

American Renaissance

There is not a truth existing which I fear or would wish unknown to the whole world.

— Thomas Jefferson

Vol. 16 No. 6

June 2005

Black Démolition

Africans bring the Dark Continent to Brussels.

by Bruno Gheerbrant

Like the rest of Europe, Belgium is in the process of transforming itself. In Brussels, the symbol of this transformation is a neighborhood not far from a big downtown intersection called Porte de Namur. Long ago, the neighborhood had a Belgian name, which no one can remember. Now it is known as Matongé, a street name in Kinshasa, in the Congo. Over the last several decades, Africans have gradually taken over.

Until the early 1990s, Matongé was a pleasant place to visit. African students—mostly from the former Belgian Congo—gathered to socialize, and African shops seemed as welcoming to Belgians as they were exotic. No one was afraid of blacks. Later, Belgium, like so many other Western countries, put out the welcome mat for refugees from the civil wars, genocides, and tribal massacres that are tearing Africa apart. The change in population led to changes in behavior. Matongé has become an outpost of Africa, and the most dangerous part of Brussels. Crime has spread throughout the city to the point that some inhabitants now jokingly refer to their city as “Bronxelles.”

About half the population of Matongé are now foreigners: Mostly Congolese, but also Senegalese, Rwandans, Burundians, Malians, etc. They hang about on the streets in such numbers that they no longer feel constrained to adopt the manners and customs of the country in which they live. Matongé has lost what remained of its Belgian soul, and is now an overseas suburb of some

African metropolis, complete with petty hustles, violence, and a constant state of semi-anarchy. Belgians are leaving the



Congolese Belgians.

area, and few whites venture in as visitors.

If you visit Matongé you will find a gigantic outdoor mural. Its style is remi-

**As an expert explains,
“Gangs are an identity, a
chance to live a life that is
authentically *black*.”**

niscent of the propaganda posters Communists and other dictators used to put up to celebrate their dogmas. This bit of Belgian propaganda celebrates friendship between peoples, and especially

between Belgians and Africans.

The Galerie d’Ixelles, a little covered street off the main thoroughfare, has gradually become the headquarters for African crime. Here was born an African gang that took an American name, and for which brutality has been its watchword. Here was born *Black Démolition*.

It was on Galerie d’Ixelles that on June 19, 2001, the police carried out what they called Operation Alpha, an attempt to bring a little order to the area. For some weeks, African gangs had been fighting for control of the drug trade, first with fists, then with knives and even with guns. (For Belgians knifings are practically unheard of; shootings happen only in the movies.) Two weeks earlier a colored gentleman by the name of Pitchoun had been stabbed in a gang rivalry. The next week violence had spilled out onto Rue Saint Josse and Rue Verbist, and the police picked up a collection of machetes, knives, and box cutters. A few days later, a few of Mr. Pitchoun’s friends came across

members of the other gang; the altercation ended in yet another stabbing. The next day there were more reprisals, when persons unknown lobbed two Molotov cocktails into a bar called Magritte, headquarters of one of the gangs. This sort of thing had to stop.

The very day before Operation Alpha, police noticed Africans loitering in a local park, who fled at the sight of the authorities. A quick check of the bushes turned up tear gas grenades, knives, and eight folding hand saws. Hand saws? The police had not forgotten an earlier incident in which seven members of one gang pounced on a rival in a streetcar and, before the eyes of the dumb-founded passengers, nearly sawed off

Continued on page 3



Letters from Readers

Sir — The article by Stephen Webster in the May issue, “California Prison Segregation to End,” was excellent. On a few small points, however, I think your source—probably the California Department of Corrections (CDC)—was misinformed. The Nazi Low Riders (NLR) started in the California Youth Authority in the early 1980s, and did not grow out of the Aryan Brotherhood. The NLRs are hardly racially loyal and are known to exploit and prey on fellow whites, especially the old and the weak. They are practically Southern Hispanics as far as their lifestyle and dress are concerned: low-riding, baggy clothes, etc. They are the most hated amongst our people in prison. Further, they claim to be “Nazis” but know nothing about National Socialism, and have closer ties to Southern Hispanics/Mexicans than to their own race.

Another point with which I must take issue is the problem of prison rape and forced prostitution. Although other state prisons may be different, in my 13 years doing time in California I have hardly heard of, much less witnessed, any cases of rape or forced prostitution. It is not something that is tolerated or common. I am confident that the statistics on these acts would be close to nil. Child molesters, informants and rapists are all subject to violent attack, and are not put into the general population.

Compared to other state prisons, I think the core of whites in CDC facilities is much more racially conscious, loyal and brave. It is so rare to see or hear of a case in which a white inmate was victimized by a non-white, that it is shocking to learn that it happens in prisons in other states. It is uncommon here because non-

whites know that if they touch or “disrespect”—to use their term—one of our people, our whole race will fight. And we all know what happens in any battle in which whites are united—we do damage! I’ve seen our people outnumbered three to one against Mexicans and blacks and still come out victorious.

It may be a comfort to AR readers to know that at least in California prisons, the majority of whites are not disunited, weak, or victimized. And I seriously doubt that we will ever integrate in the reception centers—not for one minute.

Jay Jackson, Pleasant Valley State Prison, Coalinga, Calif.

Sir — The March issue of AR printed a letter by me in which I observed that AR’s assumption that its readers should be vehemently opposed to Turkey’s admission to the European Union involved a dilemma that should cause us to reassess our premises. I pointed out that Turks are physically indistinguishable from southern Europeans; and since Turkey has received almost no non-white immigration, its inclusion would increase the proportion of the EU’s population that is white. As a result, we seem to be engaged in two campaigns. One is racial—to defend the interests of whites. The other is cultural—to defend Western civilization from Muslim inundation. The April issue of AR printed a letter from Carl Lundgren, in which he argued that a significant proportion of Turks are genetically non-European.

The definitive study of the genetic composition of the human race is L. Cavalli-Sforza, P. Menozzi and A. Piazza’s *The History and Geography of Human Genes* (Princeton University Press, 1994). On pages 135-37 they provide

seven maps that sort the population of the world by the frequency of occurrences of principal genetic components. In five of the maps, all of Turkey is the same as Europe. In one, only northwest Turkey is the same as Europe. In one, all of Turkey is different from Europe. However, in two of the maps, Great Britain, Ireland and Denmark are different from the rest of Europe. Even more important is their map on page 145, which shows the geographical distribution of skin color, classified into eight shades. The lightest is in northern and central Europe. The second lightest is in Spain, Portugal, Italy, Greece, the Balkans, the Ukraine, Turkey and eastern Russia.

I do not dispute Mr. Lundgren’s observation that Turks in Germany have proven to be inassimilable. But that is my point: We seem to be engaged in a cultural as well as a racial battle.

Prof. Steven Farron, Johannesburg, South Africa

Sir — I greatly enjoyed Jared Taylor’s review in the January 2005 issue of Frank Salter’s magnificent *On Genetic Interests*. It should go without saying that the closer genetically you are to a host “ethny,” the higher the probability of assimilation. A Danish immigrant would make a much better prospect for English society than a Mbuti pygmy because the Dane has more genes in common with the English. The further you are genetically from the host nation, the more difficult the process of assimilation.

White Europeans have been immigrating and assimilating to America since its creation, while non-whites remain “hyphenated Americans”—a foreign detriment to the host population.

Steve Snyder, Macomb, Mich.

Sir — Perhaps the most eloquent evidence of the significance of race AR has ever published are the two photographs on page 15 of the May issue. They are the aerial photos of the very same part of Detroit, one taken when the neighborhood was white, and the other taken 54 years later. In 1949 there are hundreds of houses in neat rows; by 2003, seven eighths of them are gone! They are not just vacant or tumble-down; they are gone. Whole blocks of pleasant, urban houses have become vacant fields. What a tragedy for our race and civilization.

Emily Fister, Royal Oak, Mich.



American Renaissance

Jared Taylor, Editor
Stephen Webster, Assistant Editor
Ian Jobling, Web Page Editor
George McDaniel, Web Page Consultant

American Renaissance is published monthly by the New Century Foundation. NCF is governed by section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code; contributions to it are tax deductible.

Subscriptions to American Renaissance are \$24.00 per year. First-class postage is an additional \$8.00. Subscriptions to Canada (first class) are \$36.00. Subscriptions outside Canada and the U.S. (air mail) are \$40.00. Back issues are \$3.00 each. Foreign subscribers should send U.S. dollars or equivalent in convertible bank notes.

Please make checks payable to: American Renaissance, P.O. Box 527, Oakton, VA 22124. ISSN No. 1086-9905, Telephone: (703) 716-0900, Facsimile: (703) 716-0932, Web Page Address: www.AmRen.com

Continued from page 1

his hand.

Operation Alpha proceeded without incident but without much success: The police issued a dozen summonses that went nowhere, and seized a few knives and a small amount of drugs. Still, it was a sign of the times. By 2001, Congolese criminals were beginning to make a name for themselves. The police and even the public were beginning to no-



Brussels streetcar: a good place for impromptu surgery.

tice.

