

ENOCH POWELL AND THE BRITISH LEGACY OF POLITICAL CORRECTNESS

SACRIFICING A STATESMAN BEFORE THE ALTAR OF MULTICULTURALISM

CHRIS BRAND

SYNOPSIS

The gifted and esteemed, if unsmiling and much abused British politician, Enoch Powell,* fell from grace in 1968. Powell's mistake was to have alluded to the possible perils of the mass coloured immigration into Britain which was by then well under way. Powell was instantly sacked from the Conservative Shadow Cabinet (where he had been Defence spokesman) and then left to languish on the Westminster backbenches—finally becoming an Ulster Unionist MP. With this put-down by the Heath government vanished for a generation any serious possibility of public realism in Britain about race or nationhood. Even the quite successful Scottish National Party currently professes multiculturalism and in 1999 reproved its leader when he queried Nato's bombing of Serbia (which had tried to control the Albanians within its borders). Today, it is not just academics and journalists but drinking men and grandmothers in Britain who know that "you mustn't mention the darkies." By intimidation, Britain's political class has preserved the fiction that race is not a problem.

Such enforced piety is sometimes claimed to have been a success. Britain's roughly 93% white population has certainly tolerated rather well the 7% of British citizens who now hail from the New Commonwealth. Yet, this year, Britain experienced its worst race riots since the 1950s—with over 200 police injured by young Pakistanis in nights of street battles in Oldham, Leeds, Burnley, Bradford, and Stoke-on-Trent. Globalized capitalism and its convenient religion of Political Correctness are likely to be answered by ever-rising levels of white racial consciousness and the rejection of multicultural illusions. In the past two years, scores of violent incidents between Glaswegians and London's 4,000 Muslim "asylum seekers" sent up from London have provided a test of how keen the Scots are on multiculturalism.

Was Enoch Powell correct in his forebodings that multiculturalism would not succeed? Contrary to the wishful thinking of Britain's chattering classes (themselves largely unaffected by coloured immigrants competing for their own jobs or nearby living space) the jury is still out. The murderous ethnic polarization which erupted in multicultural Sarajevo could also hap-

* Full final title: Rt. Hon. J. Enoch Powell PC MBE MA

pen in Macedonia and even the UK's south Pennines. Fortunately, dangerous multiculturalism may prove corrigible if it meets a monoculturalism that is at once nationalist and classically liberal—the kind of dynamic compromise that Enoch Powell would have wished.

We must be mad, literally mad, as a nation to be permitting the annual inflow of some 50,000 dependents, who are for the most part the material of the future growth of the immigrant-descended population. It is like watching a nation busily engaged in heaping up its own funeral pyre. ... There could be no grosser misconception of the realities than is entertained by those who vociferously demand legislation (as they call it) "against discrimination," whether they be leader writers of the same kidney and sometimes on the same newspapers as those who—year after year in the 1930s—tried to blind this country to the rising peril which confronted it, or archbishops who live in palaces, faring delicately with the bedclothes pulled right up over their heads.

—Rt. Hon. Enoch Powell (1912-1998), "Rivers of Blood" speech, April 4, 1968.

[I]n this age of cultural dunces, identikit professional politicians and spin doctors enforcing the party line, Enoch Powell stood out vividly as a man of eloquence and integrity, inspired by a messianic sense of history and of Britain's place in it. Soldier, scholar and romantic reactionary, he was the 100-degree-proof to whom, in contrast, modern politicians are decaffeinated mineral water.

—[London] editorial, *Evening Standard*, February 9, 1998.

[Political correctness] is the most intolerant system of thought to dominate the British Isles since the Reformation.

—Peter Hitchens, *The Abolition of Britain: From Lady Chatterley to Tony Blair*, London : Quartet, 1999.

Under the brutal reign of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese Communists imposed one of the first codes of "Political Correctness" (PC) prior to the Great Leap Forward and long before the Cultural Revolution. The Communist Party faithful were to avoid mentioning inconvenient truths about China's devastated economy, not to mention by the 1950s its millions of martyrs to ideology.¹ Yet it was not long before PC caught on in England, a country whose higher social classes are famed for their love of good manners and their reluctance to give direct offence about virtually anything.

England had been forged as a modern nation state in the sixteenth century when King Henry VIII invented (and made himself Governor of) the 'moderate' Church of England—compromising between Catholicism and Protestantism and thus avoiding civil war, but nevertheless keeping abjurers firmly out of public office. In the second half of the twentieth century, this national religion collapsed thanks to Darwinism, the loss of

the British Empire, the welfare state, and the failure of the Church to embrace sexual liberation (except for encouraging lesbians to be its priests). England's political class then adopted a new religion and *politesse* that would silence the vulgar and assist the multicultural Britain and the world-wide *Pax Americana* and Anglo-Saxon empire that were evidently in the making.

The excesses of PC on American campuses would much later provide more by way of regular news and humour—weirdly helping PC to appear frivolous and unthreatening. America also originated the superficially kindly sport of positive discrimination: a.k.a. affirmative action—a new form of taxation on larger employers, obliging them to hire, promote, and cover for workers they would rather do without. Yet the hard-core PC practice of having white men sacked from public office for ‘insensitive’ speech originated in England. Such draconian dispensations would prove increasingly necessary to prevent critical reflection about England's new demographic arrangement (itself also a world first): White workers were to be kept on welfare² where, from their council accommodation, they and their single-parenting daughters would vote socialist; and they would be replaced in the workforce with uneducated coloured immigrants who would also vote socialist from their ghettos.

AN EARLY CASUALTY OF “POLITICAL CORRECTNESS”

PC's first high-ranking victim had starred as a Prize Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Subsequently, he became the youngest-ever British professor of Greek (at Sydney University) before his wartime service as the youngest-ever brigadier in the British Army (in India). In UK politics of the early 1960s, as Minister of Health, John Enoch Powell began the processes of unlocking and half-emptying England's mental hospitals while introducing cheap Caribbean labour to serve those patients who remained.

