RACE
and
POLITICS

The Myth of Racial Equality

by

H. B. Isherwood

The Racial Preservation Society

RACE and POLITICS

The Myth of Racial Equality

by

H. B. Isherwood

By the same author:

Racial Contours: The Factor of Race in Human Survival
Times Press Limited (1965)

Racial Integration: The Rising Tide of Colour
Britons Publishing Company (1965)

Man's Racial Nature: An Exposure of the False Propaganda of the United Nations
The Racial Preservation Society (1969)

Religion and the Racial Controversy: The False Propaganda of the Church
The Racial Preservation Society (1970)

Race and Nationhood: The Menace of Multiracialism
The Racial Preservation Society (1972)

Racial Kinship: The Dominant Factor in Nationhood
The Racial Preservation Society (1974)

Man's Racial Nature, Racial Kinship, Religion & Racial Controversy and Race & Politics are available from R.P.S.. Send S.A.E. for full list of publications on race and allied topics – to:
R.P.S., Chapel Ascote, Ladbroke, Southam, Warwickshire, England

RACE and POLITICS

The Myth of Racial Equality

by

H. B. Isherwood

CONTENTS

First Impression 1978

Printed and Published by The Racial Preservation Society,
Chapel Ascote, Ladbroke, Southam, Warwickshire

RACE and POLITICS

The Myth of Racial Equality

"The practical question before mankind is how to devise fair methods of co-operation and work out a mixed and various world society . . . This is not to be done by ignoring race and racial differences; the natural thought forms, and dispositions and instinctive reactions of northern Europeans and Jews, Negroes and Whites, Indians and Chinese, vary subtly and profoundly; you can no more ignore differences of race than differences of sex. They are things greatly intensified and supplemented by differences of tradition, training and conditions, but when all such modifications are eliminated, essential differences remain. Intermarriage provides no remedy but rather a multiplication of types. If races are to be brought together, and not merely jumbled together . . . an educational effort has to be made on an altogether unprecedented scale."

Is Race Conflict Unavoidable? H. G. Wells (19th July 1924)

"Constitutions are easily copied, temperaments are not, and if it should happen that the borrowed constitution and the native temperament fail to correspond, the misfit may have serious results."

The British Constitution Walter Bagehot. Preface by Lord Balfour (1920)

"I will say, then, that I am not, never have been, in favour of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races — that I am not, nor ever have been, in favour of making voters or jurors of Negroes — nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together, there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favour of having the superior position assigned to the white race."

Speech at Springfield, Illinois, by Abraham Lincoln (17th July 1858)

"A man should, whatever happens, keep to his own caste, race, and breed. Let the White go to the White and the Black to the Black — unless he wants a disaster."

Beyond the Pale, Rudyard Kipling (1890)

RACE and POLITICS

The Myth of Racial Equality

1. NATURAL INEQUALITIES

Probably the greatest single cause of the political turmoil disfiguring the world today is the Marxist or Socialist pretence that human beings are distinguishable only by their class in society or their religion or by the property they own, and that otherwise, irrespective of the race or nation to which they belong, are fundamentally equal to each other in nature, all endowed at birth with identical abilities, talents or potentialities, all instinctively seeking the same ends throughout life, and that if all had the same education or upbringing under similar conditions, with equal opportunities, could all reach the highest levels of the mind. Offending commonsense and contrary to all human experience, such a socially and nationally disruptive doctrine, both fallacious and absurd, has nevertheless been accepted in principle by the United Nations and has now been written into the laws of certain multiracial nations, including England and America, where the political pursuit of fictitious equality is having demoralising consequences.

The source of such aberrated political thinking can without difficulty be traced to the egalitarian revolutionaries of 18th century France. Typical of their ideas is Babeuf's *Manifesto of Equals (1796)* in which we read: "Let there be no other difference between men than that of age and sex. Since all have the same needs and the same faculties, let there be only one education, one kind of food . . . and the same portion and the same quality of food suffice for each of them." Fanatically obsessed with notions of abstract equality, Babeuf could not see the paradox that in a democracy of equals unequals rise to the top, and he was duly guillotined by the Terror he did so much to create.

After bringing his mind to bear on egalitarianism, Dr. Samuel Johnson, scholar and humanitarian, than whom there was no greater down-to-earth realist, shrewdly observed: ". . . mankind are happier in a state of inequality and subordination. Were they to be in this pretty state of equality, they would degenerate into brutes — their tails would grow."

The disciples and heirs of the French egalitarians are the Marxists, Communists, Socialists, Liberals and political Churchmen

of today, who, believing themselves to be missionaries and theorising themselves out of reality, are not prepared to concede that equal opportunities inevitably reveal unequal capabilities.

As with individuals, so with races. Clearly it is not reasonable to squeeze people of contrasting natures into a common mould, nor could they be permanently regimented to think alike by doctrinal methods. The evolutionary gap dividing the races is deep and wide and cannot be bridged by arbitrary Procrustean laws. To treat people before the law as though they were racially all alike in nature evokes a sense of injustice. The natural and healthy tendency for "birds of a feather to flock together" is disregarded by Marxists who imagine that it is possible to iron out by law the variations between racial groups with different instincts living in a multiracial society. Marxist attempts by universal race-mixing to downgrade everyone to a common level give rise to false expectations, as we see in England and America, the predictable oucome of which is envy, discontent, social instability and discord, with a decline in traditional standards and national disciplines. The key to civilised progress is racial preservation, a fact not yet fully realised by political theorists who are inclined to ignore the basic biological factor, the compelling force that lies behind cultural and historical change.

Assertions made, usually by Jewish talmudic publicists who believe in the preservation of their own race, that each race has a social or cultural origin only and has only emerged as a human conglomerate during comparatively recent historical times is not history but Marxist propaganda. It may be true that certain sub-races, of which the Jews provide an outstanding example, have been kept relatively intact by the development of exclusive cultural or cohering religious forms, but these were subsequent developments. Most peoples growing up in isolation and becoming tribally or communally self-conscious have invented gods and myths to account for their origins and this has tended to keep them homogeneous and united as nations.

In the final analysis it cannot properly be said that tribes and nations, together with their contrasting civilisations and barbarisms, are the product of "cultural change and challenge" alone — as Toynbee, the world historian, following Marx seems to suggest along Hegelian lines. Cultural forms are superficial and transient. Below and preceding them, and indeed giving rise to them, are the impulses and compulsions, the complex instincts of biological qualities associated with variations in the brain and neural structures implanted by natural evolution. In short, nature governs nurture.

