%	33%	30%	25%	21%	18%	14%	17%	25%
<i>It doesn't matter</i>	57%	46%	45%	43%	54%	63%	66%	65%	56%	62%
<i>I think it's bad</i>	12%	9%	16%	17%	13%	50%	12%	10%	17%	7%

Majorities across political divides feel comfortable with mixed-race relationships in their family.

6. How would people feel if their children married someone of a different race or faith? (All UK/ethnic minority respondents)

Regardless of whether you have children at the moment, how would you feel if your child or grandchild were to have a serious relationship or marriage with any of the following?

	Comfortable All / BME %	Uncomfortable All / BME %
Someone of a different race or ethnicity to their own	75 / 82	25 / 18
Someone who practices a different faith	70 / 68	30 / 32
Someone who is long-term unemployed	38 / 40	62 / 60
Someone with a disability or long term health condition	68 / 60	32 / 40
Someone with a criminal record	25 / 29	75 / 72
Someone of the same sex	67 / 58	33 / 42
Someone in another country which involved going to live abroad	56 / 70	45 / 30
Someone who is more than 15 years younger or older than them	47 / 48	53 / 52
Someone who is from a much poorer background	82 / 75	18 / 25
Someone who is from a much wealthier background	89 / 84	11 / 16

Younger citizens were most likely to have liberal attitudes to mixed-race relationships, with 86% feeling comfortable. Those aged 25-34 (79%), 35-44 (82%) and indeed 45-54 (78%) were all more positive than the national average. It was only among the older age groups, those aged 55-64 (69%) and 65+ (64%) where we found a slight

tailing-off of support for mixed-race relationships, though it's important to note that nearly two-thirds of those aged 65+ still feel comfortable with a close family member marrying or entering a serious relationship with someone from a different race.

7. Attitudes to mixed race relationships. (By age)

Regardless of whether you have children at the moment, how would you feel if your child or grandchild were to have a serious relationship with someone of a different race or ethnicity?

	Total	18-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65+
Comfortable	75%	86%	79%	82%	78%	69%	64%
Uncomfortable	25%	14%	21%	18%	23%	31%	36%

Indeed, majorities across political divides feel comfortable with mixed-race relationships in their family, including Leave voters (65%) Conservative voters (68%) and a narrow majority (51%) of those with the most negative views on immigration who gave a score of 0-2 when asked "How positive or negative has immigration been for Britain on a scale of 0-10?"

Our survey finds that people are generally at ease with the diversity of modern British society. Over 90% of people are comfortable with their children's friends being of different ethnic backgrounds; and with the nurses, doctors and police that serve our communities being of different colours and creeds. They are at ease with their boss or MP being from a different race to their own, too. And while we should look to make more progress with the 21% who would feel uncomfortable when Britain elects its first ethnic minority Prime Minister, they

remain a minority: 79% of us would only be concerned about the colour of their party rosette rather than the colour of their skin.

Younger voters aged 18-24 are more relaxed still, with 85% feeling comfortable with a PM of a different race compared to 75% of those aged over 65. Women voters, too, would be more at ease with a Prime Minister of a different ethnicity to their own, with 83% feeling comfortable compared to 75% of men.

8. How you would feel if the following positions were filled by someone of a different race to you? (All UK respondents)

	Comfortable	Uncomfortable
The Prime Minister	79%	21%
The boyfriend/girlfriend of one of your children	81%	19%
The best friend of one of your children	92%	9%
The husband/wife of one of your children	82%	19%
Your local MP	87%	13%
Your next door neighbours	88%	12%
Your boss/line manager	89%	10%
Your child's school teacher	90%	10%
A doctor or nurse treating you in hospital	92%	8%
A police officer	92%	8%
Local business owner eg. local shop/pub landlord	93%	7%
Your colleagues	91%	9%

Our survey finds that people are generally at ease with the diversity of modern British society.

Attitudes harden, however, when we asked how people would feel if those positions were occupied by someone from the Muslim faith. While two-thirds (65%) of people would still be comfortable (party politics aside) about Sajid Javid or Sadiq Khan winning the keys to No10 and becoming Britain's first Muslim Prime Minister, a third (35%) would not. That shrinks to a quarter who would be uncomfortable to have a Muslim MP, perhaps reflecting the fact that we have grown accustomed to seeing Muslim MPs sitting on the green benches of the House of Commons (and indeed around the cabinet table).

It would be more worrying if that difference comes from a fear about trusting a Muslim with the

power to run the country – echoing some of the prejudice that John F Kennedy, a Catholic, faced when standing for election in the US in 1960. The vast majority of people are comfortable with Muslims filling positions of responsibility in society such as teachers (78%), nurses and doctors (87%), police officers (85%) or as their boss (82%). The same goes for positions in their closer community – as their neighbours (79%), colleagues (86%) or their children's friends (82%) – though it is noticeable that they are less relaxed about their child marrying someone of the Muslim faith (65%) than of a different race (82%) or faith (70%).

9. How you would feel if the following positions were filled by someone of the Muslim faith? (All UK respondents)

	Comfortable	Uncomfortable
<i>The Prime Minister</i>	65%	35%
<i>The boyfriend/girlfriend of one of your children</i>	65%	35%
<i>The best friend of one of your children</i>	82%	18%
<i>The husband/wife of one of your children</i>	65%	35%
<i>Your local MP</i>	76%	24%
<i>Your next door neighbours</i>	79%	21%
<i>Your boss/line manager</i>	82%	18%
<i>Your child's school teacher</i>	78%	22%
<i>A doctor or nurse treating you in hospital</i>	87%	13%
<i>A police officer</i>	84%	16%
<i>Local business owner eg. local shop/pub landlord</i>	89%	12%
<i>Your colleagues</i>	86%	13%

82%

Younger people are more likely to have more experience – personally or in their friendship groups – of relationships across ethnic and faith divides.

Those attitudes mellow noticeably among younger people and, on the whole, harden among older participants in our poll. While eight in ten (79%) 18-24s would be comfortable with a Muslim PM, for those aged over 65 that drops significantly to a narrow majority of 52%. Younger people are significantly more comfortable about their children being in a relationship with a Muslim, and older people are significantly less at ease – though again a majority, albeit a narrow one, remain comfortable.

Some of the generational differences and similarities suggest where these different attitudes may be coming from. Older people are likely to have encountered Muslim doctors and nurses, local business owners and police officers, and so their

comfort levels are similar (in some cases higher) than those of 18-24s: 90% feel comfortable being treated by a Muslim doctor or nurse, for example. Younger people are more likely to have more experience – personally or in their friendship groups – of relationships across ethnic and faith divides and this is reflected in much higher levels of comfort on these questions.

Ethnic minority scores on these questions were broadly similar to those of 18-24s: three-quarters (76%) would be comfortable with a Muslim Prime Minister and 73% would be relaxed about their child marrying someone of the Muslim faith, for example.

10. How you would feel if the following positions were filled by someone of the Muslim faith? (By age)

	18-24 Comfortable/ uncomfortable %	65+ Comfortable/ uncomfortable %
The Prime Minister	79 / 21	52 / 48
The boyfriend/girlfriend of one of your children	73 / 27	53 / 47
The best friend of one of your children	80 / 20	80 / 20
The husband/wife of one of your children	77 / 23	53 / 47
Your local MP	81 / 19	72 / 18
Your next door neighbours	83 / 17	76 / 24
Your boss/line manager	81 / 19	79 / 11
Your child's school teacher	83 / 17	69 / 31
A doctor or nurse treating you in hospital	84 / 16	90 / 10
A police officer	83 / 17	86 / 14
Local business owner eg. local shop/pub landlord	86 / 14	90 / 10
Your colleagues	87 / 13	87 / 13

People recognise that Britain's Muslim citizens face higher levels of prejudice than other groups.

Who faces prejudice today?

People recognise that Britain's Muslim citizens face higher levels of prejudice than other groups: 56% said that Muslims face 'a lot' of prejudice and a further third (32%) said they face a little – only 4% said they face no prejudice at all. Romanians are also perceived to be on the receiving end of prejudice, with a quarter (27%) of people saying that Romanians face 'a lot' of prejudice and 48% feeling that they face a little. The other group seen as experiencing prejudice is gypsies and travellers: half of respondents (50%) say they face a lot of prejudice, and 37% a little.

Ethnic minority respondents were more likely to say that different minority groups face a lot of prejudice: 30% felt that there was a lot of prejudice against Asians while only 20% of white respondents agreed, for example. Nearly one in four ethnic minority respondents (38%) and more than half of black respondents (57%) felt there was a lot of prejudice against black citizens, while only 19% of white respondents thought so. Interestingly, Asian respondents were not so markedly more likely to say there was a lot of prejudice towards Asians, with 28% saying so.

