

# Fallacies of Integration

*Dave Baxter argues that now the Establishment has admitted that the multicultural society is not working, full integration, i.e. multiracialism, is likewise doomed to fail. It would have the effect of fragmenting society and breaking down still further our traditional sense of community.*

Even before the July London bombings, prominent Establishment figures were questioning how much longer the belief in a multicultural society could continue. *The Times* published an interview with CRE chairman, Trevor Philips, on 3/4/04. In it he said that multi-culturalism was out of date and no longer useful as it encouraged “separateness” between communities. This brought praise and support from a number of people, including former Tory party chairman, Norman Tebbit, who declared: “*If we can make common cause around the idea that the problems don’t revolve around so much as ethnicity as culture, then we have moved a huge step on.*”

For many, the very word “multi-cultural” is little more than a euphemism for multi-racialism. Perhaps even the very word “race” is just too traumatic for those who fervently believe that no such thing exists (or of it does then we certainly shouldn’t acknowledge the fact!)

Culture also has a convenient ambiguity to it. In its strictest definition, after all, it is simply a way of life at any one given time. There can exist a ‘culture of violence’ or a ‘culture of apathy’ and so on.

Of course, healthy cultures do not remain static and stagnate; they change, adapt and evolve. The crucial point is that all previous changes in our cultural norms – language, dress, modes of behaviour and so on – have mostly been part of an evolutionary process *within our own people*. Historically, customs and manners have changed, but the people have remained unaltered.

The forced imposition of a multi-racial society, however, is different. It is a regressive step and unless halted and reversed, will lead to the decline and eventual disappearance of the British as a distinct ethnic group.

Those who think this prediction is alarmist should reflect on the fact that decades of immigration and asylum, combined with a higher non-white birth rate, have already resulted in indigenous British people becoming a minority in many cities. In addition to this, Britain has the highest rate of inter-racial relationships.

Based upon the above trends, what is the prognosis for our people?

## **INSTABILITY AND FRICTION**

Britain’s multi-racial/multi-cultural society has seen violence and bloodshed before of course, mainly in Black areas in the late 70’s and early 80’s. But whatever the real or perceived causes of these riots, they lacked any real political direction or agenda. Most Blacks seem to have abandoned whatever pride they might have had in their ancestry and identify with western consumerist values. Not so Asian Muslims. Unlike the Blacks, they have retained strong cultural bonds. Growing sections of their youth are rejecting western society and finding a sense of belonging and purpose in insurgent Islam.

Their discontent stems from a world view that not only opposes the materialist values of consumerist capitalist society (values also rejected by nationalists), but also grates against traditional European standards and values. Intolerant and universalist, a resurgent and militant Islam does not wish to integrate; it wishes to dominate and subjugate.

The System dislikes such instability and friction. There is always the potential of a White backlash, and this has to be guarded against at all costs. Also, the vested interests that form the Establishment

don't want any disruption to the smooth running of the system. A consumerist, passive, raceless, culture-free society provides the optimum conditions to make maximum profits.

The new integrationalist line is that once immersed in 'British values' (whatever they may be defined as) anybody – Asian, Black, Oriental will magically be transformed not just into citizens, but become thoroughly British.

It's interesting to note that both the capitalist Establishment and those on the Left (who imagine themselves to be an alternative to the system) are wholeheartedly in favour of this approach. Both assert, albeit from different perspectives, that shared common values are more important than 'collectivist' notions such as race and nation.

The left believe that race divides the working class and acts as a barrier to 'class unity', which will somehow bring the capitalist system tumbling down. Those on the capitalist right, however, dislike race for quite a different matter: Because it is bad for big business.

Implicit in both these materialistic philosophies is the assertion that most people cannot aspire to anything and are content to be little more than well-fed units of production and consumption; just factors in some economic equation.

An article in *Capitalist* magazine by Peter Schwartz entitled "*The Racism of Diversity*", commented: "*If racism is to be repudiated, it is the premise of individualism, including individual free will, that must be upheld. There is no way to being about racial integration except by completely disregarding color.*"..."*We need to identify "diversity" for what it is: a malignant policy that harms everyone, because it is the very essence of racism.*"

One wonders if those remnants of the Marxist Left ever stop to consider that, if multi-racialism equates to the smooth running of capitalism, what side of the fence they're really on!

For the capitalist system, currently in a globalising phase, race, nation, culture and sovereignty are all impediments to it maximising its profits. Little wonder, then, that over the last decades it has been capitalist concerns, not just in the political sphere, but more importantly in the opinion-forming news and entertainments media, that have been in the forefront of the steady erosion of these barriers to its profits.

Multi-racialism has the effect of fragmenting society and breaking down the sense of community within the 'host nation'. It then undermines cultural identity and unity; finally it results in interbreeding – the destruction of the 'host community' as an ethnically homogenous group (race). And when races do not exist, the nation no longer exists. When nations do not exist, the task of the internationalist establishment becomes easier because it is not threatened by those who would seek to assert their national identity.

A world population of racially mixed proles, who don't know where they are because they don't know where they've come from, are likely to be more docile and malleable than groups of people who are aware of their identity, and are aware that the territorial, political, financial and cultural expressions of that identity and nationhood are being taken from them or submerged by a globalist New World Order.

## **EASILY MANIPULATED**

Such a population would be an ideal consumerist market for the system; easily manipulated to have the same needs and wants and incapable of ever displacing the power elite who exercise real control.