The gaunt “Enoch”—as he would become known nationally both to London dockers and on the BBC's flagship weekly radio programme, “Any Questions”—had tight lips, a massive jaw, a high forehead and an Edwardian moustache. In the late 1960s, he held a position at the top table of Edward Heath's Conservative Shadow Cabinet. In 1968, Powell turned his analytic mind to the growing concerns of his constituents in Wolverhampton (north of Birmingham) with “wide-grinning piccaninnies” chanting “Racialist!” Powell mused that non-integration coupled with “positive discrimination” were recipes for trouble, and that mass coloured immigration might even turn “bloody.”³ For his thoughts, he was promptly denounced by the *Times*⁴ and swiftly sacked. Powell was already a thorn in Heath's flesh because of his pre-Thatcherite monetarism and insistence on fiscal probity; so his “racism” was intolerable. The technocratic Heath wanted to show that the Conservatives had learned some lessons from their 1964 and 1966 poll defeats—the Tories' first electoral reverses since 1945. Thus Heath (who would never again speak to Powell) rid himself at once of an over-bright and doubtless overbearing opponent. Subsequently, Powell came to abhor Conservative concessions of sovereignty to Brussels. Thus he found himself a constituency in Northern Ireland backed by the Ulster Unionists who wanted to resist IRA terror while holding

ultramontagne attitudes about Catholics and sexual permissiveness—attitudes that distanced them from post-1968 Britain and made them pariahs at the Palace of Westminster.

When Enoch Powell died in 1998, aged 85, his death was announced on Britain's more popular TV channels by coloured newscasters.⁵ Within a few days of his death, an under-cover inquiry showing racist preferences on the part of London taxi-drivers for White passengers elicited anguished protestations from the accused drivers themselves. Notoriously, this group held classically racist and authoritarian attitudes (for which "String-'em-up" sentiments they were much lampooned); but here were the drivers protesting that they would never *dream* of passing by a potential fare who was coloured. (Some of the cab drivers' best friends were black, supposedly!) The next year, the Government-sponsored Macpherson Report⁶ would condemn London's Metropolitan Police as "institutionally" and "unconsciously" racist. Following the report's swift acceptance by the Blair government, the police were obliged to lower their rates of stop-and-search profiling of black youths—resulting over the next two years of "de-policing" in a 60% increase in London street crime. Throughout Britain, by this time, all big employers maintained informal quotas for minority employment—hoping thereby to placate the Government-funded Campaign for Racial Equality.⁷

By 1998, coloured immigrants—composed primarily of blacks, Indians and Pakistanis—made up about 7% of Britain's and 30% of London's population. Fully 14% of mothers giving birth had been immigrants themselves. Still more remarkably, the generation following Powell's "Rivers of Blood" speech had encountered no serious public policy developments with regard to immigration. New immigration had certainly been reined in⁸ -- even by the Labour Party. Politicians had been shocked by the race riots in England of the late 1950s, had been given reminders by the skirmishes between blacks and police around 1980, wished to quash Powellism. However, the freedom to bring into Britain blood relatives and prospective marital partners had been maintained, and these allowances proved quite sufficient to yield the steady increase of "New Commonwealth" (i.e. coloured but not East Asian) immigration that Powell had anticipated. In particular, many immigrant parents continued to arrange (i.e. dictate) their daughters' marriages. In the absence of any sensible policy for selecting new migrants, Eastern European gypsies, Iraqis, Kurds, Afghans, Albanians, Ceylonese Tamils, and eventually mainland Chinese headed in droves for Britain as "asylum seekers" or just as illegal immigrants. (Fifty-eight Chinese were found suffocated to death in a single incident at the south-coast port of Dover in 2001 after a Dutch lorry driver had turned off ventilation to keep any chattering among his charges from being overheard by immigration officials.)

The problems identified by Powell had thus both multiplied and remained largely unaddressed. The chief response to them, in fact, was the continuing propaganda campaign in the media to urge British whites to applaud "diversity," accept multiculturalism and to refrain from "racism." Minorities had replaced the old working class in efforts by playwrights and advertisers to spice up their work and attract attention by showing superficial sympathy for the underdog. Yet Britain's campaign to stress the delights of multiculturalism cut little ice with the less successful immigrants themselves. This

year, it transpired that—quite apart from the well-established American phenomenon of blacks and whites living largely apart from one another—British cities such as Bradford and Leicester had actually become ghetto-ized so as to separate Indian Hindus from Pakistani and Bangladeshi Muslims.

In this policy vacuum, accompanied by growing *de facto* apartheid, English voters had never been given a say in the inner-city transformation of major populated areas into ghettos where a policeman can be semi-decapitated with impunity—his death celebrated openly by machete-wielding young blacks and their local politicians. In particular, the Conservative Party had resolved that it would rid itself of much of its Toryism (support for the monarchy, the country's aristocracy and the Church of England) and instead adopt neo-conservative capitalism. Realizing nineteenth-century economic liberalism might seem hard-hearted on its own, the Party resolved to accept a large measure of humanitarian idealism and welfarism—even though the Labour Party soon responded by stealing the Conservatives' "tough-on-crime," pro-Nato, and pro-European Union clothes. In particular, Conservatives resolved to assert that they would never be conspicuously outdone in racial tolerance; and they struggled hard to adopt black parliamentary candidates even though such selections lost them previously ultra-safe Conservative seats.⁹ Altogether, a transformation of Britain that was desired by leftists seeking new votes, businessmen seeking cheap labor, and rightists seeking to break strikers occurred without either intelligent discussion or positive democratic assent. The Conservative Party declined to develop its natural role as an English nationalist Party. It believed it could rise above such "vulgarity"—and persisted in this belief even when, from 1997 to 2000, it held no parliamentary seats at all in Scotland, Wales, or Northern Ireland.¹⁰

POWELL AND BRITISH IMMIGRATION POLICY IN PERSPECTIVE

That questions about immigration and integration should have been left to "extremist" groups like the British National Party¹¹ is less surprising when the enormity of Powell's put-down is considered. Here are the things which Powell *never* did, either in 1969 or subsequently—even though he was invariably accused by the left of having links to the "far-right."

