



AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 1988

English-language publishing in the 1980s belonged to pale Anglo-Saxon persons with BA degrees. The socio-pol journals prayed for black writers, prayed for Afrikaners, and, third best, prayed for someone who at least knew something about something that counted. Along came ...

Andrew Kenny; BSc, an engineer, and what Southeffricanese calls 'otherwise', a polite version of 'outrageous'. It'd be nice to say that Frontline made Andrew famous; truer that Andrew made Frontline notorious. Two decades later he's the Grand Duke of Otherwise on empty issues, even though on his mainstay, nuclear energy, he turns out to have only been ahead of his times. His new writing still makes people think new ways. So, we see, does the vintage model ...

Bad arithmetic

*Not merely as a moral matter, but also for practical benefit, it is about time for the White West to drastically review its apartheid thinking, says **Andrew Kenny***

Ask your average white supporter of Apartheid why he opposes the scrapping of the Group Areas Act and he will give you one or more of the following reasons:

- * There isn't enough room for them in this area.
- * We haven't got the facilities to cope with them in this area.
- * We've got problems enough of our own in this area.
- * They would create unemployment.
- * We've built up this area. What right have they got?
- * They would be happier in their own areas.
- * They would change the character of this area.
- * Why don't they stop having so many children?
- * This is *our area!*

Outside South Africa there is a world shared by rich white people and poor

black people. The white people live in pleasant countries where they have problems with over-production of food and schools becoming empty because of dwindling populations. The black people live in impoverished countries where there is not enough food and the schools are overflowing because of growing populations. Immigration laws prevent the poor black people moving to the countries where the rich white people live. Ask your average white American, Briton or Australian why he opposes the scrapping of the immigration laws and, if you substitute “country” for “area”, he will give you exactly the same list of reasons that appears above.

The white-ruled countries practise an International Apartheid that is as morally repugnant as domestic Apartheid in SA and even more unnecessary.

British Immigration Law is exceedingly complicated in its detail and exceedingly simple in its purpose. To give a kind of moral legitimacy to the British Commonwealth, Britain gave all people of the Commonwealth the right to hold a British passport, which at first meant they could freely enter Britain. For a long time the only colonials who took up this right were white people from Australia and Canada. The British did not mind this at all. Then in the 1950's black people from the Caribbean and brown people from the Indian subcontinent began to come to Britain. The British were horrified. Racist shockwaves reverberated through the Mother of Parliament.

From 1962 on, Tory and Labour Governments wrestled with a vexing legal problem: How can we keep blacks out and allow whites in without actually saying so? Thus followed the legal acrobatics, the twisting and turning, the tortuous requirements of parentage and grandparentage and the complicated racist hypocrisy of the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, the 1971 Immigration Act and the 1981 British Nationality Act. I can summarise the tens of thousands of legal words of these laws in two words often seen sprayed on British subway walls: *wogs out!*

It has become fashionable to lament that while Britain has become more prosperous under Mrs Thatcher it has also become more greedy and bigoted. The implication is that under Labour governments Britain was less efficient but more liberal and compassionate. We are invited to look back fondly to the

happy, heady days of the 1960s and in particular 1968. This view is nonsense. The most influential figure was not John Lennon but Enoch Powell; the most passionate campaign was not “How to bring peace to the world” but “How to keep blacks out of Britain”. The most potent work of British genius was not Sergeant Pepper but the 1968 Commonwealth Immigrants Act, a piece of racist legislation that would make Dr Verwoerd blush.

The British Labour Party passed this act because it was terrified of an influx of Asians from East Africa. In his book *Immigration Law*, Prof J M Evans writes:

“This extraordinary piece of legislation, enacted in three days *in a Parliamentary atmosphere reminiscent of emergency measures passed under the shadow of war*, resulted from an increase in the flow of Asians from Kenya as the Kenyan Government introduced measures to restrict the trading activities of non-Kenyan citizens.” (My Italics).

With admirable candour, Mr Richard Crossman, then a member of the Labour Government, wrote in his *Diaries of a Cabinet Minister* about his government’s restrictions on immigrant workers: “We have become illiberal and lowered the quotas at a time when we have an acute shortage of labour”. Of the 1968 Act he wrote that he had to support “this appalling violation of our deepest principles” because he was “an MP for a constituency in the Midlands, where racialism is a powerful force.”