To the more devout who believe that God created the separate races for His purpose it may seem that much of what is now

confirmed by science about the origin of man and his races on earth conflicts with Holy Writ and religious dogma, but this need not be the case if due regard be had to the symbolic or allegorical nature of the Babylonian or Semitic folklore of the Old Testament. As part of this folklore the picturesque story in *Genesis 10* of how the races were originally created should not be accepted as historically true. The races were in fact in the pipeline of terrestrial evolution long ages before the Flood.

Nevertheless, by distilling fact from fable it could quite reasonably be concluded that the separation of the races one from the other as recorded in the Bible had divine sanction, providentially purposive in the universal scheme of things, not to be revoked by man. In pursuance of this belief in the purposive creation of the human races, some theologians admonish: "What God has done, let no man undo." Others, however, with leanings towards Marxism, prefer the misleading slogan "only one race, the human race," the war-cry of those who are sensitively aware of their inferiority.

2. RACIAL ORIGINS

Because of the radical nature of racial biological differences (and also for strict taxonomic reasons) not all scientists are ready to classify mankind as a single zoological species. Be that as it may, there is ample evidence to show that the primary existing races, though now possibly interfertile, are the descendants of variants of more than one archaic species of ape-like creatures who were inhabiting the earth over a million years ago. But all the races did not reach the level of *homo sapiens* at the same time, the Caucasoid, for example, preceding the Negroid by over 200,000 years. This fact alone may be sufficient to account for the comparative historical backwardness and cultural failure of the Negroid people and their negligible contribution to civilisation. And some races have already become extinct, while others, for example the Australian Aborigines (described by anthropologists as Stone Age fixtures), the Veddahs of Sri Lanka (formerly Ceylon) and southern India, and the non-Mongoloid Ainu of Japan have plainly reached the paracme of their evolutionary lines with no hope of recovery. Nor is there much hope of survival in intact racial form of the Amerinds, the Mongoloid American Indians, the indigenes of the Western Hemisphere.

Taking a realistic view of mankind anthropologists and other serious students of natural history now generally agree that the main factor underlying the cosmic process that has lifted man up from a more primitive or brutish condition has been racial

variability, not uniformity, each ethnic entity having been evolved with constitutional or biological characteristics peculiarly its own and which gave it an advantage for survival in a special environment. Indeliby implanted by God-given natural laws such organic variations can now be seen reflected in the history of each nation, in its general character, the personality of its people, their customs and culture. These qualities are measurable, thus making national and racial comparisons possible and discrimination rational without prejudice.

3. BIOLOGICAL BASIS OF RACES

A thorough understanding, free from preconceptions and prejudices, of the way mankind has been diversified by nature into disparate races may perhaps best be reached if some reference, however brief, be made to the complex structure of organic life as seen through the eyes of specialist authorities on the subject. First revealed by the experiments of J. G. Mendel and later successfully shown by Sir Francis Galton to apply to human beings, the fundamental factors determining inheritable or intrinsic qualities are now called genes. Sir Ronald Fisher, Sir Julian Huxley, Ruggles Gates, J. B. S. Haldane, C. D. Darlington, Carleton S. Coon, John R. Baker and indeed all other scientists of repute in the relevant fields agree that the human races as constituted today differ fundamentally from each other according to the genes which they possess. Scientists whose subject is molecular biology have probed deeply into the chemical or elemental structure of genes, even to the extent of suggesting that "it is in our DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid, the bridge between the inanimate and the animate) that sets the basic physical limits of what we can or cannot do." Physical limits, including cerebral development, set the seal on mental growth, the frontier beyond which man on earth cannot go.

Evolutionary transformation upwards along divergent lines depends primarily on chemical changes (mutations) in the genes, caused by spontaneous subatomic stimuli, or in new gene combinations which have value for survival in a specific environment and which in the course of procreation, uncontaminated by migratory intrusion, establish pools of inheritable qualities of varying racial excellence. It is out of such genetic pools that races or variations of the human species, involving gregarious instincts (and ultimately nations), are formed as an integral part of the organic structure of nature. Any interbreeding between such pools, especially if entailing miscegenation, would inevitably tend to eliminate the finer or more highly developed genetic qualities and thus impede further evolutionary progress. In less technical

terms, it may be stated in short that when two races mix and interbreed the more advanced race suffers. It is not unreasonable to suggest that genetic drift or migration across the racial evolutionary lines has irrevocably saddled mankind with many of the congenital malaises and apparently ineradicable imperfections (morphological anomalies) from which it suffers today.

It is important to keep in mind that although genes may be intermingled in one animal (a human being for instance) in the way vinegar may be mixed with water, they cannot be fused or blended as some Marxist scientists suppose. As indivisible and inviolable entities genes retain their character intact from generation to generation — unless, of course, subject to subatomic action as stated above. From this it will be appreciated that selective breeding along eugenic lines over a number of generations the descendants of racial mixtures could in some cases atavistically assume the form and nature of either of their first crossbreeding forebears. Darwin, who inferred the existence of gemmules (now called genes) in his theory of pangenesis, proved that by allowing domestic pigeons to interbreed, even though they were vastly dissimilar in appearance, it was possible to reproduce pigeons indistinguishable from the wild Himalayan rock dove from which all varieties of pedigree pigeons had been bred by artificial selection. And both the extinct tarpan (horse) and the extinct aurochs (ox) have been reproduced by selective crossbreeding of modern domestic pedigree animals. These cases prove genetic persistence, as all stockbreeders know. Thus it may be explained, though perhaps not in every detail, how it comes about that many Negroes in the Western Hemisphere, atavistic throwbacks, inherit coal-black skins, lanate hair and other specific Negroid characteristics of body (and mind) despite their having part non-Negroid ancestry. However, the Frankenstein suggestion made in all seriousness by some scientists that it would be possible to transform a black man into a white man, with a corresponding change in mind and personality, by a synthetic process called genetic engineering (eugenic selection or alternatively the surgical transplant of genes) is not likely to get beyond the realm of imaginative speculation.

For reasons too complex for elaboration here, certain inheritable modifications are irreversible, and being more often than not dysgenic or retrogressive constitute an ever-present threat to mankind's future development. Taking a long view, it may not be stretching imagination too far to suggest that as nations degenerate through race-mixing and hybridisation (cross-breeding) as advocated by Marxists (but significantly not for the Jewish race) so could the whole human species become static or revert to a more primitive condition, the prelude to decay and

extinction. Though at present seeming to be inevitable such a decline could be avoided if the eugenic theories first enunciated by Sir Francis Galton be nationally applied to preserve the better racial qualities by appropriate selective mating.