First, Powell did not identify the particular problems posed by Britain's different racial/ethnic groups. He never picked out the higher criminality and promiscuity or the lower intelligence and literacy of the average black; he did not say that Pakistanis clitoridectomized and locked up their daughters and wanted to kill Hindus; he did not say that Asian people generally have a considerable propensity for killing—as the Chinese themselves acknowledge when they insist that the crimes of Stalin and Hitler together were far exceeded by those of Japan's Emperor Hirohito. Nor could Powell even bring himself to reflect critically that an important feature of English society, at least after 1066, was its relative neglect of biology. Departing in their secure island home from the revolutionary idea that had allowed the German tribes to challenge the Roman Empire,¹² the English—with encouragement from their Norman French rulers after 1066—were disinclined to admit blood as a determinant of nationality.¹³ It was their un-

friendly treatment of the American colonies—presumed to need the same authoritarian rule as did India—that resulted in Britain’s first and greatest disaster, America’s declaration of independence in 1776. Later, sneakily admiring a revolutionary, king-killing, and mass-murderous France (despite the efforts of England’s fighting men during the Napoleonic Wars), English politicians let their country be sucked into the disastrous 1914-18 war against their north German cousins.¹⁴ Britain had eventually to be rescued by the Americans after many of its finest young men had been madly sacrificed in the trenches of the Somme and Ypres—where officers were expected to “lead from the front.” Enoch Powell lacked the familiarity with social science that would have allowed him to point out how English “empiricism” and simplistic veneration of environmental factors lay behind England’s dismal experiments with socialism—including the loss of India¹⁵ in 1947, and eventually the winding down of the English grammar school system following Labour’s election victories of 1964 and 1974. That Chinese men like gambling, that Indian girls are good at sex, and that Englishmen like their “space” may be obvious to any check-out girl at Tesco’s; but such actual proposals about racial and national differences were not even *mentioned* by Enoch Powell. Thus, precisely because he was sacked for far less, they could not be mentioned by any public figure after his sacking.

Second, despite his reputation for logical and thorough thinking, and for immense hard work on parliamentary and governmental documents, Powell made no attempt to explore the empirical questions of whether cultural and racial diversity have any general advantages or disadvantages. By 1968, the world was plainly living in “an American century” and America was a multiracial country—at least by British standards. Yet Powell did not begin to consider whether multiracialism was really a problem; and, if so, whether it had not been largely overcome in the USA by an enthusiastic monoculturalism which had swept whites, blacks, Hispanics, and Amerindians along for much of the twentieth century into free enterprise, individualism, democracy, gun ownership, anti-Darwinism, and TV-viewing. Politely, Powell did not propose that immigrants to the UK (or, indeed, the natives) should have to meet exacting criteria of integration before being allowed to vote or hold government office. He did not consider how the tyrannical ideologies of Rome (both pre-Christian and Christian), Moscow (tsarist and Communist) and Peking (Qing and Maoist) had held disparate racial groups together—whereas multicultural Austro-Hungary, despite its short-lived civilized glories, had been an ongoing joke among realists¹⁶ until its delightful but unworkable empire triggered World War I and promptly vanished. Again, Powell’s restraint had a simple consequence: once he was sacked for less, such topics could not be properly discussed.

Third, Powell put forward no practical or even hopeful scheme either for limiting undesirable immigration of dependents or for encouraging the *re-migration* of immigrants who failed to find gainful employment in Britain. Apparently reluctant to use the psychologist’s concept of general intelligence (i.e. IQ), Powell advocated no standards of his own for deciding who should have either work permits or full citizenship. Whereas liberal, and indeed PC Canada and Germany would develop elaborate systems for determining which potential immigrants to accept (with points awarded for

degrees, Ph.D.s, knowledge of German, computer skills, etc.), Britain was to languish with a quite indiscriminating set of restrictions on *all* immigration¹⁷—allowing only “asylum seekers” much chance of success, so seeking asylum became the rage. Whereas peaceful and successful Switzerland monitored applicants for many years before granting citizenship, Powell did not even suggest obliging migrant labourers to take holidays back in their home countries so as to maintain their connections. For a generation, Britain could not discuss such practicalities since Powell had been sacked for far less.

Fourth, though Powell received over 100,000 letters of encouragement following his 1968 speech and could easily have rallied millions of supporters, he made no effort at all to organize public protest outside Parliament. A true English nationalist, without a trace of fascism in his bones, he saw Parliament as the proper forum for the discussion and resolution of great issues. Powell knew and loved India and was fluent in two of its languages; and he had spoken through passionate tears in the House of Commons against the injustices and murders meted out by the British colonial authorities to the inmates of the major internment camp in Kenya for Mau Mau rebels of the 1950s. Powell did not even seek to write a book or to have social scientists research questions about race. “Racism,” if that is what Powell propounded, never had a less troublesome champion, or one less deserving of being turned into a pariah.¹⁸ So others noted his fate.

Nevertheless, the terrors that awaited those who thought of discussing Powell’s anxieties were hardly those of the Spanish Inquisition or the French Jacobins. All that happened to English outspokeners was that they lost promotion chances, conference invitations, or their girlfriends. They suffered only the non-life-threatening odium that had attended atheism in the eighteenth century—when Scotland’s most distinguished philosopher, David Hume, was denied a chair thanks at once to mobs led by ministers of religion and to cowardly academics. Few went to prison for “racism” in multicultural Britain—and many who did were mainly black sufferers from paranoid psychoses who made ordinary political extremists look parliamentary. So why did only a few fringe supporters of the “far right” make much effort to protest against coloured immigration to Britain? There are four main reasons.