A special police report published that year revealed that many gang members had come to Belgium as children in the early 1990s, accompanied by various "aunts" or "uncles" who were soon out of their depth in the complexities of an industrial society. Many left school, where they could not keep up, and since they had no one looking after them, ended up on the streets. Many were criminals by the time they were age 12 or 13.

The report continued: "They will steal a VW Golf in Brussels and drive it to Holland to buy hashish. They will steal a Ford Fiesta in Amsterdam for the drive back to Belgium, and if they find a girl hitchhiking they will pick her up and gang rape her. They have no sense of guilt. If you try to explain to them it is wrong to attack an 89-year-old woman they will tell you there is nothing they can do about it if the old broad won't let go of her handbag and has to be knocked down. They are predators, true predators."

The report also quoted officers who complained of the constraints under which they had to work because these criminals are so young:

"I recall one youngster who had been involved in 18 crimes including a holdup at Ixelles, two thefts from vehicles, a home invasion in Liège, and a car-jacking in a discotheque parking lot between Brussels and Anvers. It took us a year to nab him. The very next day, he was back on the street . . ."

Another complaint: "There are thugs the court protects from being photographed and put into our files, so we can't show their pictures to victims or witnesses."

The report noted that Congolese who arrived in Belgium after about the age of eight or ten grew up with an African state of mind. Some fought in the civil and tribal wars in Congo, Rwanda, and Angola. Some were boy soldiers. Others were born in Belgium, but that seems to make little difference. As Frédéric Van Leeuw, family court judge and expert on youth gangs explains, "For all of them, gangs are an identity, a chance to live a life that is authentically *black*." (Mr. Van

Leeuw used the English word "black," as do many Africans living in Europe. It is a sign of the extent to which aggressive American expressions of blackness influence how Africans view themselves.)

These young immigrants conformed to a kind of ethnic constant: They quickly established social structures like those of an American black ghetto or African slum, forming gangs in which violence is the primary means of self-expression. They live by what appears to be instinct: muggings, attacks on the weak and elderly, car-jackings, rape.

As Judge Van Leeuw puts it: "Groups like this are almost exclusively African. There are similar groups of young African girls. All are characterized by extreme violence. Individually, these young people can show extraordinary acts of kindness. Nevertheless, they are almost all armed with knives or even folding garden saws. Joining a group requires some demonstration of qualifications,


Today there are many gangs with colorful names: *Kung Fu Klan, Black Wolves, Azewa, Black Faces, and Black Démolition.*

usually an act of violence."

The first gangs appeared in the early 1990s and can be traced to gatherings at which young Congolese met in the evenings to dance and socialize. These parties quickly jumped the tracks. Fascinated by violence and looking for ways to express themselves as racial minorities, they looked to America. In 1991, inspired by an American movie about New York gang wars called *New Jack City*, a Brussels gang started calling itself *New Jack*.

Other gang names came from more prosaic sources. *Les Finest* came from "Finest Gordon," a beer of high alcohol content sold in half-liter bottles that Africans drink in great quantity. Today there are many gangs with colorful names: *Kung Fu Klan, Black Wolves, Azewa, Black Faces, and Black Démolition*. These are not translations—they are the actual names of African gangs, and show the cachet of sounding American. Influence does not flow the other way; no black American gang would call itself *Les Serpents Noirs*, for example.

In 2001, a gang with the unlikely name of *Les Japonais* (The Japanese) made a brief bid for power. Two of its members made a spectacular haul when they grabbed a briefcase with more than three million Euros from a businessman who had just made a bank withdrawal. They



The famous Matongé mural.

pulled off the job right under a security camera, so were quickly identified and caught. No one seems to know why they called themselves *Les Japonais*, and they were soon eclipsed.

The gangs tend to be organized around an individual strong man who recruits members from ages 13 to 20. As in the mafia, when the head of a gang is arrested, an underage member comes forward to take the rap, because a minor will not see much jail time. Often the youngest gang members are the most reckless.

The true record of the havoc *Black Démolition* and other Congolese gangs have wreaked on Belgian society lies somewhere in the confidential records of the police. Occasionally, if the victim is elderly or treated in a particularly horrible way, the crime may make its way into the papers, but the names of the perpetrators are generally left out. Obviously African names would give the wrong impression, after all, so it takes some sleuthing for outsiders to get a grasp of the extent of black crime.

Gang violence is by no means limited to attacks on hapless Belgians who are at the wrong place at the wrong time, that is to say when a Congolese decides he wants to make a few Euros without having to work for them. Among themselves, and especially with rival gang members, these African predators show little sentiment. Punishment of traitors and settling of scores can lead to spec-

tacular and bloody encounters. Here are some of the incidents from about a six-month period that did manage to make the papers.

One evening in October 2001, Andy Djimbo gets off the streetcar at Berchem-Staine-Agathe and sights a few members of *Black Démolition*. This is a worry because his people—he is a *New Jack*—have already had some warm encounters with *Black Démolition*. He makes a quick call on his cell phone to a buddy who promises to come for him right away. He takes off down Avenue des Myrthes, but his enemies catch up with him. They have sticks and knives, and proceed to beat him. For extra fun, one takes out a gun and holds it to his head. His friend shows up in a car just in time, and Mr. Djimbo makes a break for it.

He jumps into the car, which takes off like a shot, but *Black Démolition* is not to be left empty-handed. The men chase the car all the way to Rue Potaerdegat, and one fires three shots, hitting Mr. Djimbo in the leg and shoulder.

The *Black Démolition* contingent—all 18 of them—hop on a passing bus in the hope of making a getaway, but the police are already after them. A quick search turns up chains and baseball bats. The firearm is found under the seat of Fabrice Dimbala. It is not to be forgotten that this is Belgium, where no one is allowed to own a handgun, and people do not spray city streets with bullets.

Just a few weeks later, on Jan. 11, 2002, there is another revenge attack, this time by *Les Black Wolves*, a juvenile gang that is a kind of subcontractor for *Black Démolition*. Some of its boys attack 16-year-old Cedric, a member of a rival gang called *Black Pite*. They stab him at Galerie d'Ixelles, and leave him for dead in a pool of blood.

The next month *Black Démolition* pulls off a particularly rococo stunt. On a late afternoon, six of its members show up at number 196 Avenue Dailly and go up to an apartment on the fourth floor. They persuade 20-year-old Christophe to open the door (he is to this day close-mouthed about why *Black Démolition* sought his society that day), whereupon they tie him up and beat him with an iron rod. It appears that they are seeking information. They threaten to kill him, and finally drag him out to the balcony of

the apartment. The downstairs neighbor hears screaming and opens the shutters. There, before his astonished eyes, is young Christophe, hanging from a rope in mid air.

That same month, the wife of the president of Central African Republic pays a visit to Galerie d'Ixelles in the company of the wife of the Central African ambassador. A *Black Démolition* stalwart takes a swing at them with a sword. As it happens, the ladies have a body guard, who puts up a stiff resistance, but the brouhaha brings out about 10 members of *Black Démolition* who give chase. The three Central Africans manage to take refuge in the Hotel Conrad. The police make one arrest.

There is more to come at Galerie d'Ixelles. On March 22, 2002, *Black Démolition* rubs out one of its own members suspected of being a spy for a rival gang. The murder weapon is a fondue fork. The police pick up one of the killers two months later. They are already acquainted with Yannick, also known as Erwynn, who likes to spook the police by removing his glass eye and leering at them with an empty socket. Another killer happens to be the swordsman who attacked the ladies, but he is not caught until September, when he shows up in Switzerland. A third stays on the lam



The city is known for something else now.

until December when he, too, is rounded up in Switzerland.

But *Black Démolition* really makes a name for itself on May 16. That day, thousands of Belgians throng Rue Neuve, the busiest shopping street in the capital. Unbeknownst to them, *Black Démolition* and *New Jack* are fighting over who will control the drug trade in the area. Alain Ndakoze and Lutahe Okundji, both of *Black Démolition*, are killing time on Rue Neuve when they catch sight of several *New Jacks*. Mr. Ndakoze decides to set up an ambush for them, but the *New Jacks* are too quick

for him. Andy Djimbo, the gentleman who just a few months before stopped two *Black Démolition* bullets, pulls out a .32 caliber pistol and shoots Mr. Okundji in the leg. He then empties his pistol wildly into the crowd. Susan McDonald, a 24-year-old British tourist is hit in the leg. Panayotis D., a 21-year-



Congolese refugees: How many will end up in Europe?

old Greek living in Brussels, is seriously wounded, also in the leg, and is rushed to the hospital. Twenty-four-year-old Bechir D., visiting from Schaerbeek, is grazed by a bullet, and Andres B. from Anderlecht, age 29, is hit in the thigh. Miraculously, no one is killed.