It has been argued by some scientists — even by Sir Julian Huxley — that because of man's increasing technical ability to control his natural environment he shields himself from the discriminatory pressures of evolution and thus has remained organically static or unaltered genetically for some 10,000 years. This appears to be yet another of the illusions or fallacies being perpetuated by philosophers who seek to confuse the racial issue by assuming that society alone is changing, not man himself. It is of course true that a modern European Nordic man may resemble an ancient European Cromagnon man of 12,000 years ago in many anatomical respects, but we are not considering individual man, but nations and mankind as a whole, i.e. the human species, which is built up of racial elements originating at different times in different territories, and of fluctuating degrees of evolutionary advancement. In short our concern is with "the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life" — to quote the subtitle Darwin gave to his *Origin of Species*. We know from the demographic statistics of the United Nations that the growth of the species is not the same for all races, birthrates and deathrates both differing between races in substantial percentages. The creative people of Europe whose more complex or more subtle qualities have contributed so much to modern civilisation are not keeping pace in numbers with races not so cerebrally favoured by nature, thus changing, perhaps irredeemably and to its evolutionary disadvantage, the genetic balance and character of the entire human species.

An important internal biological classification of racial significance relates to blood group differences. Serological analysis has revealed that specific cellular blood groups or their combinations belong to particular races, even though comparisons furnish some evidence of archaic racial mixing — or perhaps a common inheritance from an earlier anthropoid species. The inherited blood condition known as 'sickle cell anaemia' found in Negroes originated in Africa as a genetic mutation that afforded some prophylactic protection against certain kinds of malaria. Outside the malarial belt it is injurious to the race. It is still present in Negroes living in the Western Hemisphere. It has also been found in Negroid halfbreeds, which means that it may be dangerously transmissible to non-Negroid races, a powerful argument against indiscriminately mixing certain racial breeds in multiracial societies. A noteworthy example of an inherited cellular defect is found in Jews of Semitic breed and in no other race, and which

actually tends to curtail their birthrate. Medical records show that the incidence of illness is not the same for all races, the congenital susceptibility to disease varying between them. Lacking a certain enzyme indispensable for digestion, Negroids in adulthood should avoid the lactic diets more suitable for the Caucasoid races. Such imponderables as racial allergies have been reported and these also no doubt have a physiological basis.

It is often argued by egalitarians, concerned more with quantity than quality, that the observable racial differences, far too many to list here, pale into insignificance when set against the number of similarities, an argument without much substance or relevance, since what is being discussed relates to the anatomical and physiological factors not inherited equally by all races or subraces — nor, for that matter, by any of the anthropoid primates.

Of the outward characteristics by which races can be identified colour of skin is the most conspicuous, but not the most important, except as a badge of identification. The skin colour referred to is genotypic, that is, inherently implanted by evolutionary sifting over thousands of years, unlike the phenotypic suntanning temporarily acquired by people with light-coloured skins. In general dark skins (and dark eyes) vary according to the amount of melanin (granules of dark pigment) in the system, but the genetic formula is not the same for all coloured races. Resentment is roused in multiracial communities in England and America by the crude official lumping together of all non-white people under the generalised head of colour. The yellow-tinted skins of most Mongoloids and the nearly black skins of Asiatic Indians (not to mention the sallow Red Indians of the Mongoloid Amerinds) have a genetic foundation that differs from that of the African Negroes, evidence of age-old racial divergence.

Even if they lived under natural conditions in tropical Africa for 10,000 years Nordic families with white skins, blue eyes and fair hair would not acquire Negroid characteristics. In the evolutionary scheme of things light skins are advantageous in temperate or polar zones; dark skins are more advantageous in equatorial zones. From this it could be predicted that the Negroid migration northward from the tropics to Europe and North America will ultimately be limited by natural selection despite artificial protection.

4. RACIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES

Of all the many characteristics that distinguish and irrevocably divide the human races by far and away the most important in the scale of human values are those relating to the cerebral qualities

or mental faculties.

School teachers know from class-room experience that some pupils are mentally brighter than others and — what is more important — percipient teachers know that in general such relative brightness has an origin deeper than the home life of the pupil although this does have some influence on the pupil's attitudes. Studies in the educability of school children in multiracial schools in England decisively reveal that Negroid pupils invariably fall behind the others in lessons despite being born and bred in England in domestic circumstances no different from English children. The explanation of this phenomenon — as conspicuous in America as it is in England — is complex, suffice it to say here, what perhaps to the unprejudiced mind is already obvious, that it is directly associated with a congenital discrepancy in the Negroid brain.

Notwithstanding the volume of factual information to the contrary, the British Museum put out a statement in 1977 that "there is no scientific evidence to distinguish human races in terms of intelligence or their relationship to gorillas" — a preposterous piece of Marxist mendacity officially sponsored by the Socialist Government.

In I.Q. tests over fifty years it has been convincingly established (as confirmed by Shuey, Jensen, Eysenck and others competent to assess the evidence) that on the scale of natural or inborn intelligence, uninfluenced by environment, the Negroids and the Australoids fall considerably below the average of other races, including the Mongoloids (Chinese and Japanese) and most of the dark-skinned races of the Indian Sub-Continent. It has been noted in America that Amerinds, greatly underprivileged as they are, score higher I.Q. marks than Negroes from better-class homes.

An important element in basic mental differences, as in physical differences, which must be taken into consideration, is the varying rates of maturation between the races, the Negroids on average excelling in neural response in early growth, a precocity, needless to say, not maintained into adulthood. Of evolutionary significance is the exceptional simian clinging instinct of newly-born Negro babies.

However, it is not merely in basic intelligence (cognitive ability, educability, adaptability, creativeness, etc.) that individuals and races differ intrinsically, but in all subjective aspects, in temperaments, tastes, natural inclinations and aptitudes, as was explained years ago by Sir Francis Galton and later by Sir Cyril Burt, the renowned educationalist, who sensibly taught that children should be encouraged to develop their inborn bents and talents.

Despite the evidence of science and history to the contrary,

Marxists persistently claim that because of grades of ability between individuals within each race, coupled with fringe racial interbreeding, it is not feasible to isolate each race or to measure and compare racial or other human group averages and therefore one race or subrace cannot properly for political action be deemed to be superior to another by any criterion or objective frame of reference. Proceeding logically from the totally false premise of racial equality, this can only be regarded as specious propaganda conceived to confuse the issue. The supposition that only the characteristics of individuals, not social or group averages, are susceptible to rational evaluation or comparison is carried to the lengths of dishonesty and absurdity when it goes so far as to include nationalities and even the sexes. Behind such spurious indoctrination to dissuade the citizen from identifying himself with his own people and land may be detected an ulterior motive, a sinister intention with the object of weakening all sense of national loyalty and with it any warm feelings of patriotism.