First, the tolerance and good manners of England’s higher-class and rural people are legendary. The essential feature of a stereotypical Englishman is that he regards his home (preferably a country seat, though more commonly today a suburban semi-detached with a garden) as his castle. It is against this backdrop that his vaunted individualism, idiosyncrasy, and quietly imaginative sexual psychopathy are found. Fortified by his possessions, and with his wife and family installed in them, the classical Englishman was able to face city life and its necessary civilities with good grace—his club and preferred harlot provided a refuge on evenings when he was unable to return to get the whip out in the shires. The natural tranquillity, love of privacy, and non-abrasiveness of the upper-class English are much remarked by foreigners—not least by Germans who often find their own countrymen too aggressive in everyday affairs (e.g. in insisting that pedestrians obey traffic lights, that cyclists keep to designated paths, and that condominium dwellers should not have pets or babies). English acceptance of others and their own unobtrusive perversions was doubtless helped by England’s having one

of the lower rates of neuroticism in the whole of Europe—perhaps a result of the country having suffered no invasion (apart from Scottish pinpricks) after 1066.¹⁹ Never doubting his own superiority after two centuries of successful empire, the better-class Englishman of 1969 felt largely unthreatened by the new immigrants. He was thus readily impressed by PC's core proposition that none should give offence on the subject of race. Likewise, he had tolerated Roman Catholicism after 1829—enabling Britain's extensive use of Irish manual labour.²⁰

Second, in the 1980s, British Conservatives largely decided that they were really nineteenth-century Liberals and that capitalism and free trade would continue as great success stories. This novel view—for a party which had in its past backed nationalistic agricultural protectionism—provided both a rationale and a method for standing up to trade unionism. Thus it was readily seized upon once Ted Heath's managerial methods had failed. In particular, New Commonwealth immigration provided the labour force that made it practical to challenge union power. Yet, in their inspiring new anti-statism (furnished by Mrs. Thatcher), the Conservatives let go of what were by then the major state institutions—the schools, the hospitals, and local government—and virtually invited the left to do with them what it would. The left, though in disarray about socialist economics, quickly seized the playground it was offered and turned Britain's remaining socializing agencies (given the demise of religion) to its advantage. Even the armed forces and police could be suborned into new roles of invading a long-standing ally (Serbia) and cracking down on “racism.” The left used its natural control of local authorities—by then massively subsidized from Whitehall, so local voters always chose high spending—to forge a new lower order. This was made up of “minorities” (including women) so as to compensate for traditional working class whites being embourgeoisified into buying their council houses and holidaying in Spain. Such was the scale of the Conservative surrender of voters in the vast state sector of the economy that, by 2001, only 7% of UK academics said they would vote Tory. [This summer, Edinburgh University—which sacked me in 1997 as being too controversial—hosted a conference of the International Society for the Study of Individual Differences (ISSID, founded by race realist Hans Eysenck) only on condition that there should be no papers dealing with race: such stars of modern differential psychology as Tom Bouchard, Arthur Jensen, Richard Lynn, Phil Rushton, and Glayde Whitney were not encouraged to attend and even had the unprecedented experience of seeing their papers rejected by the Society.] Unopposed by the center-right, institutional anti-racism has well and truly arrived in Britain and it terrorizes all those many modern academics who have wives, children, motor cars, and second mortgages to consider. PC is a new trade unionism from which Britain will somehow have to make a new escape.

Third, as the “liberal”-left seized the universities, it became possible to produce government reports which ignored genetic possibilities and “showed” the problems of minorities to be environmental. Thus Her Majesty's Government commissioned from the University of Cambridge a subtle account of immigrant children's educational problems which, while rejecting left-wing accusations that IQ scores were mere racist labels, supposed that black children would catch up with whites as Pakistani children were

perhaps doing.²¹ In fact, Pakistani children invariably had a big language handicap on arrival in Britain; by contrast, basic English was not a problem for West Indian immigrants. Yet the important Cambridge report met no significant public opposition. Likewise, Britain's criminologists—by the 1980s more left-wing than sociologists—could be relied upon both to minimize the problem of black criminality (accounting for 40% of crime and 60% of violent crime in London) and to attribute it to “socio-economic factors.”²² When the Director General of the BBC complained this year that his staff were “hideously white,” not a single person of stature stepped forward in public to question how many New Commonwealth migrants ever applied for £80,000p.a. jobs with the Corporation, or what percentage had the basic qualifications of high intelligence, general knowledge, and command of English that audiences expect of broadcasters who live off compulsory licence fees.

Fourth, PC provided a new religion that was adapted to the times. It offered the traditional religious thesis that men are all one—all somehow equal in the eye of God. With the help of anthropological relativism and Parisian deconstructivism, it sought to deny, or at least forget what is to most modern economists and other social scientists the painful reality of race differences. At the same time, PC offered to journalists a fall-back account of the world. Under this, any embarrassing observed differences could be trendily interpreted as the result of racism. Especially invoked were “institutional” and “unconscious” racism: these were deemed to be as prevalent as had been elitism and snobbery in the days when Britain enjoyed the fun of class competition. Rather as the Church of England had once brought together under one roof the squire and his farm labourers in a display of achievable harmony, so PC pervaded every soap opera and news broadcast—often preventing audiences from learning the race of the many blacks accused of serious crimes. Whites themselves became alert to the possibilities of blaming their fates on “racism”: for example, an increasingly common pursuit was for Englishmen living in Wales and Scotland to complain of “racism”; and jokes about the Welsh on the BBC became taboo. No one could “discriminate” any more. No employer, at least, was free to choose. Like early Christianity, PC had no centralised leadership; but it could be adopted by Prime Minister Blair just as Christianity had been taken over and made into a success by Emperor Constantine. Tony Blair arranged for the Labour Party to have an unprecedented one hundred female MPs (“Blair's Babes,” as they were called) and Britain's first “Asian” Cabinet Minister.²³ By 2000, the ever-willing media had taken upon themselves the task of encouraging inter-racial marriage even though sexual liaisons between whites and blacks actually remained rare and though no one had explained how general miscegenation could be expected to maintain the West's production of classical composers, political philosophers, comedians, and top scientists. By this time, PC was, like traditional religions, unquestionable—except sometimes by high priests hailing from its own protected minority groups.²⁴