In the panic that ensues, Mr. Ndakoze leaps on Mr. Djimbo and takes his weapon, then hustles off with his bleeding comrade, Mr. Okundji. The police show up promptly, however, so he ditches the gun. The gunman is quickly taken into custody. The very next day, Congolese are out in force on the Rue Neuve, but so are the police. There is no more gunplay.

Back in the Congo

One is struck by certain similarities between the behavior of African gangs and that of the armed gangs devastating the Eastern Congo. Particularly in the province of Iturie, killers give themselves fancy names, and it is the *Effaceurs* (Obliterators) who run things. Although they pretend to give it some kind of vague political justification, they have a habit of indiscriminate rape: men, women, children, grandmothers, babies. Anyone who makes it though the hair-raising reports Amnesty International sends back from the Congo begins to wonder why the militias bother to wear trousers when they are on maneuvers.

Black Démolition has something of a reputation in this line, too. On the night

of November 16, 2001—during the same period discussed previously—Augustin Pasi, Trésor Mutamba and Philippe Nguwa Wukendi sidled up to a girl of 16 (race unspecified) waiting for the train at the Louvain la Neuve Station. They talked her into following them to student quarters where they put a knife to her throat and proceeded to spend the night raping her. Mr. Pasi is something of a serial rapist. On the night of Nov. 18, 2000, he and three other Africans met three girls (again, race unspecified) at a snack bar, and managed to get them into an apartment. Once inside, all four systematically raped all three. This was not long after a group of nine *Black Démolition* members talked a girl of 15 off the streets of Antwerp, and took turns raping and sodomizing her.

All is fair in love and war. In February 2002, a girl who was having a drink with *Black Démolition* suddenly lost consciousness—knock-out drops in her drink—and came to only to find herself tied to a kitchen table in a strange apartment, where several Africans had their way with her.

Being the girlfriend of a gang member is no protection. On the night of March 2, 2002, Fabrice Dimbala left the



What some of them left behind in the Congo.

Gala discotheque with his 18-year-old companion. She had had enough for the evening and wanted to go home. This infuriated Mr. Dimbala, who decided to teach her a lesson. He invited Magatte Kobi, David Bakupa and Bayazi Mbuyi to come along with him to help mete out discipline, which he began by breaking one of her teeth with a vodka bottle. They spent the rest of the evening beating and raping her.

For *Black Démolition*, 2002 was The Year of the Woman. On August 13, seven members abducted a woman and spirited her off to an apartment in Rue Fontaine in Brussels, where they spent the night raping her. The next morning, when the young victim thought her tortures were over, the men bundled her into a car, drove her to the town of Charleroi, and started on her again. The woman did not manage to escape until three days later. This is not unusual. *Black Démolition* likes to keep women for days on end, and makes them do the cleaning when they are not otherwise occupied.

Belgian women are sadly ignorant of what they are up against. On April 19, 2003, our friend Fabrice Dimbala was out with pals in the Porte de Hal area and decided to snatch a handbag. The young owner, hoping to get her things back, followed them into a side street where they turned on her, dragged her into an apartment, and raped her.

It was around the same time that *Black Démolition* began branching out from rape and street crime, and started to ply its trade outside the capital. In December, Bely Tshimanga, Fabrice Okitundu and Luc Gillissen went to the town of Machelen where they visited a Pizza Hut. They helped themselves to the contents of the cash register and quickly disappeared. By the time the employees real-

ized what had happened, *Black Démolition* was already on the road to Evère, where they arrived 40 minutes later and knocked over another Pizza Hut.

Later that month, four gang members cruised into the town of Nivelles in a stolen automobile. They were broke and needed cash. About noon, armed and hooded, they burst into an electronics store called Draime Electronic. One gang member held a knife to the throat

of the store manager while another kicked a customer violently in the stomach. The gang dragged the two to the back of the store and tied them up, while they brandished weapons at the other customers. *Black Démolition* collected wallets, cell phones, car radios, DVD readers, and 2,055 Euros from the cash registers, and roared off in the store manager's Ford.



From Kinshasa . . .

Still in December, the day after Christmas, six or seven members attacked a take-out restaurant in Waterloo. They beat the woman behind the counter, emptied the till, and tried to make her open the safe. She stalled for time and they panicked, leaving with only the 650 Euros from the cash register.

The next day, December 27, *Black Démolition* arrived at Berchem-Sainte-Agathe. Two members reached into a car at a stop light, and stole purses from two women. An auxiliary police officer witnessed the crime and put out an alert. The next day, police saw the perpetrators back in Brussels in a car with French plates and went after them. *Black Démolition* escaped after a wild, high-speed chase through the streets of Brussels in which, miraculously, no one was hurt. Once again, Belgians were treated to sights heretofore seen only in American movies. On January 9, 2003, the gang robbed a gas station in the town of Lasne, drove to Overijse and hit another gas station.

In April of 2004, *Black Démolition* moved on to bigger things when two of its members abducted an executive in the Brussels office of the Congolese diamond mining company, Minière de Bakwanga. They were acting on orders of Jean-Charles Otoko, a former Congolese foreign minister and former officer of the company. He is suspected of

having stolen \$80 million from the firm, \$20 million of which he spent on weapons in Ukraine and the Czech Republic to get around the arms embargo on the Congo. The remaining \$60 million are thought to have come to rest in private Congolese hands. The abduction appears to have been some murky score-settling.

The petty thugs from Galerie d'Ixelles had, it seemed, come to the attention of highly-placed Congolese officials who seem to have discovered kindred spirits on whom they could rely for certain delicate operations.

Behind Bars

The police are finally putting some of these criminals behind bars. In February 2004 they caught up with the men who went on the year-end tear in 2002, in which they hit Pizza Huts and gas stations all over Belgium. Sentencing standards

are far different in Belgium than in the United States: Of the seven defendants, one got seven years, but several got off with just three.

In March 23, 2004, it was Bely Tshimanga-Kazadi's turn. This 20-year-old *Black Démolition* veteran, in the dock in Brussels along with a dozen confederates, was charged with seven rapes. Six of his victims were minors; one was just 13. He was also up for a car-jacking and several holdups. When the time came for the accused, in accordance with Belgian law, to speak for himself, Mr. Tshimanga glared at the judge, a woman, and explained:

"The police are always coming around Porte de Namur looking for blacks. But it's not just blacks who like group sex. Whites and Asians do too, and in my case it was all consensual. Group sex may seem strange to you, Your Honor, but you're just too old to understand. Anyway, I don't have to rape to have sex. I'm plenty good-looking enough to find a woman."

As the judge begins to read the sentence, Mr. Tshimanga exploded. He shot

out of his chair screaming, and threw himself at the judge. The police were on him in an instant, but it took a ferocious struggle to control him. Everyone in the courtroom thought peace had been restored, but at the first opportunity, Mr. Tshimanga went on the offensive again. This time all the other *Black Démolition* members erupted with him, lashing out at whoever was handy. The women in the courtroom were frozen in terror—they had heard what these men were capable of—while the defense lawyers, who had spent enough time with their clients to get to know them, fled for safety. The blacks started swinging chairs and benches. Fifteen more officers rushed to the courtroom, where there was a general melee. Order was finally restored, and *Black Démolition* got its sentences: ten years for Bely Tshimanga and Magatte Kobi, eight for Stefan Ngueudong, Guélor Litanda, Andry Bandazio, David Bakupa, and Bazayi Mbuyi, seven years for Lutahe Okundji, Frederic Kani, and Yves Mbena, six years for Prince Lusungi and Fabrice Okitundu, five years for Frederic Kani and Kaseba Kabamba.

As they are marched out of court, one of the men shouted, "We'll see you in hell and then you'll pay!"

Fabrice Dimbala, who was finally sentenced in January 2005, has been part of our story from the beginning. He was the *Black Démolition* member under



. . . to Brussels.

whose seat on the bus was found the pistol used to blaze away at the unfortunate Mr. Djimbo. It was he who decided to teach his girlfriend a lesson when she wanted to go home rather than keep the party going, and he was also one of the

purse-snatchers who raped the victim when she tried to get her property back. He was up for two gang rapes and three attempted murders, and got 13 years in prison. His lawyers were shocked. "A jail sentence must have some meaning and must lead to rehabilitation, but in this case the punishment is incomprehensible," said one. "This is why we will undoubtedly appeal."

Mr. Dimbala is one of these black criminals who fascinate liberal journalists, Belgian and American alike. The young thug was apparently a first-rate soccer player. He had already made a name for himself in a first-division amateur league, and was a sure bet for spot on a pro team. "Only 19 and facing 13 years in prison," moaned the press. "What a waste. What could have driven him to crime?" What, indeed?