Those on the Left who harbour the daydream that such an atomised bovine herd of humanity will ever challenge the system are deluding themselves. The harsh reality is that a raceless, rootless

mass of people with no sense of identity or loyalty to nation or community are far more likely to succumb to the rapacious 'I'm all right Jack' individualism promoted by the Free Market forces they wish to replace.

In essence, those who promote or acquiesce to multi-racialism are, whether they realise it or not, helping the system they profess to oppose consolidate its grip even further.

The intended result of the impending policy of integrationism is for the 'new ethnic Britons' to be judged purely as individuals, and not by their race, nationality or religion as they have signed up to accepting 'British Values'.

It must surely be one of history's sickest ironies that Establishment figures can enthuse about the undoubted merits and achievements of British culture which Blacks and Asians should embrace, whilst at the same time advocating policies that will drive the people who created it to gradual extinction.

This Establishment-approved individualism may well appeal to inherent British feelings of fair play. Only judging a person as an individual is surely fairer than judging him by his accent, hair colour, background – or race – isn't it? After all, we mustn't be prejudiced!

And it's certainly true that there are many Black and Asian people who are better educated and better mannered than our own people. It's also a fact that many Afro-Caribbean and Asian immigrants had values and moral codes we might identify with and find attractive – a strong work ethic; respect for others; strong family ties; discipline and so on.

But even ignoring the debate as to what extent values are learned or innate, the fact is that an African Negro born here will still be a Negro. Even if his speech and manners were perfect English, he would remain – however impolite it may be to point it out – someone of a different race.

Many Blacks and Asians might well identify with this country, but that no more makes them British than they would be Japanese if they were born in that country.

Like it or not, there is a racial basis for nationality. To accept this does not imply hatred of others, but merely to state a love of our own people and a desire to see them continue to exist.

This desire is derided by those on the Left and Right. According to them, being proud and conscious of one's roots and identity is incompatible with social progress or achieving one's potential. But, if anything, acknowledging the struggle and sacrifice of previous generations acts as a spur not only to safeguard those achievements, but to emulate them.

To celebrate our past and our identity does not mean passive acceptance of the status quo. Nor does it mean we cannot strive to change our circumstances for the better.

## **BOGUS PATRIOTISM**

The shift away from multi-culturalism will mean that even patriotism, for years denigrated and debased by the liberal media, will become fashionable. That's to say it's the *Establishment* version of patriotism that will be 'in'. There certainly won't be any indication that there is a racial basis of nationhood. Instead we will get the 'inclusive' patriotism that declares that any featherless biped that happens to be born here and is capable of passing a 'citizenship test' is not just a citizen, but totally British.

This bogus, plastic patriotism is a convenient safety-valve for the Establishment that prevents voter discontent moving outside their consensus. Criticising the EU and 'standing up for Britain' is always a favourite act at election time. As is the media hype encouraging us to participate in the 'look at me I'm supporting England' conformism that arises during international sporting tournaments.

The Establishment does like conformism, after all – as long as people are conforming to its values. And of course, the dominant value on offer is multi-racialism.

Yet patriotism without race (which is the bedrock of nationhood) is surely meaningless. Patriotism is about more than just love of a particular countryside. It is a spiritual concept that recognises that each of us represents a link in a chain stretching back into our past and leading to our future.

The phrase 'Our country' has a resonance that transcends politics. It means more than regarding our nation as just a geographical piece of land with no more meaning or significance than any other. It is a sense of belonging; of shared history and ancestry – a common bloodline; a feeling that we belong to a people who are special and unique.

An awful lot of people, including many who consider themselves apolitical, would instinctively recognise this. This recognition necessitates that one would put one's own country and people before others. This is nationalism. And what is the major constituent part of a nation? Race.

The drive to promote individualism is something that all racially aware people should be alert to. Just as not two people are identical, then no two races are the same; they differ not only in physical characteristics but in mental ability.

The egalitarian ideologue is easily proved to be a liar, fool or both. But the man who judges everyone only as an individual can back his judgement with reason.

To be sure, the reason is not unassailable: it is reason that only stands in an individualist vacuum and fails to take account of a larger reality. For example, everyone understands that in a war the course of wisdom is not to judge men as individuals, but only according to the uniforms they wear. The soldier who reasoned that some of the troops in the opposing army might have no hostility in their hearts and might be much nicer than their own comrades-in-arms – and who concluded from this that he would make his decisions on who to shoot solely on the basis of individual judgements – would not last long. And we most certainly are in a war. A war without uniforms, perhaps, but a war nevertheless – a war – for our survival as a people. People of European descent are a global minority. In Britain, the indigenous people are set to be a minority in our own country sometime this century. Interracial relationships are increasing. Our youth are being indoctrinated with a message that is leading them to commit self-inflicted genocide through race-mixing.

It is the real world in which we must live, a world in which race is a determinative characteristic, telling us more about the nature of any individual than any other features by which we might judge him – not the make believe world of the individualist, in which we are supposed to ignore all features identifying an individual as a member of a group having those features in common. The man who ignores relevant information for the sake of politeness or for fear of being thought a 'racist' puts himself at a competitive disadvantage in evaluating those around him. That's no way to win a war. And it's no way to ensure a future for our people.

Just as an army will not win its battles unless its soldiers put the goals and interests of the army as a whole first, and not just their private interests as individuals, a race will not win the fight for survival unless its members think of themselves and others in racial terms and act accordingly.