ALTERNATIVES TO THE MULTICULTURAL MORASS

What can be done about the new religion which is at once so tyrannical and so derogatory to white males as to be itself sexist and racist? PC already suppresses

unwanted publications by terrorizing publishers (like Wiley, which turned down a book by race theorist Arthur Jensen and withdrew another by me), and President Chirac of France currently plans to ban Internet publication of “race hate” material. PC already criminalizes intentions (making “racially motivated” violence more severely punishable than other types) and speech (e.g. racial slurs shouted at soccer matches); and it is on the verge of criminalizing thought.²⁵ Furthermore, PC’s main racist thrust has become quite clear in the past decade—most recently in the youth-oriented action film “The Fast and the Furious” which extols the excitements enjoyed by black street racers and their hip-hop-worshipping white girlfriends in Los Angeles. PC expects the boring white race to fade away—at least, once Whites have paid the bill for their supposed historical record of elitism, eugenicism, imperialism, slavery, and the Holocaust. Nevertheless, these blatant flaws in PC dogma have been insufficient to attract the kind of condemnation with which Western liberals and democrats once made so free when arguing against monarchy, aristocracy, fascism, and, sometimes, communism. Only a handful of Internet sites offer steady condemnation of PC; and when the UK Conservative leader, William Hague, reminded the British public ever-so-faintly this year²⁶ that people might “wake up to find themselves in a foreign land,” he found himself condemned by virtually every national newspaper and by all Britain’s main political parties, including half of his own. Will Brits and other Westerners just have to accept a few centuries of PC—the world’s new church militant?

First, it needs saying that nationalism and racism are not going to die out around the world, however they might be suppressed by neo-socialists in the West who have traded in their Marxism for multiculturalism so as to continue their attack on the West’s institutions.²⁷ The peoples of mainland China, the Indian subcontinent, and the Muslim world (to mention just a few) have explosively high estimations of the superiority of their own cultures—estimations which seem only to be fuelled by their lack of economic success. America’s unprecedented military superiority may preserve multicultural illusions for a while, but the West’s rivals know that terror works —having notably forced Russia to pull out of Afghanistan and Britain to hand over Ulster to undemocratic “power sharing.” Using the many migrants now situated in the West, other countries’ fanatics will be able to pursue terror campaigns against their host countries as well as against each other. Those Westerners who think that the Chinese and the Muslims have lots of convenient border squabbles with each other should remember the sudden Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939 which led to World War II: both the Chinese Communists and the Muslims have considerable shared antipathy to Buddhists, Taoists, and Hindus—as also to the “imperialist” West. Even if the Western political class is incapable of learning the limits of multiculturalism from the genocide in Rwanda/Burundi, from the break-ups of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, or from the impossibility of racial harmony in Israel/Palestine, Indonesia, Zimbabwe, and probably South Africa, it will eventually be impressed by mayhem in its own midst.

Second, another problem for PC will arise if the West’s economy falters. The rise of PC has been linked to a remarkable decade of prosperity for the fairly-free-trading English-speaking peoples. Yet history gives no reason to expect ongoing rises in afflu-

ence since boom and bust cycles tend to follow reciprocal patterns; and continuing improvement seems especially unlikely since America and Britain have wrecked their state schools and—thanks to contraception, feminism and egalitarianism in education—have been failing to breed from their higher-IQ stock. If an economic downturn should occur, these countries will attract nothing of the loyalty that their former working men once gave them in the trenches of Flanders and jungles of Vietnam. Rather, whole cities will be in ferment as the occupying races fight to promote their own ethnic interests while staking a claim for their portions of the West's heritage. Whites who believed in PC will find themselves rapidly disillusioned in the event of an economic downturn—as happened in Oldham, Lancashire, this year after mill closures of the 1990s made many Pakistanis redundant, which led to racial ghetto-ization and finally rioting.

Third, still another problem for PC will be its internal incoherence. Just as Christians could never quite agree as to whether their religion was monotheistic (or allowed a four-in-one godhead—including the Virgin Mary) or believed in “justification by faith” (as opposed to the many “works” preferred by the Catholic Church), so PC enthusiasts have grave divisions. Notably, feminists abhor typical Aboriginal,²⁸ African, Muslim²⁹ and Indian attitudes to women; homosexuals know that they are little esteemed by Africans—with the exception of the mighty Zimbabwean policeman-fancying homosexual ex-president, Canaan Banana; and handicapped activists know that parents everywhere will move heaven and earth to avoid having to look after disabled infants³⁰—only relenting in this when vast outlays on “special education” are available from the state. PC will also be subject to the kind of change that distanced the American Irish from American blacks. In Britain, Hindus will probably be the first to dissociate themselves from the anti-Englishness of black and Pakistani leaders. Even the key historical pact between the Jews and the blacks would break down if more blacks threw their lot in with Islam or Jewry decided to stop using its massive control of the media to give whites a hard time.

Whether intellectuals and scientists will ever contribute much to overthrowing PC is a moot point. To date, the best efforts of psychologists like the late Hans Eysenck and Canada's Phil Rushton have met with media disdain and *de facto* suppression; and not even the work of the silver-haired London clubman, Richard Lynn, is now acceptable to mainstream publishers.³¹ The position of PC with regard to facts is interesting. In recent years, PC has moved beyond denying that human races differ deep-seatedly in intelligence to denying that race is a useful concept at all. Refutations of such PC positions arrive weekly as new reports indicate average IQ levels under 80 for blacks in South Africa³² and drug companies and America's National Institute of Health report medicines having differential efficacy for blacks and whites;³³ but PC remains weirdly intact even when scholars from Communist China report the main human races as having different biology and evolutionary histories³⁴ or when DNA criteria show higher-caste Hindus to be more similar to Europeans than to the Dravidian peoples displaced historically to southern India by waves of migrating Caucasians.³⁵

It has to be considered that factual claims are actually not central to PC, for all that enthusiasts may like to joust occasionally with hereditarians of the London School. It could be that PC is essentially a *moral dogma* in which case biological differences should

simply not be *mentioned* until they can be remedied. And therefore PC is simply not open to falsification. If so, PC has chosen a wise path. It was only when Christianity became over-confident about its geocentric cosmology and the separate and recent historical origin of the human species that it fell foul of science and spun into apparently irreversible decline.³⁶ It has to be considered that PC might even be able to ride through massive developments in eugenics and genetic engineering—mouthing its mantra that all biological causation is somehow ‘an interaction effect’ between proteins and social conditions. PC’s more shrewd supporters will soon realize the egalitarian potential of neo-eugenics if pursued under strict state control from leftists, so they will be eager to avoid any outright conflict with science and medicine. So long as psychologists and geneticists remained terrorized into avoiding straight talk in public about race, they might thus be allowed by PC to continue their work.