In May 2004, no less a personage than Nicole Maréchal, Belgian cabinet minister for Aid to Youth, was at Galerie d'Ixelles to hear young Congolese speak for themselves. She heard that Congolese parents don't do enough for their children, but that ultimately the fault lies with the Belgians. There are no positive black role models in Belgium as there are in France or the United States, and blacks are society's chosen victims. "Most of us," said one Congolese, "feel that whichever way this country is going, it is going without us. We are the fall guys in this country, and the government doesn't do for us the things it does for other immigrant groups." And that, the young Congolese explained, was why they join gangs. They crave a thousand things they cannot afford, and fall under the influence of Africans older than themselves who are already completely alienated from Belgian society.

White Demolition

It would be a mistake, of course, to suppose that *Black Démolition* is a problem unique to Brussels. There have been extremely violent gangs in France for more than a decade, and they have appeared whenever immigration from Africa reached a certain level. In Switzerland, where the murderers of Okito Djunga took refuge, Africans are heavily involved in the drug trade. In Quebec, increasingly active gangs of blacks terrorize the population. Nor is the problem limited to French-speaking countries. In London, black gangs are such a problem that Trevor Phillips, the black

head of the Commission for Racial Equality, recently suggested that black boys be put in separate classes (see May issue.)

In the United States, of course, the theory has always been that black gangs of super-predators were the fruit of cen-

the most deluded optimists to see that throughout Europe, these people do not want to assimilate; they want to rule.

It is perhaps with blacks that the European elite maintains, to some degree, a genuinely colonialist mentality. Our rulers came of age when there were still



Ile de Ré: Where old Socialists go to get away from multiracialism.

turies of slavery and prejudice, but 40 years of racial preferences have not brought notable improvement. In Europe, where blacks have immigrated voluntarily, they find themselves in exactly the same situation and are clamoring for the full panoply of quotas and preferences.

In Africa itself one finds even worse gangs. Contrary to all predictions, the end of Apartheid in South Africa has not led to peace but to an explosion of violence of all kinds. In Congo, Liberia, Angola, Ivory Coast, Sierra Leone, and Rwanda, armed gangs in a state of alleged civil war prey on civilians as much as they fight each other. The black gangs in Belgium, with their violence and sadism, are a kind of social constant independent of geography or social or historical circumstances. It could have been predicted with complete confidence that they would appear once the African population reached a certain number.

Why, then, have Belgian politicians—like politicians in all European countries—been unable to take the bull by the horns, to stop this immigration, and protect their populations from predation? At least in the case of Muslims, the events of September 11 forced even

African empires, and when Europeans still claimed their goal was to civilize the savage. Politicians today seem to think they can go the previous generation one better: If civilization could not be brought to Africa, they can bring Africans to Europe and make them into good little Belgians and Frenchmen. What we now see before our eyes—in the streets, on public transport, in the crime figures—is proof that Africans do not become Belgians or Frenchmen. It is when they are in gangs that they most brutally assert their differences from us, but the gangs themselves are only the tip of a huge iceberg of irreconcilable differences that our elites—blinded by Eurocentrism—are determined to ignore.

Of course, our elites, just like the Communist *nomenklatura* who insulated themselves from the realities of the worker's paradise, are indifferent to the destruction of European society because they can escape its consequences. The French Socialist politician Lionel Jospin is a perfect example. For years, he preached multiculturalism and promoted full-bore immigration. When he finally withdrew from politics in 2002 after an unsuccessful run for the presidency, he

did not retire to a mixed-race neighborhood of the kind he did so much to bring about. He doesn't even live on the French mainland, but on a chic little island called Ile de Ré off the coast, in the Bay of Biscay. No non-white neighbors for him.

The Africans of *Black Démolition* are responsible for their crimes, but they are not responsible for having committed them in Belgium. Others—Belgians—are responsible for that. It is the politicians, the intellectuals, and the media personalities who are to blame. They are members of a far more dangerous gang: *White Démolition*.

Déjà Vu

The Belgian authorities do not seem to have noticed that what they are going through very much resembles the 1960s and 1970s in the United States. That was when crime rates—among blacks in particular—began to soar, and there was no shortage of theories about how society

was to blame. Jail sentences were short because prison was for rehabilitation. It took 20 years before Americans learned that the only thing that rehabilitates career criminals is old age, and that the best thing to do is simply keep them away from the rest of us. Now that most states have stiff sentencing guidelines, we have a larger prison population, but crime rates have been dropping for a decade.

The sentences the Belgian courts have handed out to *Black Démolition* thugs are jokes by American standards. The lawyers for Mr. Dimbala, the soccer prodigy, were shocked when their client got 13 years for two gang rapes and three attempted murders. An American court would probably have given him 30 years to life. We are certainly capable of unlearning our lessons, but Americans have had their fill of catch-and-release.

The Belgian view of crime is typical of all-white, European societies. The country has traditionally had violent crime rates one third to one quarter of those in the United States. It has had the

occasional sensational crime, but is not accustomed to the casual brutality and indifference to suffering that characterize many black criminals. It is only now discovering the horrible things of which certain 12 and 13-year-olds are capable, and has not yet adjusted its juvenile code. Many American states now prosecute child-pimps and child-murderers as adults.

If Belgians do not stop the flow of immigrants, they will be forced through the same, painful adjustment as the United States. It remains to be seen whether they will recognize in time that *Black Démolition* does not reflect inadequacies of Belgian society but results from the presence of Africans in a civilization built by Europeans **Ω**

Mr. Gheerbrant is a French author and poet who has written extensively about anti-white racism. This article is a translation and adaptation from his web site <http://blackdemolition.neuf.fr/index.html>.

Exposing the British Immigration Bureaucracy

Steve Moxon, *The Great Immigration Scandal*, Imprint Academic, 2004, 247 pp, \$29.90.

A whistle-blower tells his story.

reviewed by Derek Turner

Since 1997, when New Labour ushered in a new era of immigration irresponsibility, race relations in Britain have become so bad even some on the Left have noticed that mass immigration has brought serious and possibly intractable problems. Labour's careless attitude towards race relations has had many unfortunate consequences: The government abolished the Conservatives' "primary purpose rule," which prevented marriage for the sake of gaining British citizenship. It encouraged immigration by extolling its supposed cultural and economic benefits, and lavished work permits, student visas and family reunification permission on hundreds of thousands of applicants. It extended all kinds of "human rights" to illegal immigrants and "asylum seekers." It presided over various enquiries and reports (such as the *Parekh Report*, which recommended, *inter alia*, abolishing official use of the term Britain be-

cause of its "racist connotations"). It appointed David Blunkett as Home Secretary—a man who once said he could "not see any obvious upper limit to the



number of immigrants," and who spent much of his time in office expediting visa applications for his mistress's Filipina nannies. All of this was, of course, ac-

companied by a constant, shrill, chorus about "racism," and this combination of posturing and foolishness has led to a massive increase in immigration to Britain.

Immigration statistics are notoriously difficult to find or verify, but net legal immigration increased from 35,000 in 1993 to 183,000 in 2000. When all categories— asylum seekers, family members, work permit recipients—are taken into account, an estimated 543,000 foreigners came legally to live in Britain between 1999 and 2003. On top of this, there is an unquantifiable but substantial stream of illegal immigrants. Very few are ever deported even if they are caught, because each deportation costs the taxpayer some £38,000 in various expenses, and no politician dares to appear "racist." Government projections say Britain's population is likely to grow to 64.8 million by 2031 from 59.2 million today. According to the independent think tank Migration Watch, five-sixths of this increase will be due to immigration.

When to all these startling statistics is added the socio-political fallout from the Sept. 11 attacks and Tony Blair's

support for the war in Iraq, it is small wonder that the period since 2001 has seen major race riots across England, and unprecedented local success for the British National Party, the only party that has had the courage to talk about immigration seriously. Small wonder, too, that after decades of silence on the subject, four well-written books on immigration into Britain appeared in rapid succession.

First, in 2002, came Anthony Browne's *Do We Need Mass Immigration?* (Civitas, London), in which the half-Indian Europe Editor of the *Times* analysed the economic arguments for mass immigration, and found them seri-



Home Office insignia and motto.

ously wanting. He proposed a set of remedies that borrowed equally from Left and Right—but neither his evenhandedness nor his ethnicity prevented David Blunkett from accusing him of “bordering on fascism.” His book was closely followed by Myles Harris’s *Tomorrow Is Another Country* (also Civitas, 2002). This was a serious critique of the asylum “system,” and Dr. Harris was audacious enough to touch on the relative genetic relatedness of European peoples.

Ashley Mote’s *Overcrowded Britain* (Tanner Publishing, 2003) heavily influenced the United Kingdom Independence Party’s policy on immigration, and helped catapult it from three to 12 members in the European parliament. (Mr. Mote was one of the 12, but has since become an independent.) That Civitas, an offshoot of the respected Institute for Economic Affairs, published two of these books lent a degree of respectability to long-dormant arguments for restricting immigration. It has suddenly become much harder to be an immigration ignoramus.