Whatever conclusions may be acceptable to politicians for their purposes the irrefutable fact remains that there are profound variations in inherited brain-power between the races, on average the Caucasoids and Mongoloids being on balance demonstrably superior to the Negroids in cognitive, rational and creative capacities, a conclusion on which all anthropologists competent to assess the evidence agree. Where in a few instances individual Negroids have scored higher marks than average in I.Q. tests, this overlap may be attributed to some Caucasoid or Mongoloid admixture, the isolated product of genetic drift between racial pools. Also to be brought into consideration are inborn temperamental variations, particularly those found amongst the Caucasoids, the most variable of the primary races. Furthermore, there are well marked racial patterns of sensuousness.

It is becoming increasingly obvious to minds not obsessed with the malignant myth of racial uniformity that if mankind is to progress into the future in any worthwhile form it must be rationally organised on some principle of racial exclusiveness or social segregation.

5. THE GREAT LAMARCKIAN FALLACY

As fundamentally fallacious as the concept of inborn human equality is the still widely-held belief that qualities acquired in mind and body by parents during their lifetime could be passed on in the flesh to their children. This erroneous belief was first given scientific currency by the French naturalist and evolutionist, Lamarck, as an integral factor in his hypothesis of the dynamics

of evolutionary change. Knowing nothing of genetics Lamarck thought that efficiency in adaptation promoted by environmental stimulus in one generation became inherent and could thus be transmitted to the next generation. From his theory it came to be imagined that giraffes (to quote the classical example) developed their exceptionally long necks by habitually stretching up to reach the more succulent shoots on the tops of acacia trees on which they fed in their natural habitat and that any increase in the length of their necks thus acquired by stretching was reproduced in their offspring. Darwin's alternative explanation is more simple — and indeed self-evident. It is that the animals of the species (possibly somewhat like the okapi, now almost extinct) out of which giraffes have been evolved were not uniform in stature or identical in nature (any more than men are today) and that those amongst them genetically endowed with slightly longer necks, which enabled them more readily to obtain the food best suited to them, became stronger and better fitted (with correlated factors) to reproduce their kind than others not so well-adapted, a process recurring with accumulative effect in succeeding generations with almost imperceptible slowness, but with the "inevitability of gradualness," each single step being infinitesimally small.

Instincts are inborn; habits are acquired later. Heredity and environment may work inseparably together, but in principle the two categories are not logically susceptible to comparison in terms of priority and value in the universal framework of things.

Under the general head of "the inheritance of acquired characteristics" the theory propounded by Lamarck was most plausible and up to Darwin's time seemed convincing. Even today, when it is completely discredited, some thinkers are reluctant to discard the theory entirely since it does seem to fit in with their political or religious preconceptions and prejudices. Up to a few years ago the Lamarckian concept was considered to be an indispensable tenet of Marxist ideology and was ruthlessly applied by Stalin in the U.S.S.R. in the belief that by ceaseless indoctrination later generations of Soviet citizens would be born with an enhanced inclination towards materialistic Communism. The theory was also applied to animals and vegetation (in particular wheat) with such abortive results, however, that it has now been discarded by the Soviet commissars. Further, absurd as it may seem, the idea is still being harboured by certain Churchmen that training in Christian ethics, if continuously given, would in the end result in children being born with an inherent Christian outlook — a totally unwarranted hope. The Marxist supposition that children of different races in a multiracial nation would eventually be born with like minds if their parents grew up together under a

common culture can be dismissed as meretricious wishful thinking. Characteristics culturally acquired are not inheritable. Each generation has to be taught anew.

It is now accepted by science as axiomatically. true that biological modifications, including psychological and personality traits, acquired in one generation by education, training, exercise, dietetics, drugs or any other form of environmental influence or conditioning cannot possibly be transmitted in the blood (or genes) to the succeeding generation, a fundamental truth not yet acknowledged by politicians with Marxist propensities who for personal purposes persist in claiming that social changes under man-made laws alone will permanently ensure racial harmony in a racially mixed community.

6. MULTIRACIAL DEMOCRACY (GREAT BRITAIN)

Experience is now beginning to prove that democracy as applied in the Marxian manner is not necessarily the best form of government if the end desired be universal happiness with social harmony or the fulfilment of Utopian dreams. To be of real value to civilised society public representation demands more than the application of the crude formula of 'one man, one vote', which is based on a concept of equality and which inevitably leads to ochlocracy (organised mob law) or autocracy. Also it is clearly not desirable for candidates for electoral or governmental power to be chosen on gounds of wealth alone, as is now advocated by the Board of Deputies of British Jews and by some Socialists, e.g. Sir Harold Wilson, who themselves, with little dignity or compunction, have as professional agitators in the Labour Party climbed to affluence, social status and privilege on the backs of the unsuspecting labouring classes. To be ameliorative democracy requires something more civilised than mercenary attitudes. It must stand on intelligence, education, understanding, proven ability and honesty, conjoined with the disciplined sense of fraternal purpose that is only to be found in a gregarious instinct with racial pride within the bond of natural affinity and nationhood.

Equal suffrage may confer equal privilege, but it cannot confer equal nature. Freedom comes from a sense of independence, self-reliance and security. Collective responsibility of equals is little more than a political device for evading personal blame if things go wrong. To demand by law that which does not exist in reality offers little hope of better administration or an improved society in which more personal freedom can be enjoyed without anarchy.

Putting volume before value and ignoring discrepancies in

natural ability and merit, Marxism cannot therefore be regarded as a true or commendable form of democracy. It does explain, however, why Marxism in its guise of Socialism, with its assertion of drab utilitarian values, makes some appeal to the failures in society, to the less gifted and more gullible elements — and to racial minority groups striving as immigrants to gain privileges or a status to which the national indigenous host community alone is entitled by prior right of heritage.

It may not be irrelevant to observe here that in Great Britain Socialist trade unionism, "the dictatorship of the proletariat," with its Communist closed shop exclusiveness, its class warfare inciting envy, its rejection of private endeavour and enterprise, and its negation of freedom of choice, together with its lack of consideration for the public weal, forbids under ruthless Marxist rules any discussion of racial or patriotic urges and motives. Subversively using trade union power in 1978, Marxists or Communists attempted to deprive Englishmen who belonged to or supported patriotic bodies of the right to work. Seeing in the dynastic succession of the Crown a racial phenomenon which republicans and egalitarians abhor, trade union militants seize every opportunity to disparage the British Monarchy. Blindly believing in Marx and enjoining equal treatment for all, trade unionism, with unconscious inconsistency, nevertheless presses for preferential treatment (differentials) for its more powerful and privileged members.

Up to 1939 the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* defined a nation as a "distinct race or people having common descent, language, history, etc." In later editions, however, this has been amended to read a "congeries of people, either of diverse races or of common descent, language, etc." This change in the meaning was officially made to accommodate unassimiliable racial immigrant elements proliferating in the United Kingdom. The revised definition is peculiarly appropriate in the Western Hemisphere, particularly in the U.S.A. and Brazil, two nations in which it is predicted ill-assorted multiracialism will eventually inhibit social and national cohesion and thus impose a severe handicap on real progress towards a stable and better society.