11. Who faces prejudice?

For each of the following ethnic and religious groups, how much ethnic or religious prejudice you think there is against them? (All UK respondents/BME respondents)

	A lot All / BME %	A little All / BME %	Hardly any All / BME %	None at all All / BME %
Muslim	56 / 58	32 / 29	7 / 7	4 / 5
Asian	21 / 30	52 / 46	20 / 17	7 / 7
Polish	15 / 21	49 / 49	28 / 23	8 / 8
Romanian	27 / 27	48 / 42	19 / 22	6 / 9
Black	20 / 38	50 / 40	24 / 15	7 / 7
Hindu	13 / 17	47 / 42	32 / 31	8 / 10
Sikh	14 / 19	44 / 44	33 / 28	9 / 10
Mixed Race	10 / 15	47 / 46	35 / 28	9 / 11
Jewish	14 / 20	45 / 43	32 / 24	8 / 12
Christian	10 / 14	27 / 27	39 / 34	24 / 25
White British	10 / 11	23 / 22	32 / 30	35 / 38
Gypsies/travellers	50 / 40	37 / 38	9 / 15	5 / 7

When we asked people whether they felt that ethnic minorities faced various different forms of prejudice more or less today than they did 50 years ago when Powell gave his infamous speech, we were rather surprised by the results. On almost every measure, the public as a whole are more likely to say there is less prejudice now than there was 50 years ago, as one might expect – but not by the margins we had expected.

51% said there is less racial prejudice now when applying for jobs than there was in 1968 – before it was outlawed by the Race Discrimination Act that Powell opposed – compared to 16% who felt there was more discrimination today in 2018. But only

40% felt there was less unfair treatment by the police now than 50 years ago, with 21% saying that it is now more prevalent. And as many people felt there was more violent crime towards people because of their race, 32%, as said there was less now than 50 years ago.

Worryingly, for violent crime against people because of their religion, 35% felt this was more prevalent today than in 1968, 31% that there was less of it now and a quarter (24%) that it was about the same – largely reflecting the growth in anti-Muslim hatred, a phenomenon that would have been very marginal 50 years ago, as well as antisemitism and other faith-based prejudice.

12. Is Britain more or less prejudiced?

Below are several forms of prejudice that people of ethnic minorities can face. For each, please say whether you think it happens in the UK less now than it did 50 years ago (in 1968), more now than it did 50 years ago or about the same. (All UK respondents/BME respondents)

	Less now All / BME %	More now All / BME %	About the same All / BME %	Don't know All / BME %
Racial discrimination when applying for jobs	51/33	16/26	22/29	11/12
Under-representation amongst characters in British TV, soaps, etc.	53/38	14/22	21/27	12/14
Under-representation amongst newsreaders and TV presenters	53/35	13/24	22/26	13/15
Low expectations of academic achievement by teachers, colleges and universities	47/32	14/24	25/29	15/15
Under-representation amongst MPs	50/37	14/21	22/27	14/15
Racist chanting at football matches	45/31	20/28	22/26	14/16
Unfair treatment by the police, eg. high stop and search levels	40/26	21/32	26/29	13/13
Violent crime against people because of their race	32/26	32/39	25/23	11/12
Violent crime against people because of their religion	31/26	35/38	24/24	11/12
Under-representation on FTSE 100 Boards	34/23	11/21	24/26	31/30

For younger respondents, 1968 is ancient history: a society that they never experienced.

It is also significant that ethnic minorities were much less likely to feel that things had got better. Only a third of minority respondents felt there was less racial discrimination when applying for jobs today than in 1968; a quarter (26%) felt there was more. Less than a third of minorities (31%) felt there was less racist chanting at football matches today, with 28% thinking there was more now than 50 years ago. And 39% of minorities said there was more race-based violence today, with just 26% saying it was worse in 1968.

Examining the different responses among different age groups, including from ethnic minority respondents, an interesting pattern emerges that may offer some explanation. In some respects it is simple common sense: for younger respondents, 1968 is ancient history: a society that they never experienced. If they are unhappy with the levels of

prejudice that they encounter today, they may assume that it was better in the past.

Those who can remember 1968 give significantly different responses to this question than those who were only born more than 25 years later. Among the UK population as a whole, majorities of respondents aged over 55 say that a wide range of prejudices are less prevalent now than they were 50 years ago., with a gap of 20-30% in some cases between their scores and those of 18-24s.

There is a marked dip, however, on questions related to violence: indeed among those aged 65+, 34% feel that there is more race-based violence today than in 1968, slightly more than the 31% who think there is less. Older people may feel that we live in a generally more violent society today than that of the 1960s.

13. Is Britain more or less prejudiced? (By age)

Below are several forms of prejudice that people of ethnic minorities can face. For each, please say whether you think it happens in the UK less now than it did 50 years ago (in 1968), more now than it did 50 years ago or about the same.

	18-24 Less now	18-24 More now	55-64 Less now	55-64 More now	65+ Less now	65+ More now
Racial discrimination when applying for jobs	37%	26%	66%	7%	60%	10%
Under-representation amongst characters in British TV, soaps, etc.	37%	20%	69%	9%	67%	7%
Under-representation amongst newsreaders and TV presenters	35%	18%	67%	6%	69%	5%
Low expectations of academic achievement by teachers, colleges and universities	31%	26%	57%	7%	56%	6%
Under-representation amongst MPs	29%	23%	63%	9%	65%	4%
Racist chanting at football matches	31%	23%	54%	18%	50%	18%
Unfair treatment by the police, eg. high stop and search levels	29%	30%	49%	16%	42%	20%
Violent crime against people because of their race	28%	31%	40%	33%	31%	34%
Violent crime against people because of their religion	28%	32%	39%	34%	28%	39%
Under-representation on FTSE 100 Boards	25%	20%	43%	5%	40%	4%

The ethnic minority findings by age show a similar pattern, though we should treat some findings with caution as the sample of ethnic minorities aged over 65 was small. But those aged 55 and over are much more likely to feel that there is less prejudice today than there was in 1968 – with the worrying exception, again, of violent crime against people

because of their race or religion. Younger ethnic minorities, for example, are more likely to think there is more racist chanting at football matches today than in 1968 (31%) rather than less (27%) while for those aged 55-64, 43% think it was worse back then and just 13% worse today.

14. Is Britain more or less prejudiced? (Ethnic minority respondents, by age)

Below are several forms of prejudice that people of ethnic minorities can face. For each, please say whether you think it happens in the UK less now than it did 50 years ago (in 1968), more now than it did 50 years ago or about the same.

	18-24 Less now	18-24 More now	55-64 Less now	55-64 More now	65+ Less now	*65+ More now
Racial discrimination when applying for jobs	31%	28%	43%	15%	54%	19%
Under-representation amongst characters in British TV, soaps, etc.	29%	26%	47%	16%	80%	–
Under-representation amongst newsreaders and TV presenters	30%	26%	41%	17%	68%	23%
Low expectations of academic achievement by teachers, colleges and universities	30%	25%	39%	20%	59%	17%
Under-representation amongst MPs	29%	23%	55%	14%	71%	20%
Racist chanting at football matches	27%	31%	43%	13%	38%	23%
Unfair treatment by the police, eg. high stop and search levels	25%	32%	33%	24%	43%	31%
Violent crime against people because of their race	24%	36%	36%	32%	31%	60%
Violent crime against people because of their religion	24%	37%	31%	38%	54%	38%
Under-representation on FTSE 100 Boards	21%	21%	32%	13%	36%	5%

*Small sample

This is not to discount the opinions of respondents aged 18-24. Their feelings about the levels of prejudice they face today are important. Mostly born and raised here in Britain, in a society that has gone through many of the debates and dilemmas about race and diversity and come out the other side, they rightly have higher expectations that they should not face prejudice. As a black member of our over-55s focus group in Wolverhampton said:

“When I was growing up it [racism] was expected because it was there all the time, but now they shouldn’t expect that to happen.... but it does happen all the time and they can’t deal with it as much as I could when I was younger.”

For those growing up in Britain today it is cold comfort, when they experience prejudice, to know that it was worse for their parents or grandparents. They want it to be better now.

Younger respondents were slightly more likely to say that they had experienced racial, ethnic or

religious-based prejudices in the workplace and on the street – as well as considerably more likely to have experienced it on social media, as one might expect. In one respect this is surprising as we did not give a time period in the question, for example ‘in the last year’ – so a 50-year-old should, in theory, be more likely to have experienced prejudice just by virtue of being around to experience it for twice as long as a 25-year-old. It may be that younger ethnic minority Britons have higher expectations of their society and hence are less likely to turn a blind eye to prejudice.

We should not look to lower those expectations, but instead work harder to live up to them. While we can mark the progress that Britain has made on attitudes to race in the 50 years since ‘Rivers of Blood’, that 25% of ethnic minorities have experienced prejudice in the workplace and 33% on the street is a stark reminder that we still have a long way to go.

15. Have you experienced prejudice? (Ethnic minority respondents)

Have you directly experienced the following either directed at yourself or at another person?

	YES At me All	YES At me 18-24	YES At another All	YES At another 18-24	NO All	NO 18-24
Racial, ethnic or religious-based prejudices on social media such as Facebook or Twitter	17%	27%	30%	41%	43%	24%
Racial, ethnic or religious-based prejudices in the workplace	25%	28%	23%	26%	45%	37%
Racial, ethnic or religious-based prejudices on the street or public transport	33%	38%	26%	29%	34%	26%

That 25% of ethnic minorities have experienced prejudice in the workplace and 33% on the street is a stark reminder that we still have a long way to go.

What has made a difference?

We asked both our West Midlands focus groups and our nationwide poll respondents what had made a difference to race relations in the last 50 years. We found that everyone – across all ages, ethnicities and political divides – can agree that ‘Children mixing at school with kids from other ethnic/religious backgrounds’ has made a significant difference to race relations. Many people in our focus groups talked proudly about their children growing up in a society where diversity is the norm. Contact between people in the workplace was seen as the second most important factor.