Now comes the most personal of these books, Steve Moxon’s story of how he

blew the whistle on Home Office immigration procedures (or lack thereof), and was first suspended and eventually sacked for “embarrassing ministers.” Mr. Moxon worked for six months during 2004 in the Managed Migration section of the Home Office’s Immigration and Nationality Directorate (IND) at Sheffield, where his job was to process work permit applications. He soon realised that migration was not being “managed” at all, and that the name was, as he puts it, “unintentionally comic.” In every area—work permits, student visas, dependent relatives and marriages—senior immigration staff, up to ministerial level, were complicit in flouting immigration law and procedures, and approved tens of thousands of applications on the lamest of pretexts and with minimal investigation.

The applicants he dealt with were mostly from European countries either about to join the European Union or scheduled to join in several years. This was politically sensitive because there had been considerable public worry that many people would immigrate from these countries as soon as they joined the EU. The government had promised there would be no mass influx, and so—Moxon believes—may have pressured the IND to approve applications from these countries before their accession on May 1, 2004, so the numbers after that date could be made to look small.

Whether there was pressure or not, IND staff in Mr. Moxon’s department were “literally rubber stamping” the applications. Managed Migration told underlings there was no need to look too closely at applications; since the vast majority of applicants were being approved, it meant there was “low risk” across all categories of applicant. As a senior caseworker explained to Mr. Moxon, “Look, we all know it’s pants [all rubbish]; so don’t ask me about it because I’ll just get annoyed.” Mr. Moxon describes the entire Immigration Service as a “super-thin porous membrane.”

Mr. Moxon was worried by what he was seeing, and began to ask questions. His superiors brushed him aside, so he tried to reach Beverley Hughes, then immigration minister. She ignored him. He then spoke to the *Sunday Times*, and a story duly appeared on March 7, 2004, under the headline “Lid Blown on Migrant Cover-up.” The following day, he was suspended with full pay.

The Home Office denied Mr. Moxon’s claims, but the next day Beverley Hughes admitted there had been problems, and that there would be an enquiry—although she denied knowing about the problems. On March 14, the *Sunday Times* published more of Mr. Moxon’s revelations about abuses in student and marriage applications, and this time the Home Office did not deny the charges. Other IND workers began to leak memos and instructions that supported Mr. Moxon. The government’s official enquiry exonerated Hughes, but it was widely regarded as untrustworthy.

Simultaneously, it emerged that the government had been ignoring recommendations of its own consular officials in the applicants’ own countries. James Cameron, manager of the visa section at



Ex-Home Secretary David Blunkett.

the British Embassy in Bucharest, had long been recommending that many Romanian applications be rejected. He was overruled every time without explanation. Mr. Cameron contacted the Conservative Party about many such applications, including what became the notorious case of a one-legged Romanian who applied for a permit to work as a roofer in Britain. He reported that Mr. Moxon’s revelations were “just the tip of the iceberg.” Mr. Cameron was also suspended, and the government charged him with “gross misconduct” because of his revelations. In June 2004, he was removed from his post, given a “final warning” and had his pay and promotion frozen.

Miss Hughes denied all knowledge of Mr. Cameron’s warnings, only to be reminded by Labour’s deputy chief whip that he had called her attention to these warnings himself. Miss Hughes was forced to resign on April 1st (an approx-

priate date)—a sacrificial lamb for then-Home Secretary David Blunkett who was, we now know, scamming visa applications to please his mistress.

The government panicked, halting all applications from Romania and Bulgaria. On April 6 and 27, Prime Minis-



Asians rioting in Bradford, 2001.

ter Tony Blair gave major speeches on immigration, promising to bring the situation under control. (In September, he even wrote an article for the *Times* admitting that concerns about immigration were “neither extremist nor racist.”) The police made much-publicized raids on a few illegal-immigrant-run massage parlors. The government began to trumpet the decline in asylum applications, and used immigration as a pretext to push its scheme for national ID cards.

At the same time, as a leaked Home Office paper on “Marketing and Media Strategy” made plain in late May, the supposedly impartial civil servants at the Home Office were to feed human interest stories about immigrants and pro-immigration arguments to broadcasters at the (also supposedly impartial) BBC. The government tried to make the case for more immigration, but its arguments were undercut by a National Audit Office report in June that said nine out of ten Romanian and Bulgarian applicants should have been refused. On July 26, in the midst of all this, Mr. Moxon was sacked under the Public Interest Disclosure Act, for “gross misconduct,” although the unofficial, internal justification was the charge of “embarrassing ministers.” The *Sunday Times* and *Daily Mail* immediately called for his reinstatement.

Conservatives tried to exploit the scandal. Party leader Michael Howard and David Davis, the Shadow Home

Secretary, met Mr. Moxon, and tried to take the credit when Miss Hughes resigned. However, Mr. Davis backpeddled after the *Independent* called Mr. Moxon’s book “a crude and inflammatory tract,” and the party’s new policy on immigration, announced in late January, is characteristically underwhelming: Conservatives promise to set an (unspecified) upper limit on legal immigration and a quota for asylum seekers, improve port security (while cutting the Immigration Service budget), and to tighten up on sham marriages. All this is softened, if not quite negated, by multicultural pieties and assiduous courting of minority groups.

The story Mr. Moxon tells is rewarding to read, and he has combined his anecdotes and ruminations on diverse subjects with very well-researched material, especially on why the economic arguments for immigration do not stand up. There are also well-informed discussions on such matters as Islam (for which the book was dubbed “an Islamophobic rant”) and racial nomenclature.

Most ambitiously, however, he includes an interesting analysis of why mass immigration can bring on “crowding stress.” It is well known that in times



Bradford rioters burned every car at a BMW dealership.

of overcrowding and food shortages, pregnant rabbits, for example will reabsorb unborn litters rather than bear them into hardship, and that laboratory animals respond to crowded conditions with infanticide, cannibalism, “unusual and unproductive sexual behaviour,” reduced reproduction, and abandonment

of unweaned young. Mr. Moxon says human beings living in densely populated societies may have similar reactions, and that his may be especially likely in diverse societies: “Logically, in a pre-modern, unsafe world (the one to which we are genetically adapted), if we encounter many people who are non-kin and unfamiliar strangers, then there would be more risks in trying to raise children than in the social environment we are born to expect, that of a sub-tribal group.”

Despite this sort of boldness, Mr. Moxon is an unlikely hero for those who wish to preserve Britain’s national identity. No “rightwinger,” his only experience of politics has been as a Liberal Democrat candidate in local elections, and he had no interest in immigration until his period of enforced idleness between suspension and final dismissal from the Home Office—meaning, ironically, that the government effectively subsidised his research for this book. On his web site (<http://uk.geocities.com/spmox/home.html>), one can detect the shocked feelings of the honest liberal who suddenly realises he is up against a monster: “Anyone writing about this subject [immigration] is open to unlimited abuse. The media, the BBC especially, actively suppress debate. How can politics be conducted in the absence of any standard whatsoever regarding representation of opinion?” He is clearly bitter about how he has been treated, and is preparing a case against the Home Office for firing him.

The liberal Mr. Moxon has accomplished far more than many more traditional immigration reformers. He has managed to get the subject into the public domain, and had a pivotal role in the sacking of a waste-of-space minister—and purely out of a sense of duty. He is acutely conscious of his family’s non-conformist religious traditions: “My Quaker ancestors were imprisoned for their beliefs in 1650, so battling the establishment must run deep within me. John Mokeson [a 17th century ancestor] and his kin fought against what they saw as the false God of empty worship championed by the state, while today I fight against the false God of universal Equality.”


The Great Immigration Scandal is not flawless. It is occasionally repetitive, and although it has a list of Further Reading

(including New Century Foundation's study, *The Color of Crime*), the references leave something to be desired. Some of the slang terms may also be lost on an American audience. But these are minor quibbles, almost not worth mentioning except that a reviewer is obliged to nitpick. If the demographic, cultural and political death of a thousand cuts that Britain is suffering is yet forestalled, much credit should go to Steve Moxon. Partly because of his principle and courage, no one—however much he might like to—can now ignore the ethnic elephant in the drawing room.

Whether Labour's laxness on race

was motivated by the desire to get more voters (85 percent of Britain's immigrants and descendants of immigrants vote Labour), or a belief that it simply wasn't important, or out of millenarian sentimentality, the situation has spiraled out of control and may rebound badly on them at the polls. In a review of Mr. Moxon's book, the *Sunday Times* of Oct. 17, 2004 quotes a Labour MP: "Many of our supporters hold social views well to the right of the Conservative Party and offer opinions on asylum that the British National Party tries to reflect. A basic shift of allegiance could be under

way, with Labour's immigration policy the catalyst." Those of us who wish to preserve something of the greatness and uniqueness of Britain can only hope that he is right.

(This book is published in Britain but available in the US from Philosophy Documentation Center, Box 7147, Charlottesville, VA 22906. Please add \$5.00 to the purchase price, for shipping and handling. A check for \$34.90 should be made out to "Imprint Academic.") 

Derek Turner is editor of the London-based magazine Right Now! (www.Right-Now.org).