Altogether more troublesome for PC would be a revival of the family. The West’s massive progress in the twentieth century towards peace, health, affluence, sexual liberation, a clean environment, and scientific truth left one huge problem in its wake: that of broken families, unfathered children, and adults living increasingly alone. Crime in particular is linked to divorce, especially when IQ is low; and the twentieth century saw its new permissiveness prove disastrous for low-IQ and black people. Today, the one aspect of Asian life that an average Westerner might specially envy would be the cohesiveness of family life; and Western politicians will very likely turn to reviving, strengthening, and extending the family when they realize that the attempts to solve human social problems by both statism and individualism have left much to be desired.

Just which version of family life to encourage will need much discussion. Christians will presumably continue to prefer the largely monogamous family arrangements that were once officially central to higher class life-- even if many poorer people were effectively excluded and led their lives as ill-paid servants, sailors, wet nurses, and prostitutes. Fortunately, today there are happy diversions for those not willing or able to marry; whether individuals pursue “careers” or “alternative lifestyles” that fulfill hedonistic desires. But many improvements are surely possible—and necessary as people live longer and need more of the support that only a partner or partners of a lifetime can provide. In particular, if white people cannot be once more grouped into families, they will increasingly suck in third-world servant labour and thus risk obliterating their culture amidst awesome racial disharmony.

Almost certainly, some version of polygamy will have to be tolerated so as to deal with the two current problems of children being cut off by divorce or paternal imprisonment from their biological fathers. Yet once Christian monogamy is considered as only *one* possible lifestyle, many other options will come up for discussion. These will include the re-creation of extended families involving perhaps a dozen working adults, all providing each other support and keeping long-term commitments to the family’s children and elderly. If the state were to subsidize such part-voluntary, part-genetic *neo-families*³⁷ and assist them to make cheap but binding contracts, it would be able to unload on them some of the responsibilities for education, health, and welfare that are currently shouldered so tyrannously and

inefficiently by the state. At the same time, such new forms of community would provide intrinsic satisfaction and fulfilment to many.³⁸

Any such developments would seriously threaten PC. Any rebuilding of family life in the West would commonly involve people conspicuously choosing to share their lives with people who would often be similar to them, whether psychologically, genetically or both. PC may pose an attractive enough form of “good manners” while people are living increasingly isolated lives jumbled together in tower blocks, but it will be seen as a nonsense when people are increasingly shaping their lives around neo-kith and kin brought into contact with each other by the Internet and teleconferencing when not meeting in the flesh, but inevitably moving towards the acquisition of properties that will provide perfectly traditional “family seats.” Thus can the German and English traditions be put together—in neo-families that will take biology as their bedrock yet expeditiously assemble other members to assist with responsibilities.

Accompanied by the positive development of new familial arrangements, the liberation of Westerners from a single institution of marriage will be a major undertaking; and it would fall naturally to nationalists to encourage such developments—making for a continuation of a nation’s genes, choices, and traditions as family life invariably must. It is hard to see PC keeping pace with a world of thriving neo-families which would naturally insist that their own conversations were entirely private and not the business of “antiracist” or kindred snoopers. Moreover, nationalist politicians, seeing increasing proof that people thrive on freedom and responsibility, would surely extend offers of freedom in other areas too—notably allowing more customer choice in state schooling, in recreational drug use, and in the type of medical insurance people take out. The nationalist will remedy the ghetto-ization into which multiculturalism collapses by simply insisting that a certain percentage of neo-family members should have above-average knowledge of the country and its constitution and language—though some degree of familiarity with other cultures could also be required. By this relatively painless process, a sensible yet not stifling integration would be firmly encouraged, one that would instill a true appreciation of *cultural differences* rather than accept the *cultural suicide* of amalgamation. Already, California has shown the way forward: there, contrary to the propaganda of white multiculturalists, most Hispanic parents welcome attempts to have their children taught standard English at state schools.

Thus might a freedom-oriented nationalism (perhaps *National Liberalism*) increasingly come to provide the main alternative to the dangerous dogmas of PC. Hopefully it will not need yet more rioting in the streets before people opposed to neo-socialism realize what needs to be done. Enoch Powell himself, though he had two daughters from his late marriage in 1952, did not think much in biological terms. Undoubtedly that was one reason he could not provide a strong lead for Britain to address its racial problems. Probably this was why it proved so easy to suppress him and any realism about the multicultural follies being foisted on the West. At least, it is worth trying to undo his mistake.

Apart from his disinclination to talk biology, Powell set a fine example of how to combine nationalism with classical liberalism. He was an early advocate of divorce,

homosexual liberation, and abolition of the death penalty, and he did not oppose abortion until he was forced to use Ulster as his political base. The seemingly aloof expert on Herodotus left instructions with the Chaplain of Trinity College, Cambridge, to reveal after his death that at least one of the romantic affairs of his life had been homosexual³⁹—a further demonstration of how badly Powell had fitted the “fascist/authoritarian” mould that his enemies had shaped for him. Sadly, Powell’s enemies have had their way for thirty-three years—ironically realizing the truth of Powell’s own remark that “all political careers end in failure.” Today, it is time for England to solve the problem that Powell left—to fashion a classically liberal monoculture, firmly grounded in liberty, of which all Englishmen and their guests in their neo-families’ villas can be proud.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge my debts to my wife Shiou-yun Fang and to John Derbyshire’s articles “Lessons from an Asian Yugoslavia: Beware the Multiculti Society” and “The Island Race Riots: The English Have Created Their Very Own Race Problem from Scratch.” John Derbyshire’s articles were published in *National Review*, March 13, 2001 and May 31, 2001 respectively. The present article also drew on the useful articles about Enoch Powell at the following websites:

UK Freedom Party,
<http://www.bartleby.com/65/po/Powell-E.html>
<http://www.freerepublic.com/forum/a3aeedee02929.htm>,
http://www.findarticles.com/cf_0/m0FQP/4415_127/53857642/print.jhtml
<http://www.derbydeadpool.co.uk/deadpool1998/obituaries/enoch%20powell.htm> and
<http://b.cartage.org.lb/web/bio/bio/P/PowellEnoch/1.html>.
 The last of these URLs carries a fine picture of Powell.