It is further interesting to note that in the dictionary "to naturalise" is defined as "to admit (alien) to citizenship." "To nationalise" would have been a more appropriate and realistic term since "to naturalise" implies a change in nature, and "natural integration" within a nation is neither possible nor desirable. Negroes or Asiatics or Jews born in England do not become English by that fact, any more than kittens born in a kipper box become kippers.

Multiracialism may be defined as a political system whereby

different races, whether interbreeding or not, live together under one national government, in contrast to racialism, which means a nation of people of one race, common descent and heritage, a far more enlightened political concept.

As the hostility of the English people to the discordant intrusion into their midst by alien races, particularly those with dark skins, became more stridently articulate, the House of Commons, as a gesture of appeasement, were moved to set up a Select Committee on Race Relations and Immigration — the customary Parliamentary procedure for avoiding taking urgently any constructive or positive action. The Committee were severely handicapped at the outset by misleading official statistics, apparently deliberately falsified, but as the years rolled by they were nevertheless presented with substantial evidence of the social dislocation, disruption and crime caused by promiscuous immigration, yet they were not sufficiently unanimous or willing until March 1978 to make any specific recommendation as to who should (or should not) be adopted or regarded as a British subject. They did recommend, however, that English people with English forbears or blood relatives (patrials, except from Rhodesia) should have some prior right to live in England on a par with other British subjects. On other counts, however, the Committee completely ignored the all-important racial factor (all races being inherently alike to them), except to discriminate against immigrant families from the Indian sub-continent — but on an unrealistic basis, more geographic or national than ethnic. Nor did the Committee advance any proposals under which unassimilable and unwanted immigrants could be returned to their own families and relatives in their homelands of origin, a humane procedure necessary if perpetual racial acrimony and social strife are to be avoided.

By bringing the Empire to an end and with it all imperial responsibilities the United Kingdom has been absolved from any moral or legal obligations to accept as British subjects in England members of the overspill populations of nations which have irrevocably renounced their allegiance to the British Crown. Despite this, British politicians of all persuasions, cynically indifferent to the well-being and future of their own kinsfolk, have over the years taken no practical steps to stop the disruptive and needless influx into England of massive numbers of people of non-British breeds from countries no longer under British suzerainty.

Round about the turn of the century, abnormal immigration into England, mostly of Jews from eastern Europe, gave rise to serious misgivings, and in Parliament anti-immigration bills to control the situation were drafted, but were not passed into law. The question as to whether there was any danger, social or

national, in adulterating the English community with people of alien stock was apparently not discussed again (except with regard to the citizenship of Chinese discharged from the Army) until 1920, when it was found expedient to include an ethnic factor in the National Census of that year to determine the number of Jewish immigrants, which had reached alarming proportions. Another twenty years were to go by when towards the end of 1947 the problem arose in an acute form as to the desirability or otherwise of recruiting aliens of uncertain loyalties (Negroids, Mongoloids, Asiatic Indians and Pakistanis) into the armed forces of the Crown at a time when the Empire was being broken up. The Socialist Government, true to the Marxist dogma of racial equality, saw no reason why men of any race should be excluded from serving in the British Army, Navy and Air Force, or in the civil police, a decision fully supported by Conservative politicians, who, during the Macmillan régime, even sent a military team to the Fiji Islands in the Pacific to recruit Polynesians who were being turned out of their islands by Indian immigrants.

An event of national and racial significance occurred in 1958 when a number of young Englishmen in London were charged with "making an affray" with Negro immigrants they thought had been molesting their girl friends. These English youths were savagely sentenced to four years' imprisonment by a race-conscious Jewish judge, which not unnaturally had the effect of alerting the English community to the danger threatening them. Predictably racial tensions continued to grow, with social disturbance and lawlessness increasing, yet nothing was done to ease the situation.

As time went on with diminishing hope (Parliament being cynically unresponsive to the declared wishes of the electorate) of any abatement in the mounting multiracial chaos, the racial minority enclaves became more aggressive and better organised as part of the Marxist technique of national subversion from within, and under international Jewish sponsorship there came to be placed on the Statute Book the controversial *Race Relations Act (1965)*, in an attempt to proscribe all public exhibitions of patriotic or nationalist zeal. Under this Act Englishmen, worthy of more honour than the Tolpuddle Martyrs, were treated as common criminals for openly expressing their dislike of the erosion of their ethos and hard-won liberties. Discrimination in favour of one's own family or people, if British, has been made illegal, such commendable discrimination being condemned as racial prejudice or "racial hatred". It has even been made unlawful for an Englishman to sell his own home to an Englishman if he wants to. Nor is a Briton any longer allowed to identify himself with his own nation, such patriotic conduct being considered provocative. Pursuing their erosive policy of Marxist racial

integration and provocation the Government appointed in April 1978 an Indian judge to preside over English Courts of Law, even allowing him to wear in court a turban as his emblem of racial or tribal pride, his religion, Sikhism, not requiring more than that he should not trim his beard or cut his hair.

Keeping the pot of racial discord boiling, the Socialist Government, apparently at the instigation of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, had the *Race Relations Act* strengthened in 1977 in an unrealistic scheme to outlaw "racial thinking" in pursuance of the Marxist belief that the academic teaching of the facts of comparative ethnology could be deployed politically to awaken English students and other patriots to the dangers immanent in multiracialism.

The *Race Relations Act* is now administered by the somewhat misnamed Commission for Racial Equality, whose main public function appears to be inciting immigrants to complain if they feel they were not being accorded the hospitality in England they considered due to them. Formed out of the earlier abortive bureaucracies, one for a time unbelievably under the chairmanship of the Primate of All England, the Commission is now manned by Negroes and Asiatic Indians under an English chairman, a renegade Conservative politician. The mischievously named Runnymede Trust, subsidised from abroad and run by Asiatic Indians, is another body set up to promote the interests of minority groups against the English people.

As a comment on how a multiracial democracy works in practice, it may be fitting to mention here that when the Socialists were in Office in 1969, the leader of the Conservatives, Mr. Edward Heath, promised (January 1969) that if the Conservative Party were again elected to Office (1) Commonwealth citizens will not have the right to settle permanently in Great Britain, (2) no immigrant will be able to stay in Great Britain for an unlimited period, (3) any immigrant admitted will no longer enjoy an absolute right to bring in relatives, and (4) the decision as to whether any immigrant from any part of the world is eligible to be admitted will be made by British authorities in his country of origin. Mr. Edward Heath added: "These are the proposals that the next Conservative Government will carry out. But the matter is urgent." When later the Conservatives were elected to Office, largely on this assurance, they expediently did nothing to honour their pledge, thus highlighting an inherent weakness in multiracial democracies (in both England and America) where politicians unscrupulously pander to racial minority fraternities to solicit votes for election to power.