BME respondents were almost twice as likely to cite Sadiq Khan’s election as Mayor of London as an important factor that made a positive difference to race relations. This may in part be for political

and geographical reasons, with Labour and London more diverse than other parties and regions. But it may also suggest that the symbolism of a British Asian Muslim being elected to such a prominent position – shortly before the Brexit and Trump victories – was particularly resonant with minority Britons.

The example of black sportspeople was noticeably more important to white respondents than to BME respondents. More than half (55%) of BME respondents aged over 65 – who witnessed the racism faced by the first black footballers – say that the example of Cyrille Regis and other black sportspeople was important in making a difference to race relations. For younger BME respondents, however, only around a third thought it was important: it would be almost unthinkable for them to go to a Premier League match and not see black faces on the pitch.

16. What has made a difference to race relations in Britain? (All UK/ethnic minority respondents)

Thinking about things that may have made a positive difference to race relations in the UK in recent years, which of the following do you think have made the most difference?

(Figures show percentage featured in Top 3 and ranking)

	All / BME	White respondents	Ethnic minority respondents
Children mixing at school with kids from other ethnic/religious backgrounds (31% ranked #1)	67% / 57%	1st	1st
Workplace contact with people from other ethnic/religious backgrounds	49% / 42%	2nd	2nd
Black footballers and Olympic medalists like Cyril Regis and Mo Farah	48% / 37%	3rd	6th
The Race Relations Act and other legislation	42% / 38%	4th	4th =
Multicultural festivals and activities put on by local authorities and charities.	31% / 40%	5th	3rd
The response to the murder of Stephen Lawrence in 1993	24% / 25%	6th	7th
Sadiq Khan being elected Mayor of London	20% / 38%	7th	4th =
Nadiya Hussain winning the Great British Bake-off	18% / 23%	8th	8th

Everyone can agree that children mixing at school has made a significant difference to race relations.

What do we need to do now?

The importance that people attribute to promoting contact between people of different backgrounds offers a clear lesson for the new integration strategy on which Communities Secretary Sajid Javid is currently consulting. Social mixing in schools and in the workplace was seen, in fact, as more important than the Race Relations Act. We should not read too much into this overlooking of very important legislation – people see their kids and go to work every day, while most will never need recourse to anti-discrimination laws. It does, however, underline the point that integration happens in the places where we live, not in parliament or on paper.

Equal opportunities legislation appears to be a polarising issue. When asked what they think about ‘efforts to ensure equal opportunities for black and Asian people,’ the most commonly-given answer, from a third of people (33%), was that we have got things ‘about right’. But 17% think that efforts on equal opportunities have gone ‘much too far’ and a further 23% ‘a little too far’, compared to just 18% who think they haven’t gone far enough.

That polarization is by politics, too: while 50% of Conservatives think equal opportunities have gone too far and just 10% say they have not gone far enough, among Labour voters 26% feel that more needs to be done to promote equality, with 27% feeling that efforts have gone too far.

Among ethnic minorities, a similar one-third of people (34%) say things are ‘about right’ but 35% feel that equal opportunities efforts have not gone far enough. Perhaps surprisingly nearly a quarter of BME respondents (23%) feel that too much effort has gone into promoting equality for black and Asian people.

This result contrasts with a finding in the 2017 British Election Study, where 37% of respondents felt that efforts for racial equality had not gone far enough with just 16% saying that they had gone too far, and 41% saying they were about right. The contrast shows that attitudes in this area can fluctuate, rather than being fixed, and may also suggest that public responses may be particularly sensitive to how strategies to reduce discrimination are framed.



A successful approach should recognise how parts of the white population can be left behind too.

The Government's 'Race Audit,' published in October last year, brought to light the many areas in which ethnic minority citizens are being denied the same opportunities as their colleagues and neighbours. It is a bold initiative, by some distance the most comprehensive study of opportunity and disadvantage by race, class and gender undertaken by any major democracy. Prime Minister Theresa May has said that she will tackle the 'burning injustices' of inequality in Britain today and is right to do so. The findings in our survey show one of the challenges she will face: the risk of a 'competing grievance' approach to addressing unfairness, where some see policy-makers as too sympathetic to minority groups while others feel that only lip service is being paid to ethnic minority disadvantage, while majority reassurance will always trump any real investment of political capital and resources.

Most of us, including those who remain anxious about immigration, would not wish to see public debate on immigration descend into racism.

One way out of this cul-de-sac is to heed the warnings of the Brexit vote and recognize that unfairness and inequality is felt not only across racial and ethnic divides but also by class, by geography, by age and by educational achievement. A successful approach to tackling inequality, and to promoting integration, should recognise how parts of the majority white population can get left behind too. Addressing those concerns, alongside those of ethnic minority citizens, should be part of the same One Nation fairness agenda.

While equal opportunities may be a somewhat polarising topic, there is much common ground on what needs to be done to make integration work, with consensus among people of different ethnicities and political persuasions.

Three-quarters of people (74%) agree that *"To build a shared pride in Britain today, we should respect our diversity but focus more on what brings us all together. Integration works when everyone speaks English and our schools are mixed, not segregated, so people do meet and get along."* Just 6% disagree.

Strikingly, ethnic minority citizens feel just as positively about these measures, with 71% in agreement and just 5% against; with Leave voters (73%) and Remain voters (82%), Conservatives (80%) and Labour (76%), 18-24s (74%) and over-65s (81%) all in agreement.

Similarly, 75% of the UK public agrees that *"To make our shared society work, we should all speak English, obey the law and pay our taxes. Everyone who plays by the rules should count as equally British, with fair chances for all and no discrimination against any of us."* Two-thirds of ethnic minority respondents agree too, with just 8% in disagreement. Again, this proposal finds support from majorities of Leave (82%) and Remain voters (76%), Conservatives (86%) and Labour (72%), 18-24s (65%) and over-65s (84%).

In the fifty years since Enoch Powell prophesied 'Rivers of Blood' in multi-racial Britain, much has changed in our attitudes to race and diversity. British society has changed too and some have found that unsettling, even threatening – immigration has been a polarizing issue that has ranked among the public's top concerns for some time. Yet despite this most of us, including those who remain anxious about immigration, would not wish to see public debate on immigration descend into racism. Three-quarters of people agree that *"It's one thing to have concerns about immigration and quite another to take it out on people because of where they come from or the colour of their skin. It's important to have an open debate about immigration policies, but there's no place for racism and prejudice in Britain,"* with just 4% in disagreement. Among ethnic minorities, 72% agree and just 3% disagree.

Two-thirds of the UK public (65%) and of ethnic minorities (65%) agree that *"Things aren't as bad as in 1968 when Enoch Powell predicted 'Rivers of Blood'."* But racism and prejudice are still rife in Britain and we must do more to stamp it out so we can all enjoy equal rights and chances in life." People can distinguish between political arguments about immigration control and prejudice towards individuals. They also recognise that we have moved on since 1968, but not far enough.

Steve Ballinger

9. Twelve moments that defined race in Britain



1948

The arrival of Empire Windrush at Tilbury symbolises the beginning of post-war migration to Britain from the Commonwealth. The British Nationality Act created the status of 'Citizen of the United Kingdom and its colonies,' which included the right to live in the UK. Those who came to Britain filled vacancies in the NHS and on buses and trains. It wasn't until 1962 that the British government began to introduce restrictions on Commonwealth immigration. "We are proud that we impose no colour bar restrictions... we must maintain our great metropolitan traditions of hospitality to everyone from every part of the empire", the Conservative opposition spokesman David Maxwell Fyfe told the House of Commons.




1968

Enoch Powell gives the 'Rivers of Blood' speech in Birmingham. He is sacked from the Shadow Cabinet by Conservative leader Edward Heath who calls the speech 'racialist in tone and liable to exacerbate racial tensions'. The Race Relations Act is passed, making it illegal to refuse housing, employment or public services to people because of their ethnic background. The 1965 Act only covered discrimination against customers in public places.




1972

Britain took in 27,000 Ugandan Asians expelled from Uganda by Idi Amin. Many Ugandans went to Leicester, though the local council had taken out adverts in the Ugandan press to discourage them.



Viv Anderson becomes the first black footballer to play for England. Despite the appalling racism directed at him and others at the time, he paved the way for the 85 black footballers who have won full England caps since. Two years later in Moscow Daley Thompson became a household name with the first of his two Olympic decathlon gold medals, besting the world again in 1984 with Tessa Sanderson, from Wolverhampton, who took Olympic gold in the javelin.



Kim Aldis: CC BY-SA 3.0

After 5 days of rioting in Brixton the Scarman report declared that urgent action was needed to prevent racial disadvantage becoming an endemic, ineradicable threat to British society.



Diane Abbott, Paul Boateng, Bernie Grant and Keith Vaz become the first ethnic minority MPs to be elected to the House of Commons in the post-war era. There had been Asian MPs in the 1890s and 1920s, but the parliaments that debated the Powell controversy and the Race Relations Acts of the 1960s and 1970s had been all-white. Ethnic minority representation in parliament increased slowly after 1987 but progress sped up after 2010. 52 ethnic minority MPs were elected in 2017.