Old Miss, New Miss

AR ad shakes up the University of Mississippi

by Robert S. Griffin

On Friday, April 15th, a quarter-page version of the ad on this page appeared in the *Daily Mississippian*, the campus newspaper at the University of Mississippi. That same day, in the Internet version of the paper, online editor Joy Douglas wrote, "An advertisement that ran in today's print edition of the *Daily Mississippian* contained a racist message. The ad . . . promotes *American Renaissance*, a monthly magazine launched in 1999 [sic] that espouses incendiary views about immigration and race relations. The *Daily Mississippian* advertising staff will include a retraction and apology for the advertisement in Monday's edition of the newspaper."

The rest of her story explained how the ad got into the paper. Ronald Odom, advertising representative and senior at UM, was quoted as saying, "It just kind of snuck through the cracks between advertising, creative services, editorial and into the paper. I'm sure if someone had read it, it would definitely been taken care of ahead of time."

Miss Douglas also quoted the *Daily Mississippian* editor, UM student Emery Carrington: "This ad's message is completely unacceptable and is something that the *Daily Mississippian* staff does not condone, believe in or support . . . We have repeatedly spoken out against hate and racism in this newspaper . . . I hope our readers will under-

stand that this message would never have appeared in our paper under normal circumstances."

The next Monday, April 18th, the *Daily Mississippian* print version published an editorial by Miss Carrington, and columns by staff reporters Franco Healy and Michael Patronik, all highly critical of the ad.

The AR ad did raise a number of questions that could have been the subject of investigation, analysis, and dialogue on the UM campus. Is it true that whites will be a racial minority in this country by mid-century, and will that have negative consequences for them? Is diversity really a weakness rather than a strength? What is your actual experience of diversity on campus? Have you come to your own conclusions about race and diversity, or have you been told what to think? Jared Taylor, who sponsored the ad, was quoted in a story in the *Clarion-Ledger*, a Jackson, Mississippi, newspaper, explaining that the purpose of the ad was to promote debate, and these questions are certainly worth debating. Given the circumstances in this country's universities, however, it is a safe bet that they will not be seriously explored or publicly debated at Ole Miss.

One might think that unfettered inquiry and free and open

Will She Be a Racial Minority by the Time She Turns 40?



Third-World immigration—both legal and illegal—is now running so high that whites are expected to be a minority by mid-century. Will this be good for America? Everyone tells you to "celebrate diversity," but for whites to "celebrate diversity" is to celebrate their dwindling numbers and declining influence.

Would Mexicans "celebrate diversity" if whites were pouring across the Rio Grande, threatening to reduce them to a minority in their own country?

Is diversity a weakness or a strength? Just look at your campus. Are different racial groups a source of joy or a cause of friction?

Don't just swallow slogans. Think for yourself.

American Renaissance

www.AmRen.com

(703) 716-0900

debate were at the heart of what a university is about. But according to the prevailing ideological orthodoxy—multiculturalism—inquiry and debate are subordinated to achieving three racial ends: establishing the concept of racial egalitarianism; realizing the ideal of diversity in every aspect of life; and stamping out “white racism.” If inquiry and dialogue do not serve these ends, shut them down hard. As the saying goes, no free speech for fascists.

And what are students—and faculty for that matter—to do when they encounter challenges to racial egalitarianism, diversity, and anti-racism? They are to dismiss them, condemn whoever is behind them, and affirm their own allegiance to diversity and opposition to racism. They are not to engage these bad ideas and bad people but rather to get away from them as quickly as they can.

What are some ways to do that? The four articles by student writers reveal some possibilities, all of which are welcomed at universities because they keep students from dealing with perspectives and people that contradict what they are being conditioned to internalize:



Negative labeling. Give something a pejorative label and you don’t have to deal with it. The *Daily Mississippian* articles used the words “racism,” “hate,” “racist,” “bigotry,” “white supremacist,” “xenophobic,” “extremist,” “far-right,” “intolerant,” and “ignorant.”

Negative association. Writer Michael Patronik associates AR with the National Front in France, whose voters, he claims, “are not highly educated, somewhat more religious than average, and probably work in shrinking industrial-sector jobs.” Supporters of such organizations,

writes Mr. Patronik, are “losers in modernization.” He continues: “Remember those old black-and-white films of Nazi physicians using calipers to measure the skull proportions of imprisoned Jews and Roma, finding them to be sub-human degenerates? That’s exactly the rubbish this modern-day-Dr. Mengele [Jared Taylor] is promoting.”

Conventional wisdom. This assumes that reiterating the trite and (presumed to be) true is the same as refutation. Columnist Franco Healy: “How dare the *American Renaissance* question immigration when their ancestors were once immigrants themselves.”

Derision. After reading the ad, Mr. Healy writes, “I almost wet myself laughing.”

It’s offensive. Free speech is good, but not if it offends someone. Editor Carrington: “. . . it is one thing to support the debating of issues. It is quite another to allow the spreading of messages that offend a large majority. . . . People were as shocked, disgusted, and offended as I was when I first laid eyes on the ad Friday morning.” Ronald Odom, the advertising executive: “Being an African American student at the university who appreciates the progress we have made from our past, I am offended that this organization would place an ad in our paper. . . .” Melanie Watkins, advertising manager: “The ad and its message offend me greatly.”

“I think.” This involves paying attention to something—AR’s message in this case—only until it prompts something else to pop into your head. “I think this university has come a long way and has become intolerant of messages such as those that *American Renaissance* spreads,” offers Miss Carrington. Mr. Healy reports that a “practical example” of the value of diversity “would be the World War II Olympics, where the diverse roster of the United States triumphed over Hitler’s team of Aryan ‘supermen.’” There were no Olympics during the Second World War, and in the 1936 Berlin games Germany won more medals than any other country by far, but that is beside the point, because the issue is now what Mr. Healy thinks, and that is what Mr. Healy thinks.

Self-congratulation. This involves letting the world know you are a good person. Writes editor Carrington: “I, like many others my age and beyond, am proud that I refuse to judge others solely on the basis of their skin color. There

are good people and there are bad people. Color of skin has nothing to do with that distinction.” Miss Carrington



The “Lyceum” at Ole Miss.

accomplishes a great deal in these three sentences. She lets the world know she is pure of heart (“I refuse to judge . . .”). She trivializes racial differences (references to skin color are meant to affirm that racial differences are only skin deep) so we know she is a true-blue racial egalitarian. Finally, “like many others my age” emphasizes that she is part of the group, she belongs, she’s included—being shunned is one of the most feared consequences of being on the wrong side of the race question.

The *Clarion-Ledger* reported that Eruke Ohwofasa, the director of diversity affairs at UM, discussed the ad in her sociology class. I suspect some of these strategies found their way into that discussion.

My experience in the university—I’m on the faculty of one—is that when something like this ad comes up, there is a brief flurry of outrage, attack, and testimony, and then things return to normal. The bad ideas go away, and the bad people either retreat into the shadows or try to appease the commissars by backtracking and groveling. “I’m not a racist, really.” “You misunderstood me.” “I didn’t mean to offend anyone.” This goes on everywhere, not just in universities. Whichever outcome—silence or bowing and scraping—the lesson for anyone who might contemplate bucking the party line is: “I better not stick my head outside the foxhole.”

What made this case different is that after each of the four stories in the online *Daily Mississippian* there were comments—around 120 were posted in total. Some were frivolous, but many were informed and thoughtful. As far as I could tell, the vast majority of comments, and virtually all of the substan-

tive ones, came from people outside the university. The messages from students tended to be terse, and I found none from a UM faculty member. My guess is that the online participation of the UM students and faculty reflected campus reality: egalitarianism, diversity, and anti-racism are preached and affirmed, but not analyzed or assessed, and they are not compared with alternatives. It is these three noble goals versus the forces of darkness. The posts from outside interjected something onto the UM campus that otherwise would not have been there.

The “anti-diversity” side, which is absent in university discourse, rang out strong and clear in the comments. Among the posts were three from Jared Taylor, which are excerpted here:

“The *Daily Mississippian* is telling us it will publish no political opinion with which the staff disagrees. This is a shameful admission. University students are supposed to explore differing points of view, not act like Soviet thought police.

“Of course, only when a point of view is likely to be true do people try to silence it without debate. It is because diversity of race, religion, language, etc. is so obviously a weakness that people must constantly tell themselves it is a strength, and silence anyone who suggests otherwise. . . .

“Students at this university should learn from this incident that there are people on campus trying very hard to make sure they do not hear all sides of every question.”

**White university students
are *our* young people;
they are us, not them.
We must reach them and
give them guidance and
support.**

“So I am a modern-day Dr. Mengele, a white supremacist who promulgates shoddy racial quasi-science? Hyperventilation, Mr. Patronik, is not debate. The races certainly differ. On average, whites are more intelligent and law-abiding than blacks, and north Asians—Chinese, Koreans, Japanese—are more intelligent and law-abiding than whites. There are a host of other racial differences that run from average birth-weight to twinning rates and reactions to medicines, to av-

erage brain size and levels of serum testosterone.”