Although successive British Governments have neglected to record vital racial statistics, it was authoritatively estimated in

1961 that immigrants, without allowing for illegal entries, mostly of the coloured races, were flooding into Britain at the rate of about 136,000 a year, a figure accepted by the United Nations. Today, seventeen years later, they are still coming in with their families at the rate of about 50,000 a year. In 1962, as the situation became more desperate, the Government were moved to pass the *Commonwealth Immigration Act* in a belated attempt to stem the flood. Further Acts were passed in 1968 and 1971. These unrealistic and half-hearted measures, with loopholes through which an elephant could skip, reluctantly and expediently taken, were largely thrust on the Government by the racial policy of Africanisation (Africa for the Africans) introduced by the Negro despotisms in Africa to expel from their lands the coloured Asiatic Indians as well as the white Europeans, mostly Britons, who had built up their nations for them. In a few years' time Great Britain will be required to hand over Hong Kong to China and then millions of Chinese will no doubt claim Commonwealth "right" to settle in England.

Dwelling in Great Britain and enjoying all the privileges gained over the centuries by the indigenous Britons are now several million people of assorted alien races (total for each race not known) with antipathetic cultures and creeds, most of whom, under cover of the ill-conceived *British Nationality Act (1948)*, were unwisely allowed to enter and reside in the realm at a period when the British Empire under the Crown was being finally broken up. This monstrous invasion of their homeland by incompatible alien migrants, uninvited and unwanted, many with diseases, consisting largely, but not entirely, of African Negroids (mostly from the Western Hemisphere) and Asiatic Indians, has saddled the once relatively united and homogeneous Britons with a social problem of unparallelled magnitude, possibly now insoluble without some form of racial segregation within the nation or alternatively an enlightened programme of repatriation on a vast scale. As regards repatriation, the Republics of India and Guyana have already signified their willingness to allow their own expatriates to rejoin their families amongst their own kind of people, a procedure of commonsense to which humanitarians could have no justifiable objection. Illegal immigrants and alien criminals, though legion in number, are rarely deported, largely because their own countries disown them.

The Socialist Home Secretary, subconsciously swayed, perhaps, by his atavistic Cymric race-memory, jubilantly declared in Parliament in April 1978 on behalf of his international associates, Marxists and racial minority groups that as the United Kingdom could no longer properly be regarded as a purely British nation worth preserving, but an inchoate multiracial congeries in the

welter of mankind, further national action to ease the worsening social conditions, including crime, caused by immigration was not necessary, particularly as there had been some falling off in the numbers of incompatible races coming in.

Concurrently with the influx of immigrants into England there has been an outflow of an equal number of Britons, scientists, doctors, technicians and others of calibre superior to the incomers, a migratory exchange greatly to the disadvantage of the British community and nation.

Notwithstanding their agreement in principle with the Marxist philosophy of the Socialists on the concept of a non-British multiracial democracy for the United Kingdom, the Conservatives again promised (April 1978) that they would, if elected to power, tighten up the existing immigration regulations and that action would be undertaken to prevent families migrating from India, Bangladesh and Pakistan, but not against Negroids and others arriving from elsewhere, including certain European nations, e.g. France and the Netherlands, who seek to get rid of their non-European inhabitants.

Although such a sensible and humane approach may not appeal to professional politicians in a multiracial democracy, it would clearly be to the advantage of the nation, now and in the future, if immigration be discouraged or, preferably, stopped altogether, except for familiars, and that some procedure be introduced to induce and assist unsuitable immigrants to return to their homelands where they would be free from the racial rancour they complain about in England. In the meantime a degree of racial toleration may be achieved if some form of social segregation, forbidding miscegenation, be authorised, however complicated to administer, which openly recognises the irreconcilable nature of the ethnic differences, both biological and cultural which divide the races and which will for ever make congenial integration in one community impossible.

The unrealistic proposal put forward by Marxists and not a few Churchmen that the unintegrated immigrants should be compulsorily dispersed over the whole country, but not to their own countries, and not allowed to congregate seems both cruel and devoid of sense. Repudiating integration the immigrants show every determination to live in the congenial atmosphere of their own enclaves.

The Socialists in Office in 1978, with Liberals and not a few Conservatives, continued with their efforts to enforce on the English people by legal pressures uncongenial integration, including hybridisation or the procreation of half-breeds and misfits, all apparently part — or so it seems — of some international conspiracy. In an attempt to glorify the Negro race — and demean

the European races — a text book of African history, with an anti-Christian bias bespeaking its Jewish source, and confusing barbarism with civilisation, has been authorised for compulsory study in "comprehensive" schools in Great Britain, a rather blatant scheme to corrupt the minds of English youth and destroy any pride they may have in their own history, race and nation. Under the same authorship a similar history has been adopted with the same objective in state-run public schools in America.

The next national census of the population of the United Kingdom will be held in 1981, when it is proposed that details be included to show the racial or ethnic composition of the inhabitants. However, it can already be envisaged that the scheme, as approved by the Commission for Racial Equality, will fail in its avowed purpose, since it is not strictly devised on a rational or scientific or comprehensive basis, but only covers colour of skin and nation of origin of new immigrants.

Historians of the future may no doubt wonder what was the compelling force behind the great migratory wave of races from tropical lands into the British Isles when Great Britain was already overpopulated and had to import half her food requirements, all the while carrying a chronic burden of between one and two million workpeople unable to find work to sustain themselves.

It may be worth recalling that ethnic self-determination was a principle adopted for the settlement of indepenent nations after the First World War. But it was not strictly observed.

7. MULTIRACIAL DEMOCRACY (UNITED STATES)

The United States of America have been described as the "crucible of mankind", meaning a place where all races can mix freely and breed together to produce a synthetic race with a common national identity. Over the years Federal laws have been passed to regulate by a quota system the inflow of new citizens, but this has been done more on a geographic than on an ethnic basis, with the result that there now exists, as in England, a grave social imbalance, exacerbated in America by the rapid proliferation of Negroes of African slave descent, more than half fecklessly born out of wedlock, the largest minority element. On top of this millions of mixed breeds are flooding in from Mexico, many illegally, all with basic outlooks vastly different from the peoples to the north of them.

The second largest racial minority group in America, still indomitably preserving its racial uniqueness, is the well-organised Jewish fraternity, who exercise an influence in publicity, finance, trade and politics far greater than their numbers or their intrinsic

merits would justify.