Daily Mail MURDERERS

The Mail accuses these men of killing.
If we are wrong, let them sue us



1993

18 year old Stephen Lawrence was stabbed to death at an Eltham bus stop in a murder that came to shock the nation, eventually. It was four years later – as the inquest jury declared the killing ‘a completely unprovoked racist attack by five white youths’ – that the failure to bring the perpetrators to justice sparked public outrage. The Daily Mail declared the prime suspects ‘Murderers’ in a famous front page and Lord Justice Macpherson’s inquiry found that the failures of the investigation reflected institutional racism in the Metropolitan Police. Two of the gang of five were eventually jailed for the crime in 2012.



2001

After violent riots in Oldham, Bradford and Burnley Professor Ted Cantle’s report into community cohesion states that communities are living ‘parallel lives’ in the northern mill towns. Among his 70 recommendations was the need for a cohesion and integration strategy.



2004

The enlargement of the European Union brings in eight central and east European countries. Britain is one of three EU countries to extend free movement rights to the new member states immediately, sparking a much larger wave of migration than the government had anticipated. The 2001 census recorded 58,000 people born in Poland in the UK; by 2011, the figure had risen to 579,000. Today, a million Polish-born UK residents makes this the largest migrant group in the UK, slightly ahead of those born in India.



The 7/7 bombings in London kill 52 people and injure more than 700 – in the first Islamist suicide attack in Britain. That three of the four suicide bombers were born in Britain prompted fresh anxieties about identity, integration and extremism in Britain's Muslim community. Faith-based attacks on Asians increased dramatically after the bombings, including the killing of Kamal Raza Butt in Nottingham by youths who called him 'Taleban' as they punched him to the ground.



Tom Evans: Crown Copyright

The EU referendum sees Britain vote to leave the European Union. One-third of Asian voters and a quarter of black voters vote for Brexit – with approximately 900,000 ethnic minority votes for Leaving the EU and around 2 million for Remain. In the three months following the vote, the majority of police forces across England and Wales report record levels of reported hate crimes.



The Windsor wedding of Prince Harry to Meghan Markle, following their November 2017 engagement, will bring Britain's first mixed race member of the Royal family.

10. Enoch and me – and us

SUNDER KATWALA



A very young Sunder Katwala with his father.

SUNDER KATWALA on how the British-born children of migrants consigned Powellism to history – and why Enoch was so wrong about Britain.

It seems curious now to think that Enoch Powell's most fervent wish boiled down to the idea that I should never have been born. It would be hard not to take that speech at least a little personally.

Powell's Birmingham warning of 'Rivers of Blood' clearly didn't quite have the impact in India that he would have liked. For just a fortnight later on the Whitsun bank holiday my Dad, having trained as a doctor in India, got on a plane to Heathrow airport. He headed to the YMCA in west London, soon landing a job with the NHS, too busy to follow every twist in Westminster's raging debate about how he – and most of the million-and-a-quarter Commonwealth migrants already in Britain when Enoch spoke – might be persuaded

to go back home as quickly as possible.

In this specific case, Enoch did have an unusual ally. My grandfather, also named Sunder, was to come to England a couple of years later to see if his son would return home. He put his own repatriation package on the table – an offer to set his son up with a medical practice in Baroda and to arrange a very suitable marriage too.

Alas, it was too late. In a Surrey hospital, his son had met my Mum, a nurse from County Cork in Ireland, and so chose to settle and make his life here. So I was born, British, in a Doncaster hospital on a bright April day in 1974. An everyday story of family celebration, familiar in NHS wards up and down the country. But not for Enoch. I was just one more stick on the funeral pyre, a matter of national suicide for his very idea of Britain.

His 1968 speech could not see in the British-born children of migrants any positive potential for the solution of integration but only a deep, ultimately irreconcilable tragedy.

This was surely the biggest thing of all that Enoch got wrong. He was much too pessimistic about Britain.

“Sometimes people point to the increasing proportion of immigrant offspring born in this country as if the fact contained within itself the ultimate solution. The truth is the opposite. The West Indian or Asian does not, by being born in England, become an Englishman. In law he becomes a United Kingdom citizen by birth; in fact he is a West Indian or an Asian still. Unless he be one of the small minority, he will by the very nature of things have lost one country without gaining another, lost one nationality without acquiring a new one. Time is running against us and them. With the lapse of a generation or so we shall at last have succeeded – to the benefit of nobody – in reproducing ‘in England’s green and pleasant land’ the haunting tragedy of the United States.”

This was surely the biggest thing of all that Enoch got wrong. He was much too pessimistic about Britain. He showed remarkably little confidence in the attraction that British culture and identity might have for those who sought to contribute to the next chapter of its long history.

Enoch argued with fierce urgency in 1968 that, within 15 years, when half of the Commonwealth-descended population would be British-born, it would be far too late. On this, at least, Enoch was right. My birth that morning in Doncaster – along with another million like it, and the contact they would create in the classrooms of Britain a few years later – were a foundational reason why he was losing his biggest argument irrevocably.

We had an equal claim and stake in this country too: there was nowhere to ‘send us back’ to.

We all laughed at Lenny Henry saying *“Enoch Powell wants to give us £1,000 to return home. But it’s only 50p on the bus to Dudley”*. It is not a fearful joke. For me, the joke’s real power came from its sense of standing; I never knew a better encapsulation of the birthright confidence of the first British-born generation. We had an equal claim and stake in this country too: there was nowhere to ‘send us back’ to. For our classmates, perhaps it was the sheer absurdity of someone being unable to hear in Lenny’s Black Country accent that he was from here too.

Even 50 years on, speak to the first generation of

Asian and West Indian Commonwealth migrants about Enoch and you will understand the visceral sense of fear sparked by that speech – particularly once it had been translated into the street argot of ‘send them back’ by those less inclined to make their points in classical Latin. It deepened a sense of holding only a provisional licence to be in this country – of ‘keeping a suitcase packed’ just in case.

Twenty years later, it never felt like that to me. There was racism, for sure. Had you called me a ‘Paki’ in the 1980s playgrounds of my teenage years, you might have received a quick potted geography of South Asia – or what I somehow imagined then was an absolute zinger of a sarky comeback: ‘that’s kind of like me calling you French, dickhead’. I never did get beaten up, oddly.

I would have first encountered ‘Enoch’ as a slogan. ‘Enoch was right’. The shift to the past tense mattered. It had become a bitter lament for those who knew full well that their moment had long passed.

I came to understand Enoch much better once he was dead.

‘Rivers of Blood’ had not made Powell a pariah, as is sometimes claimed. He swung the 1974 General Election for Labour, with his dramatic call for tactical votes to get a referendum on Europe. Nor were politicians so shocked by the speech that nobody could mention immigration for decades. Jim Callaghan, Ted Heath and Margaret Thatcher did what they could to curb Commonwealth inflow with new laws in 1968, 1971 and 1981. But the fantasy of mass repatriation was left to extreme fringe parties – the question changing, curiously, from who could stay to which side you cheered for at cricket.

Powell died in 1998, not long into the era of Britpop and Blair. The obituarists and political veterans sparred one final time over Powell’s intentions and legacy. Like the NF graffiti under countless railway bridges, Enoch had been fading into history for quite some time.

I came to understand Enoch much better once he was dead.



WW2 Jamaican servicemen of the Royal Fusiliers. Courtesy IWM.

Reading Simon Heffer's magisterial posthumous biography of Powell, I found that Enoch had himself been in India when my Dad was born there in the 1940s. And how Enoch loved India! That fact was often deployed to defend him against the charge of crude biological racism. Still, imagine how my jaw dropped when I read what Powell, who insisted that I could never really be fully British, had written home to his parents: *"I soaked up India like a sponge soaks up water. I felt as Indian as I did British"*.

Where on earth was the fair play in that?

Yet here was the key to Powell. He only ever

wanted to be Viceroy of India. That ambition took him into politics, a career of compromises, for which he was ill-suited. He experienced the loss of India as a traumatic spiritual amputation, so turned his grief into denial as to whether Empire had ever mattered at all. The English had 'come home again after years of distant wandering,' he said. Amnesia about Empire was needed to ask why on earth this 'alien' intrusion had turned up uninvited and unwanted. Presented as a defence of British culture, Powellism was rooted in a deliberate misremembering of British history – and his own personal past too.

MANY RIVERS CROSSED

Half a century on, Powell's apocalyptic fears were not realised. We have avoided violent civil strife, but that is a very low bar to jump. We still have a long way to go – and there can be no cause for complacency about what we now need to do now, together.

Enoch was wrong, on identity and integration, to think that black and Asian people could never feel fully British, nor be accepted as

ENOCH VERSUS THE QUEEN

Powell was the classicist who sought to be a tribune of the people. 'Rivers of Blood' resonated by articulating the sense that governments had not sought public consent for post-war Commonwealth migration, though contemporary surveys showed that many of those who were sympathetic to Powell on immigration levels feared that his speech would damage race relations.

Yet how badly Powell could misread the British public too. Take Enoch's extraordinary, yet now almost entirely forgotten, public attack on the Queen, accusing her of divided loyalties, because her 1983 Christmas broadcast featured images of her trip to India for the Commonwealth heads of government meeting. Powell felt this would "suggest she has the affairs and interests in other continents as much, or more, at heart than those of her own people" especially when 'even here, in the UK, she is more concerned for the susceptibilities & prejudices of a vociferous

minority of newcomers than for the great mass of her subjects'.