“Finally, I suspect Miss Carrington is wrong to insist that her campus has no interest in the questions the ad raises. Are whites really indifferent to the prospect of becoming a racial minority? Should they be? If diversity is so attractive, why



Front page, Oct. 1, 1962.

do people avoid it in their private lives? Only someone whose eyes are firmly shut to reality would pretend these questions are of no interest or relevance. Our office has received quite a few telephone calls from students at Ole Miss. Some, including one black and one student from India, said they wished I could come to campus to give a lecture. No, Miss Carrington, your campus is not quite so closed-minded as you think.”

Here is a comment from “Courtney,” who does not further identify herself:

“Go to any part of the country that has a majority black or Hispanic population. Would you like to live in any of those places? Better yet, go to any country that is run by either blacks or Hispanics. You will find that they are all third-world slums. Whites created this country and whites are the ones who made this country great. . . . Whites have every right to want to preserve this nation’s European culture and heritage, and any white who supports the displacement of their own nation that their own ancestors created is crazy. If you look around the world, it is only white countries who are taking in immigrants. Why

does it have to be this way? How come the UN isn’t calling Japan and Korea or any other rich Asian nation ‘racist’ for not taking immigrants in? Why is it only white countries that are expected to destroy their own cultures by taking in immigrants? Nonwhite immigrants are destroying America, just the same way they are destroying Europe. This needs to stop, or we might as well say goodbye to Western Civilization.”

John Robinson wrote from Southern California:

“I did a quick Yahoo search and found many ‘racist’ organizations at Ole Miss—organizations promoting the group interests, group culture of particular racial, ethnic people. Here is a short list: Muslim Student Association. Malaysian Student Association. Chinese and Taiwanese Student Association. Black Law Students Association. Being a White European American shouldn’t be a crime anywhere in America. If you don’t fight for the legitimate rights of your people, you will lose it all.”

Finally, a reader from Florida quoted Chief Sitting Bull (1831-1890) of the Hunkpapa Sioux:

“Is it wrong for me to love my own? Is it wicked for me because my skin is red? Because I’m Sioux? Because I was born where my father lived? Because I would die for my people and my country?”

AR is to be applauded for submitting the ad. Undoubtedly it did prompt talk and reflection among white students on the UM campus, and among some faculty. And very significantly, it probably brought some people to the AmRen.com web site, where they will find a racial frame of reference they won’t get at school.

My experience with white university students—and I had this impression of the ones involved in the University of Mississippi controversy—is that they are good people. They are decent young whites who are affirming what everybody and everything in their world tells them is right and fair. Even more fundamentally, they are *our* young people; they are us, not them. We must reach them and give them guidance and support. And no matter what they say or do, we must always love them. **Ω**

Robert S. Griffin is a professor of education at the University of Vermont. His most recent book is One Sheaf, One Vine: Racially Conscious White Americans Talk About Race.

O Tempora, O Mores!

Britain Votes

The British parliamentary elections of May 5 show that the country has doubts about the wisdom of mass immigration. The Tories, led by Michael Howard, campaigned to set quotas on immigrants, establish a border police, and process asylum seekers offshore. Campaign posters said, "It's not racist to impose limits

It's not racist
to impose limits
on immigration.

ARE YOU THINKING WHAT WE'RE THINKING?

CONSERVATIVE

on immigration." Polls showed overwhelming support for Tory immigration proposals, while the electorate backed Labour on most other questions. [Tory Election Poster Sparks Complaints of Racism from Students and Teachers, Richard Garner, Independent (London), Feb. 7, 2005. Dominic Casciani, Election Issues: Immigration, BBC, April 4, 2005.]

Even as they accused the Tories of practicing "the politics of fear," Labour also pushed restrictions. The party promised to introduce a point system to ensure that non-European immigrants all have special skills. Temporary workers would have to post bond to ensure they would go home at the end of their term, and employers would be fined for hiring illegals. Labour promised more detention of failed asylum-seekers and greater efforts to expel them. Also, the government would try to return even recognized refugees to their home countries once the danger of persecution had passed. Towards the end of the campaign, Labour promised to add 600 border guards, a clear imitation of the Tory border police proposal. [Clarke Unveils Immigration Plan, BBC News, Feb. 7, 2005. Philippe Naughton, Blair Attacks 'One-Issue' Tories Over Immigration Tactics, Times (London), April 22, 2005.]

The vote returned Labour to power with 356 seats but the Tories gained 33 seats. Labour lost to other parties as well, and saw its majority in the 646-member

Parliament drop from 167 to just 66. Some Labour MPs think Mr. Blair should take responsibility for this setback and step down as leader. [Glenn Frankel and Dan Balz, Facing Roadblocks, Blair Quietly Begins Third Term, Washington Post, May 7, 2005, p. A10.]

Although the British National Party, led by Nick Griffin, did not win any seats in parliament, results were encouraging.

In the last elections in 2001, the BNP fielded candidates in 22 constituencies, but this year they stood in 118. On average, they won 4.3 percent of the vote; in one constituency, the BNP candidate got 17 percent. The party got 0.74 percent of the total British vote in 2005, versus 0.2 in 2001, an almost four-fold increase. The BNP pledged, if elected, to try to withdraw from the

European Union, to bring back troops from Iraq so they can protect Britain's borders, and set up incentives for immigrants and their descendants to go home. [BNP website (www.bnp.org.uk), Election Results, May 6, 2005. BNP Launches Election Manifesto, BBC News, April 24, 2005.]

The BNP suffered considerable harassment during the campaign. In December, party leader Nick Griffin and BNP founder John Tyndall were arrested for



"incitement to racial hatred," and were charged in court on April sixth. Mr. Griffin claimed the court had charged him because he spoke about non-white involvement in the drug trade and about a scandal in which Asian immigrants were caught molesting white girls. [BNP Leader Faces Race Hate Charges, Press Association (UK), April 6, 2005.]

Britain's two other anti-immigration parties, the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) and Veritas, did

worse than expected. Although they stood in all British constituencies, UKIP got only 2.3 percent of the vote, and their best candidate got only eight percent. Robert Kilroy-Silk, who leads the Veritas party, got only six percent of the vote in his own constituency. [UKIP Falls Short of Its Targets, BBC News, May 6, 2005.]

Europe's Dilemma

Immigration keeps Europe's population growing. Between now and 2025 (when it is expected to peak), the population of the 25 European Union EU nations will grow by two percent, from 458 million to 469.5 million, with nearly all of the growth coming from (overwhelmingly non-white) immigration. It will then start declining unless there are more immigrants. At the same time, the number of working-age Europeans will fall by 20.8 million (6.8 percent), while the number over age 65 will double to 80 million. The US population will increase 25 percent over the same period—almost entirely due to mass immigration

European leaders worry that falling birthrates and aging populations threaten both the welfare state and the EU economy. A recently released "green paper" by the European Commission worries that "never in history has there been economic growth without population growth." The report blames low fertility rates on high unemployment, expensive housing, and the lack of government handouts to parents. It suggests governments should do more to help, but notes that "ever larger migrant flows may be needed to meet the need for labor and safeguard Europe's prosperity." The United Nation agrees. It recently published a study saying Europe will need more than a million immigrants a year for the next 45 years if it wants to maintain its economy.

Average Europeans disagree. In a poll conducted by the EU last fall, 54 percent said Europe didn't need any more immigrants. Holland and Denmark have tightened immigration and asylum laws, with the Dutch vowing to deport 26,000 illegal aliens by 2007. Even the French and Germans are getting serious. France may establish a new police force to keep out illegals, and Germany has passed a new

law to let in only skilled immigrants. Anti-immigration sentiment largely accounts for the appeal of European nationalist parties like the French National Front and the Belgian Vlaams Belang.

Immigration was a big issue in the British election. When Tony Blair became prime minister in 1997, Britain let in 107,000 immigrants; in 2003, the figure was 236,000. Polls showed voters were more worried about foreigners than about terrorism or the war in Iraq. Many Britons think the situation is even worse than it is. A 2000 poll found the British think 20 percent of the population is foreign-born, though the actual figure is about eight percent—still a record high. [Stephen Castle, *Fall in Population Threatens Economic Future of Europe*, *The Independent* (London), March 18, 2005. Jill Lawless, *Angst Over Immigration Inspires Changes in Policy*, *Law in Europe*, AP, April 4, 2005. Sarah Liebowitz, *Rising Immigrant Numbers Stir Britain Ahead of Vote*, *Boston Globe*, April 5, 2005.]

Los Angeles, Mexico

In late April, commuters in Los Angeles were treated to billboards (see photo) advertising KRCA-TV's Spanish news programs, which suggested that Los Angeles is part of Mexico. The image im-



posed on the LA skyline is the Angel of Independence, a famous monument in Mexico City. The ads say *Tu ciudad. Tu equipo* (Your city. Your team).