*Chris Brand, 58, is the academic psychologist who was sacked in 1997 by Edinburgh University after a year of controversy concerning a book he had written about intelligence. **The g Factor: General Intelligence and Its Implications** was withdrawn by its American publisher, Wiley (New York), when Brand told journalists he agreed with what the “anti-racist” left had for a decade called “scientific racism.” Brand’s website is <http://www.crispian.demon.co.uk>.*

ENDNOTES

1. As early as 1957, the pioneering Chinese sociologist, Fei Xiaotong, had noted that “To doubt the superiority of collectivization is incorrect.” He hoped that no one would seize “on one or two of my sentences to argue that I am being negative.” Yet his concern for correctness and positivity had not gone far enough. Within a few months he was stripped of all his honorific posts, was labeled a “rightist” and forbidden to teach, publish, or conduct research on Chinese society (J. D. Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, New York: Norton, 2nd edition, 1999). The

degree of coercion is well documented in Jean-Louis Margolin's "China: A Long March into Night," in *The Black Book of Communism* (eds) by S. Courtois, N. Werth, et al. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1999), "The so-called brainwashing described by a number of Western observers was precisely that. There was nothing subtle about it; it was simply the rather brutal imposition of a heavy-handed ideology with a simplistic answer for everything. The essential point was to ensure that prisoners had no chance of individual expression" (p. 503).

2. In 1945, 5% of the UK's population received welfare. By 1998, the figure had grown to 30%.

3. Because of its reference to Virgil's prediction of war, during which Rome's River Tiber would foam with blood, Powell's warning became known as the "Rivers of Blood" speech. What Enoch had said was: "As I look ahead, I am filled with foreboding: like the Roman, I seem to see the River Tiber foaming with much blood. That tragic and intractable phenomenon which we watch with horror on the other side of the Atlantic but which there is interwoven with the history and existence of the States itself, is coming upon us here by our own volition and our own neglect. Indeed, it has all but come." Enoch later told his biographer-to-be, Simon Heffer, that he had only at the last moment decided to translate the Latin *Et Thybrim multo spumantem sanguine cerno* for his Wolverhampton audience. If he had not made this gift to the tabloid press, Powell would almost certainly have been able to champion race realism for rather longer among British political heavyweights.

4. The *Times* ran an editorial titled "An Evil Speech."

5. London's left-wing *Guardian* newspaper recorded in its February 11, 1998 Diary: "On Sunday, news of the death of Enoch Powell was broken on London Weekend Television by Trevor Phillips black and on BBC1 by Moira Stuart coloured. As for the *Guardian* report, this carried the by-lines of Vivek Chaudhary and Vikram Dodd. No doubt Mr Powell himself would have relished the irony as much as the rest of us." By this time, black people—though only 2% of Britain's population—were vastly over-represented in advertising, films, and the media, and not for the legitimate reasons that led them to provide some 10% of many soccer and athletic teams.

6. Responding to a long unsolved killing of a black youth in London, Britain's Labour Government of 1997 commissioned a report by a retired Scottish judge, Sir William Macpherson of Cluny. The media suspicion was that the police had conspired to enable four white youths to get away with murder following a street altercation. The report concluded that London's police were at least unconsciously or institutionally "racist" and liked giving blacks a hard time by the use of "stop and search" procedures. For a blow-by-blow account of this victory for PC, see *William McDougall NewsLetters*, Spring 1999 *et seq.*, beginning at <http://www.crispian.demon.co.uk/McDNLArch7.htm>.

7. Amusingly, that zealous body itself felt no obligation to employ representative numbers of *whites*. In 2001, 70% of the CRE's staff came from ethnic minorities.

8. The main change was to restrict the right of British passport holders to reside in Britain. British passports had been dispensed widely around the world during Britain's days of empire.

9. The Conservatives gave one such failed black candidate a peerage so as to express their faith in him—a confidence which he reciprocated cruelly in 2001 by publicly denouncing "racism" within the Party.

10. The Conservatives narrowly regained one Scottish seat in the 2001 General Election.

11. The BNP was traditionally thought to be low-IQ and to nurture anti-Semitism and flagrantly socialist economics. However, it is lately said to have been "modernized," is led by a Cambridge graduate, and fields spokesmen whose affability and reasonableness make a pleasing accompaniment to their robust denunciations of political correctness.