Powell saw this excessive Royal empathy for Commonwealth citizens abroad and ethnic minorities in Britain too as 'pregnant with peril for the future' of the monarchy, 'threatening the place of the Crown in the affections of the people'.

This particular pessimistic Powellite prophecy can be tested very directly since the 50th anniversary of Rivers of Blood happens to coincide with the first Commonwealth Heads of Government gathering in London for a generation, shortly followed by a Royal wedding in Windsor the following month, which will bring the British Royal family its first mixed race Royal.

Nobody can doubt that Enoch called this one wrong. The public mood will be captured much more by us all putting out the bunting for Prince Harry and Meghan than the apocalyptic nightmares of the Powells and Mosleys.

To build a shared pride in Britain today, we must respect our diversity but focus more on what brings us all together.

such. The passengers on the Windrush, a third of whom were returning RAF servicemen, had a strong sense of their connection to Britain. It took another generation or two to secure that acceptance. But Britain today is more anxious and fragmented than any of us would like. Powell was wrong to argue that integration was impossible but it won't happen by itself – and over those decades, while we have paid lip service to integration, we have seen little sustained action.

Enoch was wrong, on immigration, to think that the answer to years of post-war migration was to try and make it all go away again. But what always resonated most widely in what he said was the idea that governments had not secured the consent of the British public for the scale of immigration, nor their confidence in how to manage it.

Brexit will probably end free movement but it will not end immigration to Britain, nor should it. So there is a clear need to rebuild public confidence and consent for the immigration that we want and need today.

Enoch was wrong, on discrimination, to think that banning people being refused a job or a house because of the colour of their skin would offend the British sense of fair play. There is a strong, settled consensus that the opposite is true. Yet his incendiary appeal to racial grievance – that 'the black man would have the whip hand over the white man in this country' – dramatises a core challenge to governments seeking to tackle injustices and provide equal opportunity. The only way through an argument about competing grievances – where the majority resent the attention paid to minorities, while those from minority groups feel politicians only pay lip service to the barriers they face – is to robustly link issues of ethnicity, faith, social class and identity in a coherent argument for fairness, common citizenship and equal opportunities in Britain.

Enoch was wrong, on civil strife and violence, to think that the British, old and new, could not come together to make it work. Yet too much blood has been spilt on our streets: in the racist murder of Stephen Lawrence, lynched for the colour of his skin when trying to catch a bus home, and to many others too whose names never came

to such public attention. In the terrorist murders by Islamist fascists in London in 2005 and Manchester in 2017, or of innocent people on their way to prayer at Finsbury Park Mosque. We have stood together in silence to mourn and to commit ourselves to stand together. We need to build new social movements to challenge and eradicate, without fear or favour, every source of hatred and extremism that seeks to divide our society.

I saw Britain change for the better on race. I know that my children will almost certainly never see or hear the volume of overt public racism that could be commonplace when I watched football matches in the 1980s. For all of our contemporary anxieties, about immigration or on either side of the Brexit debate, the changes and contact forged in our classrooms, our workplaces and in our relationships, go much too deep for anybody to think seriously that they can turn the clock back to the 1970s Britain I was born into.

I wonder, however, if perhaps that sense of confidence and standing is not yet shared by the young British Muslim who has grown up in the shadow of the 9/11 and 7/7 attacks – and wonders whether they face a higher bar to be accepted as fully British. Or indeed the three million EU citizens who decided to make their lives in Britain and now find themselves checking the news each day looking for certainty about their family's future.

This story, of how Britain proved that Powell's fears were too pessimistic, matters to those of us for whom it is the story of our lives as well as our society. It will matter less to the generation who grew up after that. If a young woman faces prejudice in the streets today, why would a story about things being worse in the 1970s make any difference to her? The next generation have higher expectations again – and they deserve to be met.

Many rivers have been crossed. The question is no longer 'was Enoch right or wrong?' To build a shared pride in Britain today, we must respect our diversity but focus more on what brings us all together. The question in 2018 is what we can all do to make that work.

Sunder Katwala is Director of British Future

11. Could Brexit turn the clock back on race relations?

ROBERT FORD AND MARIA SOBOLEWSKA



The spike in hate crime after the EU referendum has led some to suggest that Brexit has prompted a more general upsurge in intolerance in the UK.

PROFESSOR ROBERT FORD and DR MARIA SOBOLEWSKA of the University of Manchester examine what impact the EU referendum has had on race relations in the UK.

One stark legacy of Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech is the tremendous power rhetoric and imagery have on the difficult and emotive issues of identity politics. Powell's speech upended the immigration debate, legitimating racially prejudiced opposition to 'coloured' migrants, who now felt their views were represented and supported by a leading figure in mainstream politics.

Statistics published after the EU referendum, which suggested a spike in racial and religious hate crime in the months following the vote for Brexit, sparked similar concerns. Had the sometimes emotive and heated rhetoric and imagery of the EU referendum campaign – which featured controversial anti-immigration posters and the murder of a pro-migration MP – once again given licence to prejudice and intolerance?

While a small minority may have regarded Brexit as an endorsement of xenophobia, the majority have moved in the opposite direction

While the violent actions of an extreme minority are rightly a cause for concern, a look at the broader landscape of public opinion does not suggest a surge in prejudice or intolerance since Brexit. We can start with the group most closely tied up with the Brexit debate – EU migrants in Britain.

Polling since Brexit has repeatedly confirmed strong public support for protecting the rights of settled EU migrants after Brexit – for example 84%

Pollsters have shown a sharp drop in the share of voters rating immigration as one of the nation's most pressing problems.

of respondents (and 77% of Leave voters) supported protecting the rights of EU migrants in a December 2016 ICM-British Future poll¹, while 63% of respondents in a June 2017 poll agreed that guaranteeing such rights should be the first order of business in Brexit negotiations.²

Data on political and social rights for settled migrants collected by the British Social Attitudes before the Brexit debate began paints a similar picture, with large majorities favouring extending full political and social rights to migrants who have been in Britain for several years or more³. Most British citizens favour generous treatment of settled migrants, and Brexit has not changed this.


Nor is this a matter of grudging acceptance for immigrants regarded as disruptive and problematic. While immigration is not popular with 'Leave' voters, and a desire to control it played a prominent part in the EU referendum debate, there is no evidence of rising hostility to migrants in the wake of Brexit. In fact, the opposite is the case. Multiple pollsters have shown a sharp drop in the share of voters rating immigration as one of the nation's most pressing problems.

Data from both the British Election Study⁴ and IPSOS-MORI⁵ show a shift to more positive views of migrants and the impact of migration, while both YouGov and IPSOS-MORI have recorded a sharp decline in the share of voters saying they are worried about (see figure 1 below). There is evidence of positive shifts in attitudes of both Leave and Remain voters, though Leavers remain much more sceptical of immigration overall. While a small minority may have regarded Brexit as an endorsement of xenophobia, the majority have moved in the opposite direction – seeing migrants in a more positive light since Brexit.

Younger generations tend also to hold more open and multicultural views.


Share of respondents expressing positive views about the economic and social impact of migration

Source: British Election Study internet panel



Share of respondents saying immigration is one of the 'most important problems' facing Britain since EU referendum

Source: YouGov and IPSOS-MORI



There are also good reasons to expect this trend to continue. If we shift our focus out from day to day political debate, there are several long run shifts in the structure of the electorate which are steadily moving the balance of opinion towards greater openness and inclusion. The share of university graduates, ethnic minorities and those with migrant heritage in the population is steadily rising. All of these groups tend to have more positive views of migrants and more inclusive views on race and race relations.

Younger generations tend also to hold more open and multicultural views. This reflects both the different experiences of generations growing up in


a multi-ethnic Britain where movement across borders is a normal part of life, and the more open and liberal values found among younger generations generally.

These changes have sharply reduced expressions of racial prejudice and discrimination between different migrant groups on the ground of race over the past few decades. Brexit will not reverse these structural shifts in attitudes – the voters who come of age in the next decade will continue to be more university educated, more ethnically diverse and more socially liberal than their parents and grandparents.

The most disruptive impact of Brexit may be the way it has politicised the divide between a tolerant majority and a vocal, intolerant minority.

Would you feel uncomfortable if the following position were filled by someone of a different race to you?

Source: Survation for British Future, 2018



Brexit will not turn back the demographic tide. But the composition of the electorate changes slowly, and there remains a substantial minority of British voters with intolerant views of various kinds, ranging from discomfort about migration to outright hostility to ethnic minorities. The most disruptive impact of Brexit may be the way it has politicised the divide between a tolerant majority and a vocal, intolerant minority.

New British Future polling data published as part of this report illustrates this (see figure 2). While large majorities of both 'Leave' and 'Remain' voters express comfort with ethnic minorities filling all the social roles asked about, from Prime Minister to pub landlord, the divide between the two Brexit

groups is substantial, with discomfort about ethnic minorities consistently more prevalent among 'Leave' voters. While there is no evidence that intolerance to immigrants and ethnic minorities has risen since Brexit, the EU referendum has more closely aligned views on identity and diversity with political choices. This could make the politics of diversity more polarised even as Britain continues its slow transformation into a more inclusive and multicultural society.