Under the *Civil Rights* legislation to abolish racial distinctions, American schoolchildren of White parents are being forced against the wishes of their parents to attend schools far from their homes where they would be compulsorily mixed with children not of their race, a demoralising process naturally resented by the parents. America is now faced with the dilemma as to whether in principle preference for posts should be given to unqualified and unsuitable Negroes just because they are Black or to others who are better qualified and more competent. On the judgement of the Federal Supreme Court in the Allan Bakke case the future tempo of civilised progress in America will depend.

In the Armageddon that one day will inevitably be fought to a conclusion between the great powers for national and racial survival, the vulnerable Achilles Heel in America's defence of Western Civilisation will assuredly be the corroding canker of multiracialism.

8. MULTIRACIAL DEMOCRACY (OTHER NATIONS)

Next to the U.S.A. (and Canada) in the Western Hemisphere, Brazil furnishes the most interesting example of multiracialism in practice. Despite the official pretence of racial equality in Brazil, the races tend to keep apart, the Negroes, manumitted only ninety years ago still rather conspicuously occupying the lower strata in society, but not so low as the native Amerinds who are steadily being exterminated as their lands are being taken away from them by immigrants.

In the multiracial Republic of Guyana the Negro ruling faction openly discriminates against the Asiatic Indian citizens.

The Republic of Haiti in the West Indies was the first nation to be ruled by Negroes outside Africa. Today it furnishes an outstanding example of the failure of Negroids to create a progressive civilised state despite massive support from other nations. The nation has, of course, suffered from the malaise of multiracialism, which still keeps the community divided.

In the Eastern Hemisphere people of racially different descent in the Indian sub-continent have been intermingling for two or three thousand years, but they are still not integrated — and perhaps they never will be. In Sri Lanka, once joined to India, the home of the almost extinct Australoid Veddahs, the Aryan Singalese are deporting Tamil speaking immigrants, Dravidian people they regard as inferior.

The millions of people in China (and in Korea), although racially differentiated in certain minor respects, are relatively

homogeneous, the invading immigrants over the centuries being all related to the same primary Mongoloid stock. In the lands once called Indo-China, however, successive waves of migrating invaders, though Mongoloid in descent, have kept the land divided and civil strife has been taking a frightful toll of the people.

Despite their apparent homogeneity, the Japanese people are in fact somewhat racially mixed (quite apart from the indigenous non-Mongoloid Ainu), their society implicitly tolerating a caste system not unlike Hinduism in India.

Africa, the Dark Continent, where experts think the first human being appeared on earth, seems to have known nothing but racial and tribal conflicts, which still prevails today. However, some thousands of years ago families of non-Negroid people had entered Africa and settled in the delta of the Nile, where their supreme racial qualities enabled them to establish one of the world's first civilisations, which as a disciplined nation under a succession of dynastic pharaohs retained for centuries its distinctive ethnic identity. Modern Egyptians, however, now under Arab rule, seem to have lost the exceptional qualities of the first settlers, the consequence of multiracialism and massive miscegenation. The various peoples living today in northern Africa, Hamites, Semites and Negroids, are precariously kept together by their common religion, Islam, forced on them from the 8th century A.D. by their Arab overlords. In Ethiopia and Somalia racial strife is endemic. Over the lands of equatorial Africa the Negroes evolved into tribal groups, each competing with the other for survival but never able to create from scratch a civilised nation without European help despite propitious conditions.

In Southern Africa white Caucasoid people have created great nations out of the wilderness, South Africa and Rhodesia, but these civilised nations with their Christian traditions are now being threatened by the rising racial power of the Bantu and other Negroid peoples, a process of dissolution and degeneracy fostered by the United Nations and by the Marxist politicians of Britain and America — and the Soviet Union.

In Europe, Sweden, with its predominantly Nordic population, with a government nevertheless strongly biased towards Marxist multiracialism, there is now apprehension at the growing non-Nordic elements in the nation, which it is estimated (April 1978) will constitute over a third of the total inhabitants by the end of the century.

Similar misgivings are arising in Norway, mainly on account of the unsolicited influx of unassimilable Pakistanis.

In the Iberian Peninsula the Basque people of northern Spain, perhaps the oldest European race still race-conscious, continue with their campaign for racial recognition and independence on

terms of self-determination.

As a consequence of the dismantling of their great empire, the Dutch people of the Netherlands are confronted with the impossible problem of absorbing into their national life countless Negroes and Mongoloids, the latter coming from what was once the Dutch East Indies.

The attempts by alien intruders into Germany after the first World War to bring Germany under Bolshevik or Marxist hegemony had fearful consequences, from which there is now little prospect of Europe recovering until the German people are racially united again as one nation.

Although for nearly two centuries openly avowing egalitarianism and multiracialism, France is now trying to get rid of citizens of non-European races, mainly of Arab extraction from northern Africa, who are Moslems and therefore cannot easily be brought within the Catholic community.

For centuries the Balkan Peninsula has been the European cockpit of racial conflict, an endemic condition apparently beyond redemption.

In the Middle East the Jews are engaged on an aggressive war against Palestinian Arabs, a conflict which involves both religion and race. Though professing Judaism, most of the Jewish invaders seem to be Mongoloid Khazars, not Hebraic Semites as their rabbis claim.

Across the vast territories of the U.S.S.R. racial troubles simmer below the surface, despite the merciless methods of the Socialist commissars to control matters by enforced multiracialism or by "liquidation" or by compulsory re-settlement of whole communities. Within the Marxist Empire of the U.S.S.R. the Mongoloids are rapidly outbreeding the Caucasoid Slav/Nordics, a pointer to the future.

In the islands of New Zealand the inhabitants of Mongoloid Polynesian Maori provenance are now holding their own as regards numbers, but the racial cleavage remains, as they instinctively cling to their evolved style of life, despite the efforts made by the dominating and more enterprising Caucasoids, mostly of British descent, to divert their course. In Australia the autochthonic Australoids (the Blackfellows or Aborigines), the first race to enter this great island continent, are now, after almost 20,000 years as a racial entity, on the verge of extinction, not being capable of adapting themselves to the more complex cultures encroaching on their aboriginal preserves — an object lesson for those who still like to believe in the fiction, the prejudice exploited by Marxists as part of their technique of subversion, that the human races are equal to one another in nature.

As the human species continues to expand beyond the limited resources of the globe to sustain it, so will tensions grow as the races, consciously or unconsciously, compete for survival, yet politicians and clerics of the Caucasoid Western World, not fully understanding the root causes of nationally disruptive migration (or invasion), take little heed of this crisis in the destiny of man on earth.