Immigration reformers reacted angrily. Peter Amundson, a volunteer with the California Republican Assembly, says the ads are “a slap in the face to Californians and a pretty blatant one . . . This

is not Mexico. This is the United States.” Daryl Jurbala, communications director of Americans for Legal Immigration, which held a protest in front of KRCA's studios on May 1, said, “I don't think it's responsible for anyone to encourage or reward or try to make illegal immigrants feel welcome.” California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger called the ads “divisive” and “unnecessary,” and called on the broadcaster and Clear Channel Outdoor, which owns the billboards, to take them down. One protester climbed a billboard and covered the word “Mexico” with an American flag.

Liberman Broadcasting, which owns KRCA-TV, three other Spanish-language television stations, and sixteen radio stations, at first defended the ads, saying they were just trying to attract Spanish-speakers. “Our newscasters cater to them. We try to make them comfortable,” explained executive vice president Leonard Liberman. “We tell the story behind LA, and we tell the story behind Mexico. If they [the protestors] find that offensive, I'm sorry. But you just have to drive around LA to know that this is a Hispanic city.” Liberman Broadcasting is the same company that produced and aired KRCA-TV's “Gana la Verde” or “Win the Green,” a TV game show in which illegal aliens compete for a chance at a US green card (see AR, Oct. 2004).

Clear Channel Outdoor said it accepted the advertising as part of its “multicultural sales and marketing initiative” aimed at “serving the fast-growing US Hispanic and African American population.” However, in the face of increasing protest, the company announced it would require a revision of the ad copy. The new posters have yet

to appear. [L.A. Now in Mexico? *WorldNetDaily.com*, April 25, 2005. Anna Gorman and Susana Enriquez, *Ad Putting L.A. in Mexico Called Slap in Face*, *LA Times*, April 27, 2005. Arnold: *L.A. Billboard Should Come Down*, *WorldNetDaily.com*, April 28, 2005. *Old Glory Covers Mexico Billboard*, *WorldNetDaily.com*, May 2, 2005. *Public Outrage Kills 'L.A., Mexico' Sign*, *WorldNetDaily.com*, May 4, 2005.]

Costs of Hospitality

Hospitals in states bordering on Mexico are going bankrupt because they have to treat illegal aliens. No one knows how many uninsured illegals there are, but states that border on Mexico and other states with many illegals, like New York, Illinois, and Florida, also have the highest concentrations of people without medical insurance. [Illegals: *The Real Cause of Health Insurance Crisis*, *NewsMax*, May 2, 2003.]

The problem is especially serious in California, where 60 hospitals closed between 1993 and 2003 because more than half of their patients did not pay. Another 24 California hospitals are struggling and may soon close. California spends \$1.4 billion per year in medical care for illegals. The federal government requires emergency rooms to treat all emergency patients, and the definition of “emergency” is so vague it covers coughs and headaches. Patients who think they are unfairly denied treatment can sue hospitals, and fines are stiff. Illegal aliens can therefore use emergency rooms as clinics.

Medicaid may also pay rehabilitation costs when illegal immigrants are seriously hurt, and since rehabilitation can take years, costs are steep. High crime rates among illegal aliens make them especially expensive. Illegal aliens with gun-shot or stabbing wounds are often dumped in front of hospitals from moving cars. Many cities in California, including Los Angeles and San Diego, have sanctuary policies that prevent hospitals from reporting patients they know are illegal.

Children of illegal aliens born in America are eligible for the full range of welfare services. Immigrant advocacy groups supply interpreters and activists to make sure children get all the welfare they can. For example, one California illegal immigrant gets expensive treatments for all of his five American-born

children because they have mental problems: two are autistic, two have attention deficit disorder, and one has oppositional defiant disorder. The state pays for drugs for all five, and the two autistic children each have a personal attendant, plus an “individual education program” that costs \$30,000 a year. [Federation for American Immigration Reform, *The Costs of Illegal Immigrants to Californians*, Nov. 2004.]

Other border states have the same problems. Illegals make up 26 percent of patients treated by hospitals in Harris County, Texas, where Houston is located, and the county is considering cutting back on services and hospital beds to compensate for the cost. The state as a whole spends \$520 million a year on illegals. Arizona spends \$400 million a year. The Southeast Arizona Medical Center, located near the border, has been teetering on bankruptcy for years because of the cost of treating illegals. [Federation for American Immigration Reform, *The Costs of Illegal Immigration to Texans*, April, 2005. Bill Murphy, *Hospital District Struggles with Burden from Beyond Borders*, *Houston Chronicle*, March 1, 2005. Federation for American Immigration Reform, *The Costs of Illegal Immigration to Arizonans*, June, 2004.]

Illegal immigrants are reintroducing diseases that had been virtually wiped out. Mexicans, Filipinos, and Vietnamese are mainly responsible for bringing back tuberculosis. The variant of the disease they have introduced is resistant to the usual drugs and takes 24 months of treatment that costs \$250,000. Immigrants have also brought chagas disease, dengue fever, and polio. Leprosy used to be rare; in 40 years there were only 900 cases. The past three years have seen 7,000 new cases, brought in by immigrants from India, Brazil, the Caribbean, and Mexico. [Madeleine Pelner Cosman, *Illegal Aliens and American Medicine*, *Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons*, Spring 2005.]

No Comprendre

Major League Baseball recently banned steroids and other “performance enhancing drugs,” some of which can be bought over the counter. There is mandatory testing, and players face fines and suspensions. Four of the five major leaguers busted so far this year are from Latin America, including the latest, Min-

nesota Twins relief pitcher Juan Rincon of Venezuela. Nearly 30 percent of major league baseball players are foreign-born—242 out of 829 (including players on the disabled list)—and 206 are foreign-born Hispanics.

Boston Red Sox player David Ortiz, a Dominican, says the policy is unfair to Hispanics because the players association did not give them a Spanish translation: “Let me tell you something,” he says. “My English is not the best, but I can understand everything. I can read, I can write. And sometimes I [still] misunderstand things. Think about a guy who can’t really talk or read.” Mr. Ortiz says Hispanic players looking for an energy boost may walk into a health-food store looking for vitamins and end up taking something on the banned list because they can’t read labels. He wants the players association to get all Hispanic players together during the offseason and use an interpreter to explain the policy. [Karen Guregian, *Ortiz Rips Drug Policy: Says Latinos Face Language Barrier*, *Boston Herald*, May 3, 2005. Scott Levison, *29.2% of MLB Players Born Outside of USA*, *Tampa Bay Sports Net*, April 7, 2005.]

C of CC Annual Conference

The Council of Conservative Citizens will hold its annual conference from 1:00 p.m., Friday June 3, until 5:00 p.m. Saturday June 4. The location will be the GuestHouse Hotel & Suites in Montgomery, Alabama.

Speakers will include **Jared Taylor** of *American Renaissance*, actor **Sonny Landham**, and author **Brent Nelson**. **Sam Dickson** will offer a tribute to Samuel Francis. There will also be a number of Alabama public and political figures, including **George C. Wallace, Jr.**, Alabama Public Service Commissioner.

Registration for the conference is \$30.00 per person or \$50.00 per couple. There is a special conference rate at the hotel of just \$55.00 per night. For more information, call the C of CC at (636) 940-8747.

Soccer Racism

During an April 13 soccer match in Sao Paulo between teams from Argen-

tina and Brazil, Argentine player Leandro Desabato shouted a racial slur at Brazilian player Paulo Grafite, who is black. Mr. Grafite filed a complaint at halftime, and when the match ended, police stormed into the Argentine team’s locker



room and arrested Mr. Desabato for racial discrimination. He spent the night in jail because his team didn’t have the cash for a \$3,879.00 bond, but he got out the next day and flew home. He has not apologized for the remarks, which he says were meant only to throw the Brazilian player off balance.

The incident was in the headlines in both countries. In Brazil—which has a large black population—people applauded the arrest, and the Brazilian government said Mr. Desabato holds “serious racist attitudes” that demonstrate “the escalation of discrimination against players of African descent.” (Earlier this year in Spain, fans of Real Madrid made monkey noises whenever black players on a rival team touched the ball. The referee filed a complaint, and if the fans can be found they face a maximum fine of \$78,000 and a five-year ban on attending soccer games.)

In Argentina, which has very few blacks, people supported Mr. Desabato. Julio Grondona, head of Argentina’s Soccer Federation, says things like that happen all the time in competitive sports, and that Mr. Desabato “doesn’t owe any apologies to anybody, because he didn’t do anything.” Mr. Grondona thinks the Brazilian player acted in “bad faith” by pressing charges. Argentina’s most famous soccer player, Diego Maradona, also stood by his countrymen, saying, “There’s racism everywhere. If they have a problem in Brazil, they should solve it outside the soccer field.” [Andres Oppenheimer, *Racial Slur Has Significance Far Beyond Soccer Field*, *Herald (Miami)*, April 21, 2005, p. 10A.]