Robert Ford is Professor of Political Science and Dr Maria Sobolewska is a Senior Lecturer in Politics (quantitative methods) at the University of Manchester.

12. “I think they’re Muslim, but they’re really nice”

RABIHA HANNAN



RABIHA HANNAN says promoting contact between people from different backgrounds helps build the trust and understanding we need for a shared and better future.

A couple of years ago, we employed a local builder to convert our garage into a study. I found him online – a wonderful, middle-aged English man who was soon round at the house drawing up plans. As we chatted and finalised things over tea, he told me: *“I was speaking to my partner last night, and she asked me who I was going to be working for. I told her, I’m not sure – I think they’re Muslim, but they’re really nice.”*

We all laughed – it was difficult to do much else – as he explained that he hadn’t come across many Muslims. The one or two he had met in the building industry hadn’t been very nice, so he was genuinely surprised to meet our (pretty ordinary) family. We told him that most Muslims really weren’t all that bad.

Within a few months the work was all done. We couldn’t have asked for nicer builders: always kind, polite, honest and full of integrity. During those months, there were terror attacks and all sorts of terrible stories in the news. We spoke a lot about Muslims, what they are about, and how we were just as critical as anyone else of what we saw some Muslims do or say in the name of Islam.

We felt honoured that he trusted us enough to be honest; and flattered that we'd helped him realise that Muslims aren't all bad!

On the final day of payment, talking again over tea, he told us: *"Rabiha, I couldn't say this to you before, but a couple of years ago, if someone had given me a button and told me by pressing it, I could get rid of all the Muslims in the world, I would have pressed it!"*

We were stunned. We'd never come across someone so open about such a sentiment. Yet his comments were not made to cause us hurt or pain: they were intended to help us understand his background and his transformation of views. So rather than feel upset, we felt honoured that he trusted us enough to be honest; and flattered that we'd helped him realise that Muslims aren't all bad!

He grinned and said: "Don't mind the tattoos, I'm harmless."

He would go on to tell us how he'd frequently find himself defending Muslims when in circles where the 'fear' and even 'hate' for Islam rode quite high, citing us as examples of Muslims that he'd met that showed him something different. Some of his friends, he said would welcome a new perspective on such issues, for others it was just a little too hard to believe!

Only 5% of people in Britain are Muslims but, according to Ipsos MORI, people think they make up 15% of the population. Coupled with negative images of Muslims involved in terrorism and all sorts of other ghastly behaviour, this means that perceptions are of millions of Muslims attempting to take over the country and govern it by some sort of Islamic system. Little wonder, perhaps, that people are so fearful.

Fear can be both irrational and unpredictable and it affects people in different ways. Although I like to see myself as someone with quite an optimistic outlook, when you hear or experience negative

feelings, sometimes this affects you more deeply than you realise.

Which brings me on to my second example. I was at a local supermarket, about to put my trolley away after shopping when I bumped into a largish man with a big beard and tattoos along both his arms. I have now been programmed to think that people will probably presume the worst of Muslims, so I do whatever I can to give them the best impression of a Muslim and Islam. However before I could smile or make an everyday remark about the weather, he grinned and said: *"Don't mind the tattoos, I'm harmless!"*

He was carrying his own 'fear' that I may be judging him and presuming the worst of him, because of the way he looked. He had his own set of tools to help allay negative perceptions of him and the way he looked.

I wonder how much we all do this – letting negativity and doubt colour the way we see each other, seeing racism and prejudice that isn't there. It comes out of fear, fed by media reports and everyday conversations around the office desk or dinner table, of 'them' and 'us'. More often than not a smile, a short conversation, letting people into your world if only for a few seconds, is all that is needed to melt the ice, and to see that we are all 'us'.

A similar type of fear means some Muslims feel more alienated now than ever before. As they retreat, they fulfil the prophecy of 'the Muslims who don't want to integrate'. It's complex, but also quite simple. It's about trust, and how much we want to understand each other. How much we are willing to open ourselves up, for the sake of making a shared future work.

Rabiha Hannan is co-founder of New Horizons in British Islam

It's about trust, and how much we want to understand each other.

13. On diversity, Conservatives are losing the generation game

ANDREW COOPER

The next generation of voters is at ease with diversity and the benefits of immigration, says ANDREW COOPER – and unless Conservatives can show they are too, they will struggle to compete for their votes.

It is a coincidence that as a member of the House of Lords my title carries the word 'Windrush' – it refers to a village, river and valley in the Cotswolds, not to the ship whose cargo began the era of immigration to the UK. But I like the coincidence, because the Empire Windrush is synonymous with the opening up of Britain.

The arrival of the Windrush started a process that would change the UK forever. The proportion of the UK population that isn't white, just 0.2% in 1951, had reached 13% by the last census in 2011; from 1 in 500, to more than 1 in 8. In the seven decades since 492 Jamaicans and Trinidadians disembarked from the Windrush, the UK has become ever more diverse – our society, economy, culture and outlook broadened and enriched, our country changed for the better by immigration.

The Conservative Party has struggled to come to terms with the growing diversity of Britain.

For much of this period, though, the Conservative Party has struggled to come to terms with the growing diversity of Britain and has even, at times, been overtly hostile towards it. The Conservative Party, extraordinarily, opposed the 1965 Race Relations Act – the first attempt to give legal protection against racial discrimination. Every subsequent UK law advancing equality of ethnic minorities has been introduced by a Labour government, while the Conservative Party's consistent priority, by contrast, has been the tightening of immigration law.

Overt racism was tolerated for decades within the Tory ranks. The party's formal link with the Monday Club, which advocated repatriation, was



not severed until 2001. The divisive rhetoric of Powell and Tebbit, among others, casts a long shadow. The signals that the Conservatives transmitted to ethnic minorities were in what the party didn't say as well as what it did. A party that claims to believe fundamentally in aspiration should, for example, have been much more outspoken than the Conservatives have ever been about workplace discrimination against ethnic minorities; few Tories expressed moral outrage about apartheid in South Africa or anger at the clear evidence of racist practices within the Metropolitan police.

It was a core tenet of the modernisation movement within the Conservative Party that parties aspiring to govern must not only look like the country they want to lead but must also conspicuously respect and value all of its diversity. Some significant strides in that direction were made under David Cameron's leadership, but since the Brexit referendum the Conservative Party has too often looked and sounded like an English Nationalist movement.

In 2017, for the second election running, the Tories lost ground among non-white voters while increasing its support in the country as a whole.

Unless something changes, before long there just won't be enough white voters in the electorate for the Conservative Party to be able to win.



OU: CC BY-NC-ND 2.0

Not being white remains, shamefully, one of the strongest demographic predictors of not voting Conservative – in a country where the proportion of the electorate that is not white is set to keep increasing. 13% of the total population is non-white, but among children under 5 that proportion is closer to 30%. The whiteness of the Tory Party's appeal means that it struggles to win in constituencies where the BAME population is 30% or higher: it currently holds just one such seat. Before 1987 there were no constituencies with more than 30% BAME population. By the next general election, it is projected that there will be more than 120 such seats. Unless something changes, before long there just won't be enough white voters in the electorate for the Conservative Party to be able to win.

It is striking that people who were alive when the Windrush docked, or who lived through the first phase in the UK's transition from a white country to a diverse one, predominantly now think that immigration has changed Britain for the worse and that multiculturalism has weakened us. But it is surely more significant that the generations who have only ever known a country that is ethnically diverse and multicultural feel, by bigger margins,

Not being white remains, shamefully, one of the strongest demographic predictors of not voting Conservative.

that immigration has been – and remains – a good thing; that diversity has strengthened us and that increasing diversity will strengthen us more.

If they are in tune with their generation and their country, the next generations of Conservative politicians will share these views about Britain today – and the Tories will be able authentically to compete to be the voice for all of Britain's people, whatever their colour or ethnicity. If they don't, they cannot be saved.

Andrew Cooper, Lord Cooper of Windrush, was co-founder of research consultancy Populus and served from 2011 to 2013 as Director of Strategy in the Prime Minister's Office under David Cameron.

14. “What I’d say to Enoch Powell”

British Future asked prominent individuals in the fields of politics, culture, race relations and social science what they would say to Enoch Powell if he could hear us now; and what they feel has changed over the last 50 years and still needs to change in the future.



“It’s 70 years since the Empire Windrush docked at Tilbury. Those young men from the Caribbean – many of whom had fought for our country – began their new lives here, full of hope. By 1960 as Minister of Health you too were campaigning for more Commonwealth nationals to come here and work in our understaffed NHS. Soon after you made ominous predictions of racial conflict which, I’m sure you would be pleased to note, have not come to pass.

“Yes, for many life did prove hard. But they overcame, to see Britain change for the better and to see their children and grandchildren greatly enrich our country in all spheres of national life. Take politics: your old seat is now represented by Eleanor Smith MP, a former nurse and a woman of African Caribbean heritage who is as British as you or indeed, me. I’m certain the irony won’t be lost on you.

“The Race Relations Act 1968, built on the landmark Act of three years previously, saw government officially recognising that racial discrimination not only existed, but that all British citizens needed protection under law. The Act also helped to challenge and change unacceptable behaviours. The disgraceful signs advertising flats to let with the condition “no blacks, no Irish, no dogs”, that my dad encountered when he was looking to rent a place, were soon thankfully a thing of the past.