9. RACIAL RELIGIOUS BIAS

Outwardly reflecting the social (and moral) bias characterising different breeds of people and their nations, religion has played a special part in human development and evolutionary progress, involving, though rarely admitted, racial politics.

Beneath the coating of cultural or religious colours, the tribal strife described in such graphic detail in the Old Testament was in fact (that is when analysed anthropologically) conflict between groups of families of racially different origins, all striving to settle in the same territory, warfare continuing in the same region today with the religious undertones of Mohammedanism and Judaism.

Under their enlightened cult of Mithraism (Persian and Greek in origin) the Roman Empire tolerated most religious sects, even racialist Judaism and at times Christianity, the great exception being Druidism, the cohering cult of the Celts or Gauls, which was essentially a nationalist religion not amenable to the kind of multiracialism the Romans, like the Marxists of today, sought to thrust upon them, the more easily to govern them. It was, of course, the degenerating trend of multiracialism that in the end brought down the disciplined civilisation of the Roman Empire, helped, according to Gibbon, by the disintegrating influence of Christianity based on the make-belief of human equality, and which in the end ushered in the Dark Ages.

This precedent was followed in 1945 by the American Army of Occupation in Japan when it banned Shintoism, the religion of the indigenous people, because such a nationalist cult tended to keep the Japanese people strong and united as a separate race and nation. In the end, however, the racial quality of the people prevailed.

It can be said that each religious cult has had its origin in a spontaneous urge to keep each family, clan, tribe, race or nation united as a self-conscious combination in fulfilment of a gregarious instinct, an evolutionary form of protection. Religion is associated with kingship, as Frazer pointed out in his *Golden Bough*, but the political aspect of this is forgotten today as mankind turns to materialist Marxism, now regarded as an international religion by

the United Nations. Even when sharing the same religion races interpret the common doctrine in their own way according to their racial predilections, an explanation perhaps of the schisms which from the beginning have dogged the great religious systems.

Though now twisted by Marxist and Maoist teaching, the Chinese have their Confucianism and their Taoism and their Buddhism, the last named being introduced by missionaries from India; the Asiatic Indians, both Aryans and Dravidians, have their Hinduism and also their Buddhism; the Semitic Arabs have their Mohammedanism, now spreading over Asia and most of Africa; and the Jews have their Judaism; religions all essentially of racial significance — and all antipathetical to Christianity, the religion, though originating outside Europe, which came to be developed by the supposedly pagan European Nordic and Alpine subraces.

In the United Kingdom Britons, whether of Celtic or Saxon origin, after centuries of travail, adopted the revolutionary creed of Christianity, albeit retaining many of their own religious rituals. Christianity is a catholic and proselytising religion and its missionaries, seeking converts from all quarters of the globe, are accordingly inclined to minimise the supreme value to humanity of the disciplines behind racial and national associations. Many celibate clerics, misinterpreting perhaps the example of the Master, deprecate and renounce the ties of family life based on the normal sexual union, in the belief that Eternal Life can only be achieved by such individual abnegation and sacrifice. It may be significant that the term "family" does not appear in the New Testament.

Once England was a racially united nation, prospering as a result of historical continuity under a dynastic monarchy, the Crown being sanctified by the Coronation, a Christian ceremonial, but it is now not only multiracial but irredeemably multicredal as well. In the realm are dwelling over 1,000,000 Moslems, mostly Pakistanis, and about double that number of Hindus and Judaists and others of non-Christian creeds, for whom the hallowed Cross of St. George has no meaning. The Established Church of England, no longer sensitive to the conscience of the nation, has palpably fallen under the blight of soulless Marxism. Through the World Council of Churches it has even aligned itself with the Black Terror in Africa, thus losing both secular and spiritual credibility.

Seeing little merit in the morale that derives its strength from national pride and prestige with an inner sense of belonging, the Established Church of England decries the value of time-honoured traditions and in line with the amoral cult of Marxism actively cultivates a form of ecumenism or internationalism in which the family loyalties of patriotism have no place. Parish churches are falling into decay, while mosques are flourishing in the land once Christian.

In welcoming the entry into England of people of incompatible breeds and irreconcilable creeds the hierarchy of the national Church, seeing no value in kinship loyalties, the basis of any disciplined society, takes no heed of the injunction given by the Almighty to immigrants in an alien land: "Return unto thy country, and to thy kindred, and I will deal well with thee." (*Genesis 32:9*)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Race
John R. Baker, Oxford University Press (1974)

Races of Mankind
Calvin Kephart, Peter Owen Ltd. (1961)

The Origin of Races
Carleton S. Coon, Jonathan Cape Ltd. (1963)

The Living Races of Man
Carleton S. Coon, Jonathan Cape Ltd. (1966)

Racial Variations in Man
Arthur R. Jensen, E. Sutherland and others, The Institute of Biology (1974)

Race and Modern Science
Edited by Robert E. Kuttner, Social Science Press (1967)

Race, Intelligence and Genetics
Arthur R. Jensen and others, Psychology Today, Vol. No. 7 (1973)

Race, Intelligence and Education
J. H. Eysenck, Temple Smith Ltd. (1971)

Race et Intelligence (in French)
Jean-Pierre Hébert, Editions Copernie, Paris (1977)

The Inequality of Man
H. J. Eysenck, Temple Smith Ltd. (1973)

Inequality
Christopher Jencks and others, Allen Lane (1973)

Genetics and Man
C. D. Darlington, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. (1964)

Environment, Heredity and Intelligence
Arthur R. Jensen and others, Harvard University Press (1969)

Human Ancestry from a Genetic Point of View
R. Ruggles Gates, Harvard University Press (1948)

The Evolution of Man and Society
C. D. Darlington, George Allen & Unwin Ltd. (1969)

The Outline of History
H. G. Wells, Cassell & Co., Ltd. (Rev. Ed. 1972)

The Hutchinson History of the World
J. M. Roberts, Hutchinson (1976)

A Study of History
Arnold J. Toynbee (Abridgement of Vols. I-VI by D. C. Somerville)
Oxford University Press (1948)

Nations and States
Hugh Seton-Watson, Methuen (1977)

Inheritance and National History
R. J. Berry, Collins (1978)

The Next Million Years
Charles Galton Darwin, Rupert Hart-Davis (1952)

Also essential reading:

The Mankind Quarterly, 1 Darnaway Street, Edinburgh, Scotland.

Monographs of The International Association for the Advancement of Ethnology and Eugenics, New York, U.S.A.

Nouvelle Ecole, B.P. 19, Paris, (Cedex) France.

Instauration, Howard Allen Enterprises, Inc., P.O. Box 76, Cape Canaveral, Florida, U.S.A.

Ethnic and Racial Studies
Routledge & Kegan Paul, Ltd. (Vol. 1 No. 1 January 1978)