

Badenoch's spinning a totally fabricated yarn about t...

Published: January 12, 2026, 9:53 pm

Kemi Badenoch was [reported by the Guardian](#) yesterday to have said:

It worries me when I hear people talk about wealth and success in the UK as being down to colonialism or imperialism or white privilege or whatever.

They added:

Instead, she said the Glorious Revolution of 1688 – which led to the development of the UK constitution and solidified the role of parliament – should be credited for providing the kind of economic certainty that paved the way for the Industrial Revolution.

As I said in the tweet that I issued in response:

There is nonsense, bullshit, fabrication and then whatever it is that Kemi Badenoch has to say on any subject.

If I failed to hide my contempt, I do not apologise.

I almost felt like asking on Twitter “Whatever did the Glorious Revolution do for you?” Apart from the suppression of Catholicism, the creation of the Bank of England, the institution of the national debt, the imposition of a monarch who believed in the importance of the navy, largely as a weapon for imperialist, colonialist inspired territorial expansion, and who paved the way for the subjection of Scotland to the whim of the English, what did the Glorious Revolution do for you, after all?

The one thing I think we can say with confidence is that it did not deliver the industrial revolution.

It did however fuel demand for income to fund royal fantasies and foibles that most definitely required the exploitation of colonies in the USA, the Caribbean, West Africa and elsewhere.

So is Badenoch wrong? In my opinion, she is not just wrong, but is actively

misrepresenting the truth.

Why would she do that? Partly because she does, for her own reasons, wish to deny Britain's racist past, and present, because her denial of that racism is itself racist, in my opinion.

As significantly, she also wants to deny the role of monopoly-based rentier capitalism and exploitation as the common foundations of the wealth of this country.

She is, instead, pretending that entrepreneurial activity did deliver that wealth. But that is largely untrue. For example, those canal and coal pioneers who, if anyone did, started the industrial revolution later in the 18th century were able to do so on the basis of land ownership, wealth and property, all of which was supported by extraction of profits resulting from privilege, patronage, expropriation, rents and exploitation. Some of that undoubtedly would have been derived from colonial activity.

In that case Badenoch's commentary does not just fail; it stinks because she is denying the truth and presenting a wholly false, politically inspired narrative that is unsupportable by evidence. But when did someone like her worry about things like that?