12. The Romans never fully appreciated the importance of genetics and often tried to make do with adoptive successors to the imperial purple.
13. English and Scottish law do not even attribute motherhood according to genetic principles: rather, a child's legal mother is the woman in whose womb the foetus grew.
14. In England, the original Celtic population had been largely replaced with Anglo-Saxons, Jutes, and Danish Vikings during the Dark Ages. After 1066, French rule was a thin veneer and had its effects chiefly at the very top of society—and within two centuries the Norman conquerors were speaking English.
15. The social-environmentalism of the English led first to a lack of sympathy for the genetically based Hindu caste system and secondly to the bizarre idea that India could become a multicultural democracy. In fact, partition and a million deaths resulted from fighting between Muslims and Hindus as soon as a Labour Government granted Indian independence in 1947.
16. Bismark was the best-known such realist; but another was Edinburgh University's distinguished Professor of Anatomy, Robert Knox, who tirelessly analysed the European scene with an eye to racial considerations and deplored race mixing as unworkable (e.g. *The Races of Man: A Fragment* [London: Renshaw], 1850).
17. Only since Prime Minister Tony Blair won his second General Election victory has there been talk of introducing a Green Card system—and that talk was initiated by confident Labour ministers with the world at their feet, and not by the nervous Conservatives, long cowed by what had happened to Enoch Powell.
18. The left-wing Labour Leader, Michael Foot, always maintained that Powell was not a racist; and Powell was in fact very popular with his Pakistani constituents because of his fluency in Urdu.
19. Emeritus Professor Richard Lynn has shown that the losing nations of World War II have higher levels of anxiety/neuroticism; but the direction of cause and effect is strictly unknown.
20. The USA likewise took in Irishmen to undertake dirty, difficult, and dangerous work of which blacks were not capable. (By contrast, America's black slaves were reserved for the arduous but uncomplicated duties of the plantations.) In America, as in Britain, immigrant Irish long provided solid support for the political left—which was why Britain's Labour Government of 1949 gave the vote to the one million citizens of E'ire who were then living in Britain for employment purposes.
21. For a summary of and riposte to the psychology in the Swann Report, see C. R. Brand, "What Can State Schools Do to Help Black Children?" *Personality & Individual Differences* 8 (1987), pp. 453-455.
22. In fact, low-income Indian and Pakistani immigrants presented no comparable problem of lawlessness.
23. Though Keith Vaz had eventually to resign following numerous allegations of petty corruption.
24. For example, the only regularly published exposure of black criminality in London came from the black journalist, Darcus Howe, in his weekly column in the *New Statesman*. Howe frequently drew attention to the "Yardie" gangs that were pushing east London towards the same sorry fate as Kingston, Jamaica.
25. Since paedophilic downloadings from the Internet are now criminal, it will not be long before "racist" downloadings go the same way.

26. William Hague's speech was made to party faithful convened in Harrogate on March 4.
27. Just like old-style socialists, neosocialists are determined to undermine such institutions as the "elitist" universities, the "hidebound" and "sexist" military, the "racist" police and, above all, the "antiquated," "homophobic," and unduly eugenic institution of the Christian family.
28. At the time of writing, Aborigine politicians in Australia have outraged feminists by saying that women's allegations of rape are sometimes fabricated (*Sydney Morning Herald*, June 20, 2001). Aboriginal magistrate Patricia O'Shane attacked fellow female Aboriginal leaders Lowitja O'Donohue and Evelyn Scott, describing them as "bleeding-heart, bleating middle-class feminists" who had themselves done nothing to combat violence against women in their communities. Ms O'Shane has a reputation for realism, having done more than other Aboriginal leaders to expose the genuinely high level of abusiveness shown by Aborigine men to their women and children. (An Aboriginal Women's Task Force recently reported "a young three-year-old child that had been pack-raped"—*Sydney Morning Herald* editorial, June 23, 2001.)
29. At the time of writing, a leading Egyptian feminist is on trial in Cairo for apostasy. Critics are demanding she be forcibly divorced from her husband because of her critical remarks about Islam.
30. The proclivities of human mothers towards infanticide of unwanted or unhealthy babies are set out in Sarah Blaffer Hrdy's *Mother Nature* (London : Chatto & Windus, 1999).
31. Lynn's recent books *Dysgenics* and *Eugenics* were published by Praeger, a mail order house.
32. See "AFRICAN IQ OF 84—AND THAT'S IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS!" in *McDougall NewsLetter*, February 16, 1999 [<http://www.crispian.demon.co.uk/McDNLArch6b.htm>].
33. One recent study found that, for genetic reasons, the African body manufactures more of the enzyme CYP3A5 (*Nature Genetics* 27 [2001], 383-391). Members of the CYP3A family are known to inactivate half of all drugs, including HIV protease inhibitors, immune suppressing agents and anti-cancer chemicals; thus Africans will sometimes require different medical treatments from whites.
34. See *Nature*, October 15, 1998 (News & Views) or *McDougall NewsLetter*, November 3, 1998 [<http://www.crispian.demon.co.uk/McDNLArch5b.htm>].
35. See *Science*, June 1, 2001 (Random Samples)
36. If only Christianity had been able to hang on till scientists had to resort to the "Big Bang" theory—which looks compatible enough with the Book of Genesis—it might have been salvageable, especially because its own primary concern with the state of the human heart is readily reconciled with modern psychoanalytic, psychometric and sociobiological concerns as to the deep truths about human nature and its possible improvement.
37. *Neofamilies* were first advocated in the *McDougall NewsLetter* 27 (July 1999). A comparable proposal to "re-invent family life" and go "beyond the nuclear family" was put forward by Helen Wilkinson in *New Statesman*, August 9, 1999.
38. The article "Get Real About Race!," in the UK hip-hop music magazine *downlow*, offers a popularly written advocacy of polygyny for black men (and perhaps others) and a more general proposal of high-commitment but self-chosen marital contracts. The great Christian theologians Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, and Melancthon all tolerated polygamy to varying degrees; the Bible's greatest hymn to real love is the Song of Songs, written by a polygamist for a single woman he was courting; one of Christ's parables concerned ten virgins all waiting for a bridegroom to come; and in England bigamy was only made a criminal offence in the seventeenth century (<http://polygamy.com/Reviews/Multiple-Marriage.htm>). Polygyny was first

urged on the West using empirical considerations by G. J. Ravisini, *Die anthropologische Bedeutung der Polygamie*, (Vienna: Instituts-Ravasini), 1930—see <http://www.polyamory.org/Howard/sociology.html>. The West's most sustained practice of polygamy has been by America's Mormons—see Malise Ruthven, "The Mormons' Progress," *The Wilson Quarterly* 15: 2, Spring 1991.

39. Enoch had particularly drawn the Chaplain's attention to the following lines in his *First Poems* (published 1988):

And since our parting is decreed
 By laws we cannot break,
 The severed tissues long will bleed
 And long the wound will ache.