“Over the past 50 years, our country has undoubtedly become fairer and despite setbacks BAME communities are amongst the highest achieving in our schools, public life and the private sector. So we have made real progress. But not nearly enough. Whilst Black and minority ethnic employment rates are at a record high, less than 3.5 per cent of people occupying the three most senior positions in FTSE 100 companies are from ethnic minorities. We have much more to do.”

SAJID JAVID

Communities Secretary



“Mr Powell, you were wrong. You were wrong about the future, you were wrong about the people of the town you represented and you were wrong about the people coming to live here. There has been no blood shed on the streets of Wolverhampton. Instead, it has become a model for successful integration and racial harmony. You may have expected the very worst, but in its place is the very best.


“The best thing that’s changed is the integration of different communities into one, stronger entity. The worst thing is that there is still work to be done among some sections of society to give everyone a sense of fairness and equal treatment.”

KEITH HARRISON

Editor Express & Star, Wolverhampton

Mixed families like mine became more common. Overt discrimination and racist language diminished.

Vince Cable MP



“The ‘Rivers of Blood’ speech had a deep impact on me. I came to the UK from working in East Africa that year with my wife – Olympia – who was East African Asian. There was an ugly climate of racism and rejection which lingered for years afterwards.

Gradually, I sensed, race relations improved – at least in the more cosmopolitan big cities. Mixed families like mine became more common. Overt discrimination and racist language diminished. Black and Asian British became more visible and successful in the media, sport, business, politics, the police, the armed forces, the professions and in education. Sometime in the 1990s my wife admitted that she at last felt British.

Periodically a more negative picture emerged – race riots; disadvantaged black youth, Islamic radicalism and the reaction to it – but the overall story was positive. Until two years ago I felt positive that the legacy of Enoch Powell’s poisonous and pessimistic rhetoric had been buried. Now I am not so sure.

The ‘immigration panic,’ albeit mainly directed at white East Europeans, and Brexit have brought some dangerous xenophobia back to the surface.”

VINCE CABLE MP

“In Britain fifty years ago, pessimistic, bleak views about our place in the world dominated. The country we arrived in as young children imbued that feeling and it dominated for many years. It eventually gave way to ordinary people becoming open-minded and fair in how they lived with and thought about immigrants. The country has a confidence about newcomers, change and a capacity to grow and improve. But this hasn’t extended to all of us, and recent East European migration is a daily reminder to many that change has been more imposed than led. It has bred a resentment that Powell would recognise.

Enoch Powell would have been puzzled by the pace, reach and scale of integration in people’s everyday lives today. This is the overwhelming picture painted after a half century of ethnic pluralism. But he would have felt partly vindicated that mass immigration and ethnic change has continued without much in the way of popular consent. On Europe and immigration, Powell would say that Parliament had been bypassed, and he would have pointed to the Brexit vote as an insurrection against the way we are governed.

So what most needs to change is our system of politics, so that future immigration and immigrants gain the legitimacy they deserve.”

PROFESSOR SHAMIT SAGGAR
University of Essex

Enoch Powell would have been puzzled by the pace, reach and scale of integration in people’s everyday lives today.

Professor Shamit Sagar

What makes my Dad and countless other patriotic Britons proud is that Britain welcomes all and allows anyone to succeed.

Sara Khan



“A few years before Enoch Powell’s speech, aged 18, my father arrived in the UK from Pakistan. I would tell Powell that like innumerable hard working immigrants, he instilled in his children a love for Britain and a profound desire to contribute positively to our home country. This story of an immigrant and his family is not unusual. What makes my Dad and countless other patriotic Britons proud is that Britain welcomes all and allows anyone to succeed.”

Yet as if trying to prove Powell right, extremists seek to do away with diversity, a sign of our country’s strength. They pump out extremist propaganda, inciting division, discrimination and violence. Bravely in these polarised times, communities are standing up to this hatred. Every day I meet activists, faith leaders and professionals defending our shared values. The Commission for Countering Extremism will listen to victims of extremism and give a greater voice to those fighting back.”

SARA KHAN

Lead Commissioner for Countering Extremism

“I was terrified. It was a time of Paki-bashing in parts of London and of racist bullying at my school. So, thank goodness, Mr Powell your predictions of a race war did not come true.

You have also been proved wrong that ethnic minorities would not think of themselves as British nor be accepted as British. In one sense, you were right: you were not an old-fashioned biological-racist but a harbinger of cultural racism – including Islamophobia – and narrow-minded, exclusivist nationalism. Unfortunately we still have tabloid papers that reflect some of your prejudices and are as irresponsible as you in using their considerable power to divide rather than to unite, to sensationalise and inflame feelings – and incite violence. When they should show that our Britishness is enriched by our differences, our hybridity, our inter-ethnic mixing, friendships and marriages, and by a multi-ethnic, multi-culturalist public sphere and national identity.”

PROFESSOR TARIQ MODOOD

University of Bristol

“Roughly as Powell forecast, now one fifth of the population is not of ‘White British’ origin, and one third of births have at least one parent born abroad. While mass immigration has not made the country happier or more prosperous, neither have we seen the large-scale violence that some predicted. Instead we have peaceful if disgruntled acquiescence and geographical retreat by a somewhat browbeaten white population, and a widespread acceptance, even embrace, of diversity as normal.

What needs to change is an effective policy of integration. Past inaction arose to some extent from confusion of aims, and from ‘fear masquerading as toleration’. But it is difficult to insist on change now in communities from whom no change or adjustment was ever demanded. Blair and Cameron spoke against multicultural policies but these flourish anyway, promoting parallel lives. Reports from Cattle to Casey need action.”

DAVID COLEMAN

Professor of Demography, University of Oxford and co-founder of Migration Watch

Most importantly there are now so many people from all backgrounds that do not know or care who Enoch Powell was.

Arten Llazari

“I would tell him that he knew well what he was doing when he decided to play the race card and touch a very raw nerve. I would “reassure” Enoch that after 50 years he remains a very divisive figure. Opinions still vary between “that racist bigot” to “the best prime minister we never had” but most importantly there are now so many people from all backgrounds that do not know or care who Enoch Powell was. I would make sure to tell him that just to see how the arrogant, self-important, contemptuous side of his complex personality would react.

Huge progress has been made and communities have learned not to just accept each other but how to genuinely live together. What still needs to change (I suspect it would take a long time) is the fear of diversity, the intolerance and that primal, territorial instinct in many humans that makes them believe that ‘higher walls around their enclave’ are the solution to the many challenges humanity faces.”

ARTEN LLAZARI

CEO, Refugee and Migrant Centre Black Country and Birmingham

“Enoch Powell would always believe that he was right to reflect his racial prejudices and those of his constituents in 1968, when, obsessed with irrational fears about mass immigration leading to the ‘black man having the whip hand over the white man’, he unleashed his controversial speech. Thankfully, the prejudice and hatred which his speech aroused, resulting in Black and Asian families being attacked, have abated and succeeding generations have accepted the need for equality legislation and action to bring communities, comprising people from all backgrounds, together.

Although prejudice, xenophobia, ignorance and hatred are still unacceptable features of modern British society, there is an assurance in the hope and optimism held by an increasing majority of people who support action for a fairer society for everyone across race, sex and class lines and are working in pursuit of equality, inclusion and cohesion.

With the recent revelations about the identity and skin colour of Cheddar Man from 10,000 years ago, Enoch Powell might today, with hindsight, exercise greater care in considering what he says about the immigrant status of his ancestors.”

LORD HERMAN OUSELEY

Chair, Kick It Out

Succeeding generations have accepted the need for equality legislation and action to bring communities together.

Lord Herman Ousley

15. The work ahead: what are the biggest challenges and how do we tackle them?



British Future's JILL RUTTER says we must build a broad coalition of voices to tackle the new manifestations of racism and prejudice in Britain.

This country is a very different place to 1968. As previous chapters have shown, public attitudes to race and diversity have changed. The widespread, open racism of the 1960s has largely gone. Abusive chanting at football matches is no longer socially acceptable and the police now take complaints of hate crime seriously. Younger people in many parts of the UK regard ethnic diversity as a normal part of everyday life.

But the spike in hate crime in the months after the EU referendum shows that prejudice is a very light sleeper. Those of us who are committed to working for a country that is safe, tolerant and welcoming face many challenges ahead. Hate crime and prejudice are also now part of a fast-moving political debate in which events such as Brexit, Trump, the refugee crisis, long-standing challenges of Muslim integration and threats from extremism both in the UK and internationally can quickly shift public opinion in a way that polarises communities and undermines a broad-based coalition of those who uphold decent values.

The spike in hate crime in the months after the EU referendum shows that prejudice is a very light sleeper.

It is important for civic actors engaged in anti-prejudice work to think more about the audiences that they need to reach. It can still be useful to mobilise those most committed to challenging racism, for example to push for stronger action from national and local government. But if the core aim of anti-prejudice work is to strengthen our social norms, it is essential that those norms make sense to broad majorities of the population. Campaigns to challenge and reduce prejudice must reach out effectively to those most likely to be targeted by extremists, who will often hold quite different views, particularly on immigration issues, to those coordinating anti-prejudice efforts.