What does the present leader of the Labour Party, Mr Neil Kinnock, the man too nice to understand racism, think of the 1968 Act? Last year in Britain’s *Spectator*, Dhiren Bhagat wrote: “After the press conference I went up to him. Mr Kinnock, do you really believe that Parliament, in particular the Labour government, was unaware that the patriality clause would discriminate racially? Didn’t James Callaghan as Home Secretary in 1968 rush the legislation through both Houses of Parliament to stop Ugandan Asians with British Passports from entering Britain?

“It was a flood’, he said, ‘the numbers’. ‘Yes, a brown flood, brown numbers.’ Within minutes he conceded my point

The underlying philosophy about race in Britain is the Racial Number Theory. The essence of this theory is that the racial tolerance of white men is inversely proportional to the number of black men living among them. If there is a tiny number of black men, the white men will treat them in a decent, democratic way. As the proportion of blacks increases, the whites will become uneasy. They will begin to complain to their MPs about muggings, loud music,

BAD ARITHMETIC

AIDS and the smell of curry. As the proportion increases further, the whites will become illiberal and intolerant. Democratic values will be threatened. If the black people exceed a certain critical fraction, the white people will turn into raging fascists and liberal civilisation will collapse. What is this critical fraction? In Britain there is almost unanimous agreement that it is 5%, the present fraction. Mr Kinnock, who stands by the 1968 Act, obviously believes this. What in effect he is saying to South Africa is: *“We in the British Labour Party consider the 5% blacks in Britain such a deadly menace to democracy that we have introduced racist immigration laws to keep more blacks out. You in South Africa have 80% blacks and you must share power with them immediately or we shall apply sanctions.”*

Whatever the personal views of British politicians, there is no doubt that the British public is overwhelmingly opposed to black immigration. I arrived in England in 1972, a wide-eyed graduate from UCT, believing South Africa to be uniquely racist. I was soon dramatically disabused. A few months after my arrival General Idi Amin expelled all Asians from Uganda. These Asians, about 25 000 in number, held British passports but because of the intricacies of the immigration laws it was not certain whether they would be allowed into Britain. Britain then had a conservative Government led by Mr Edward Heath, a failure as a Prime Minister but a man possessed with a certain stubborn integrity. To his eternal honour he let the Asians in. The result was mass racial hysteria, worse than anything I have seen in South Africa. The great bulk of the British people reacted with furious hostility. They did not mind what happened to the Asians as long as they did not come to Britain. In fact the Asians soon proved themselves model citizens, hard-working and honest people who took no jobs from anyone and provided services that white Britons refused to provide.

Bad though Britain's record on race is, she is not notably worse than any other country and indeed better than most. In France the presence of 7% non-white people has so aroused the racial fears that in the election this year one in seven Frenchmen voted for Le Pen, a fascist worse than most members of the AWB. The Germans are paranoid about their “guest workers”. The racism in Russia and East Europe is legend. The vigour with which the Scandinavians attack SA is only exceeded by the vigour with which they keep blacks out of their own rich, safe, white countries. But the worst racism of all comes from Europeans living outside Europe.

There are five large nations across the seas from Europe ruled by white men

from northern Europe. In four of these countries the white men behaved with unspeakable brutality towards the indigenous people; in the fifth they behaved better.

In the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, the white invaders did to the native people what Rome did to Carthage and what Hitler tried and failed to do to the Jews. They annihilated them as nations for all eternity. The policy was genocide followed by civil rights. First slaughter the indigenous people until they have been reduced to tiny minorities; then give them full civil rights and shower them with charity. In the present USA election campaign, the candidates are appealing to various ethnic constituencies: Irish, Jews, Italians, blacks, Anglo-Saxons – but never Red Indians. The Red Indians, who were the majority race in America for over ten thousand years, are now too insignificant to be considered.

No doubt if SA had followed the same policy and reduced her black people to tiny residues, she would now be an honoured member of the community of nations, her sportsmen playing at the Olympic Games and her statesmen making pious speeches at international forums.

But surely this is a sterile argument? Very well, the white men in North America and Australasia behaved far worse than the Boers, but so what? The slaughtered Red Indians and Aborigines cannot be brought back to life. There is nothing that the white occupiers can do to repay humanity for their crimes.