Over the last 12 months, British Future has been working alongside Hope not hate, the anti-prejudice organisation, to run the *National Conversation on Immigration*. We have visited 60 towns and cities across the UK to talk to local citizens, as well as councils and civil society organisations, about immigration and integration. But in many places our discussions have also focused on hate crime. Most of those we have met feel that people generally get on well with each other. They agree that attitudes to race and diversity have changed for the better across the generations. But our visits have also highlighted a number of challenges: the widespread nature of online hatred, fears and stereotypes about Muslims and maintaining broad coalitions against hate crime in particular.

Building broad coalitions against hate crime

The months after the referendum saw a substantial increase in racially and religiously motivated hate crime, with reported offences seeing a 41% increase in July 2016, compared with the same period in 2015. People of all ethnicities have been victims, but those of Eastern European origin appear to have been disproportionately affected. Almost everyone can agree that hate crime is wrong, yet the post-referendum period has exposed several of the shortcomings in the ways that the Government, civil society and individuals deal with hate crime. Despite Eastern European nationals being disproportionately affected, there are no long-term initiatives to support this group - through third party reporting, for example.

It is essential that hate crime and prejudice is something that we all oppose, irrespective of our personal politics. This should be something that unites all the mainstream political parties, as well as those who voted Leave or Remain. But since the referendum, the hate crime spike has sometimes been used as continuation of the referendum debate. Remain supporters do a disservice to anti-prejudice campaigns if they insist that all those who supported Leave are complicit in acts of hatred. At the same time, Leave supporters have a particular responsibility to call out anyone who believes that the EU referendum was a licence to express hatred. As the Brexit negotiations progress,



The 'Great Get Together' brought people together and reached new audiences by finding partners outside 'the usual suspects'.

we need a shared Remain-Leave campaign to protect EU nationals and other minority groups and to uphold decent values.

The UK and many other European countries have also seen a rise in antisemitism. In 2017 some 1,382 antisemitic incidents were logged by the Community Security Trust, the organisation that protects the Jewish community. Antisemitism takes many different forms from violent assault, the justification of violence against Jews, dehumanising stereotypes and Holocaust denial. Those who perpetrate antisemitic acts may be encouraged by a range of extremist ideologies, from Islamic extremism to views espoused by far-left and far-right groups.

The Labour Party has lost the confidence of many within Britain's Jewish population and beyond it, including many people sympathetic to the party, over its commitment to take a zero tolerance approach to antisemitism. The party needs to do much more if it is to secure confidence that its processes and culture take antisemitism as seriously as every other form of racism and prejudice. Fixing this has got harder because the issue of isolating antisemitism has become a political football for both supporters and critics of the party leadership, while the argument about the proper boundary between legitimate critiques of Israeli state policy

and tolerance of antisemitism has also become increasingly polarised.

Like immigration or Brexit, it is possible to have a decent discussion about the politics of the Middle East that is not antisemitic. The organisation Solutions Not Sides, developed with input by Israelis and Palestinians as well as Jewish and Muslim faith leaders, has shown one way to address this challenge, working in schools and on university campuses. It demonstrates how those with different political views on these issues can come together and call out antisemitism in all its forms.

Positive social contact between Muslims and non-Muslims appears to make a difference.

Islamophobia

Previous chapters have shown how many people are concerned about the widespread prejudice against British Muslims. Our National Conversation on Immigration visits have also shown the prevalence of Islamophobia in the UK,

Those of us who want to stamp out hate crime need to deploy anti-prejudice messaging that appeals strongly to the decent majority, not just to liberal graduates.

one of most worrying findings. While our citizens' panels would condemn violence against Muslims, we are concerned that conspiracy theories and crude stereotypes have become commonplace.

One particularly pervasive view is that our schools and councils have been forced to pander to Muslim sensibilities. We have been told in many places that schools are no longer allowed to produce nativity plays at Christmas because of the Muslim community. We have found that these views are not widely held, however, in places with large Muslim communities – in Preston and Bradford, for example. Positive social contact between Muslims and non-Muslims appears to make a difference, preventing such views from taking hold. This shows the importance of integration in building resilience to hate crime and we welcome the recent publication of the Government's Integration Green Paper and its commitment to promoting greater social mixing.

Online hatred

Comments that are no longer socially acceptable in a face-to-face conversation are now expressed through social media. Platforms such as Facebook and Twitter are also being used to recruit support for extremist groups that peddle hatred and violence. The nature of online media means that this material reaches a far larger audience than a leaflet or pamphlet. There is also a danger that the wide reach of extremist websites and hate-filled comments gives 'oxygen' to the minority of people who perpetrate hate crime.

All of us have a responsibility to report hatred when we see it online. Our legislative framework is not suited to dealing with online hatred and the police do not have the resources to investigate such comments. These are issues that need to be addressed. But responsibility for dealing with online hatred also lies with the technology sector. It is good news that Britain First has been banned from Facebook and Twitter, but as Parliament's Home Affairs Committee revealed these social media sites have been slow to take down hate speech. Technology companies must respond – by developing technology but also by making sure that enough human resources are put into moderation to remove content that breaches existing hate speech policies.

Getting the majority inside

While the police are responsible for enforcing the law, it is individuals, peer groups and communities that uphold social norms, put a stop to unacceptable behaviour and isolate perpetrators of hate crime. Yet the way that many civil society organisations campaign against hate crime often fails to reach and engage the moderate majority of the public whose support we need to put a stop to unacceptable behaviour.

We have known this for a long time. Writing about Greenwich in the 1990s, the academic Roger Hewitt argued that the anti-prejudice strategies of that period – particularly around school discipline – were heard differently by their intended audiences. Procedures to deal with racist abuse were seen as an unfair, over-zealous imposition of political correctness on white, working class communities⁶. Well-intentioned policy failed to get through. Twenty years later, many of these criticisms remain. Many of the messages used by those working to combat hate crime are still ineffective in isolating and calling out the perpetrators of hate crime – including low level verbal abuse – as the toxic minority.

Those of us who want to stamp out hate crime need to deploy anti-prejudice messaging that appeals strongly to the decent majority, not just to liberal graduates. Messages that appeal to common British values may be one way to do this. The voices we use to call out hate crime are also important and popular figures such as local footballers may have greater reach to some audiences, for example. Small, local organisations that support the victims of hate crime need to think more about preventing it too.

Above all, those who seek to combat hate crime and prejudice need to take a strategic approach. We need to build resilience to hate crime by promoting integration and dealing with the social factors that contribute to resentment. As we have stated, this means effective campaigns that reach and engage their intended audience. This will entail building broad coalitions of individuals and groups against hate crime that reach across social and political divides.

Jill Rutter is Director of Strategy and Relationships at British Future

Notes

¹ ICM poll for British Future, December 2016, <http://www.britishfuture.org/articles/eu-nationals-report/>

² ICM poll for British Future, June 2017 <https://whatukthinks.org/eu/questions/to-what-extent-do-you-agree-or-disagree-that-the-uk-and-eu-should-guarantee-the-rights-and-status-of-eu-citizens-in-the-uk-and-uk-citizens-in-the-eu-as-the-first-item-for-discussion-in-the-brexit-ne/>

³ NatCen, British Social Attitudes 31, <http://www.bsa.natcen.ac.uk/latest-report/british-social-attitudes-31/immigration/so-what-should-we-do-views-ab-out-migration-policy.aspx>

⁴ <https://medium.com/@robfordmancs/how-have-attitudes-to-immigration-changed-since-brexit-e37881f55530>

⁵ Shifting Ground: Attitudes towards migration and Brexit, Ipsos MORI, October 2017 <https://www.ipsos.com/ipsos-mori/en-uk/shifting-ground-attitudes-towards-immigration-and-brexit>

⁶ Hewitt, R. (1996) Routes of Racism, Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

About British Future



British Future is an independent, non-partisan thinktank and registered charity engaging people's hopes and fears about integration and immigration, opportunity and identity.

These debates, from EU immigration and refugee protection to integration of people from different faiths and backgrounds, remain noisy and polarised. But since British Future's founding in 2012, we have developed a unique understanding and expertise on public attitudes to these issues in the UK, through in-depth qualitative and quantitative research. We have found that there is a surprising amount of common ground among the public on which they can agree.

We believe that securing political consent for policy change on these issues requires public support – and that it is possible to build this support with the right approach.

British Future seeks to understand and engage people's legitimate concerns and to offer constructive solutions in response. We believe we can build a broad consensus among the public and opinion-formers for reforms to integration and immigration policy that work for everyone.

We project our findings publicly to inform national debate, contributing to discussions on issues such as integration, identity, combating racism and xenophobia, refugee protection and the status of EU nationals in the UK after Brexit, as well as debates on EU and non-EU immigration.

Our long-term aim is a country where we are no longer 'Them' and 'Us' but rather a confident and welcoming Britain, inclusive and fair to all.

British Future would like to thank Global Dialogue, Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust and the Sigrid Rausing Trust for their support with this project, as well as all of the authors who contributed to this report.

Published by:

British Future
Kean House
6 Kean Street
London WC2B 4AS

www.britishfuture.org
Tel. +44 (0) 20 7632 9069
Twitter: @BritishFuture

Registered charity number: 1159291