Of course there is.

For all their savagery, the white men in North America and Australasia did reaffirm one great and ancient human right: the right to move from one country to another in search of a better life. Homo Sapiens, we believe, evolved in Africa and from there radiated out to all parts of the planet. For thousands of years human civilisation has been enriched by the movement of people from country to country and continent to continent. This continual migration spreads knowledge from the enlightened to the ignorant, allows people in drought-stricken lands to find food in lands of plenty, and stimulates art and invention. So when white people, many of them poor and uneducated, moved across oceans to North America and Australia, it was a clear and hopeful sign to poor and uneducated people everywhere that they too could move to these countries to better their lives. But the white people, having claimed the right themselves to immigrate to these countries, then denied this right to black and brown people from Africa and Asia.

BAD ARITHMETIC

In 1883 Emma Lazarus wrote these wonderful words, which were placed on the American Statue of liberty:

*Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me
I lift my lamp beside the golden door!*

She should have added “provided they have white skins” because while America welcomed the huddled masses from Europe she now shuts out the huddled masses from Africa and Asia. As early as 1921 and 1924 the USA introduced racist immigration laws favouring immigrants from northern Europe and banning nonwhite immigrants. Adolf Hitler was an admirer of this policy. In *Mein Kampf* (1924), Hitler wrote: “There is today one state in which at least weak beginnings towards a better conception are noticeable. Of course, it is not our model German Republic, but the American Union, in which an effort is made to consult reason at least partially. *By refusing immigration on principle to elements in poor health, by simply excluding certain races* from naturalisation, it professes in slow beginnings a view which is particular to the folkish state concept.” (My Italics)

Notice how Hitler admires, too, the USA policy of keeping out unhealthy people. No doubt Hitler would today praise the immigration laws of the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. He would see at a glance that their discriminating in favour of the rich and the highly-qualified and against the poor and the uneducated is in effect discriminating for whites and against blacks. (In Australia, a trickle of well-educated Asians is seeping through the net. It is my melancholy prediction that the laws will be changed to stop them.)

In Australia, the USA and Canada, there are songs and TV series to celebrate the “rags to riches” immigrant heroes who arrived from Europe penniless and became prosperous. When penniless people from Africa and Asia arrive on these shores today to try to do the same thing, they are regarded as criminals.

The communist countries are a different case altogether. In them, because of oppression and economic failure, the problem is not to stop people entering but to stop their leaving. In general the white invaders in South America were almost as savage as those in North America; however. measured by their large

surviving Indian populations, countries such as Bolivia, Peru and Ecuador behaved much better and curiously enough these countries are quietest in their criticism of South Africa.

The arguments for scrapping the international immigration laws are exactly the same as the arguments for scrapping the Group Areas Act in South Africa. They are moral and practical. Consider the highest moral authority, Jesus Christ. Jesus would certainly condemn Apartheid in South Africa. Can there be any doubt at all that He would equally condemn laws that prevent starving people from impoverished lands going to rich lands which have mountains of food and allow in the rich and the healthy and shut out the poor and the sick?

Two of the greatest problems facing the human race are mass poverty and overpopulation. In fact it is as sure as a law of physics that as people get richer they breed less, and so the two problems reduce to the single problem of poverty. Cure poverty and overpopulation cures itself. In his brilliant book *The Nature of Mass Poverty*, J K Galbraith identified the most effective way of tackling mass poverty: migration. In the previous century, poor people from impoverished parts of Europe migrated to America and Australia. They relieved the population strain of the areas they left, allowing them to rebuild their economies, and they made good in their new countries.

Today America and Australia are in a better position to receive a large influx of poor people than they were then. Then America and Australia were largely agricultural, requiring a large area per productive worker; now they are industrialised, requiring little area per worker. Then they often struggled to produce enough food; now they have huge food surpluses. Then their birthrate was high; now it is low. Today the best way by far to help the poor people in impoverished parts of Africa and Asia is to allow them to migrate to Europe, America and Australia. Racism alone prevents it.

If white South Africans are ever to get rid of the wretched system of Apartheid we will have to behave better than any other people on Earth. But this should not be too difficult. The rest of the world does not set a high standard.