

QUARTERLY REVIEW

Ideas, Culture & Current Affairs

Thought for food
JULIAN ROSE

Sects, sex
and supremacy
FRANK ELLIS

ILANA MERCER on
the Libyan lunacy

Jerusalem, *Ordet*, *Hakluyt*, Gramsci, TAKI and more

Vol 5 • No 1 • Spring 2011 • £5

The promised planet

FRANK ELLIS *looks into a future that may be dominated by fecund cults*

The purpose of the whole evolution of a nation, in every people and at every period of its existence, is solely the pursuit of God, their God, their very own God, and faith in Him as in the only true one. God is the synthetic personality of the whole people, taken from its beginning to its end. It has never happened that all or many peoples should have one common God, but every people has always had its own special one [...] If a great people does not believe that truth resides in it alone (in itself alone and in it exclusively), if it does not believe that it alone is able and has been chosen to raise up and save everything by its own truth, it is at once transformed into ethnographical material, and not into a great people.

Fyodor Dostoevsky, *The Devils* (1871-1872)

The premise of Eric Kaufmann's *Shall the Religious Inherit the Earth?* is the empirical fact that the religious are having more children than the non-religious, the secular, and that, if this trend continues, to quote Kaufmann: "...religious fundamentalists are on course to take over the world through demography".¹ All the religious groups studied by him – Christians, Amish, Jews and Muslims – are having large families, demonstrating an immunity to the temptations of secularism. In Israel, the rise of the ultra-Orthodox or *Haredim* is a remarkable and moving story in view of the fact that so many perished in the Holocaust. Kaufmann also reports that the Amish, a very impressive religious denomination, members of whom this reviewer has had the privilege to meet, are also thriving.

According to Kaufmann, "The most visible aspect of today's demographic revolution is the changing ethnic composition of Western populations".² This is certainly a revolution. But Kaufmann's use of 'Western populations' as in – "the changing ethnic composition of Western populations" – is misleading

since it implicitly accepts millions of Somalis, Arabs and sub-Saharan Africans who have entered the states of western Europe legally or illegally as belonging to Western populations. In any political, economic, cultural, racial, religious, intellectual and moral context Somalis and Arabs are not part of Western populations even if they live in Western states. Indeed, how can they be, when they live in parallel worlds so as to isolate themselves from the white indigenous population?

At every opportunity in this book Kaufmann denies whites their status as the rightful owners of their lands. For example, he goes out of his way to avoid using “indigenous” when talking about Britain and uses “native”.³ Another evasion is “dominant majorities”⁴ or “dominant group”⁵ instead of indigenous. The use of “dominant” obscures and denies the fact that whites are dominant not because they have suppressed blacks in Europe but because Europe is the land which in evolutionary and historical terms created whites. Europe is white not black. The use of “dominant majority” also implicitly concedes that if whites are replaced as the dominant majority a new non-white dominant majority will emerge and whites will have to accept it. If in this scenario the term “dominant majority” is replaced with “indigenous population” the notion that the indigenous population should just accept this fact is revealed for what it is: the racial, cultural and physical dispossession of the indigenous population. To allay the fears of the white indigenous population Kaufmann tells us that the Normans fitted in and adapted after 1066. Well yes, they did but the Normans were fellow north-west Europeans. Pat Buchanan made a similar point when he asked who would adapt better to modern Virginia: a million Englishmen or a million Zulus.

Kaufmann speculates on how the struggle between secularists and religious fundamentalists might end: “And while fundamentalists can be smashed by Soviet or Nazi-style repression, this contradicts liberalism’s very own principles”.⁶ I wonder where Kaufmann has been living for the last twenty years. Where exactly is this liberalism that does not act in a manner that contradicts its very own principles? That, to which Kaufmann refers as liberalism, is, judged by its behaviour, a form of soft totalitarianism. True, liberalism has not used concentration camps and tanks to repress opponents, yet it has exploited Soviet-style methods of repression in order to silence opponents. Speech codes in American universities, affirmative action, attacks on free speech in both the USA and UK under the heading of combating what liberals call ‘hate crime’, virulent and sustained attacks on white history, culture and achievements, censorship and political correctness (a Soviet term) all bear witness to the fact

that behind the mask of liberalism lurks a readiness to use Nazi and Soviet-style methods of repression, above all in the fields of culture and language.

Despite the well documented Soviet-style measures adopted by liberalism in pursuit of its goals, Kaufmann nevertheless argues that the great danger comes from religious fundamentalists:

“from the gradual seepage of puritanical mores into society: restrictions on freedom of expression, science, recreation, the rights of women, minorities, heretics, gays and converts – even a return to barbaric punishments.”⁷

Yet bear in mind that all the restrictions on free speech that have emerged over the last twenty years have been based on the liberal agenda and introduced by liberals, measures which are intended to silence and to criminalise any criticism of liberal fundamentalism and its multicultural agenda.

Throughout much of history populations have, Kaufmann notes, stayed stable (the better-off had more children who survived). After 1900 increasingly generous welfare provision ensured that more children from the less well off survived. In 2011 this clearly relates to the demography of immigrants from the Third World in First World states. Desperate to avoid any association with eugenics, Kaufmann instructs us that:

“We do not have to accept the alarmist tropes of eugenicists to see that this has demographic implications both within the developed world and between the wealthy West and poor global South”.⁸

So, does Kaufmann find this reversal of man’s evolution alarming, and if not, why not? And if he is alarmed just whose tropes is he using? It was after all eugenicists such as Francis Galton and Charles Darwin who noted that the less responsible and the low IQ were having more children than the more affluent. They sounded the alarm. Kaufmann’s use of “demographic implications” is just a politically correct way of saying that this is alarming without giving any credit or recognition to eugenicists. When Kaufmann notes that if the rate of population growth in Africa “goes unchecked, there will come a time when death and starvation readjust the world’s population to its carrying capacity”⁹, it should be pointed out that eugenicists and others, notably Thomas Malthus, warned about this long ago.

Throughout this book Kaufmann repeatedly plays down the nature of Islamic fundamentalism and its incompatibility with the West. He recognises the totalitarian nature of certain Islamic societies, especially if you are not a Muslim, yet asserts:

“Some argue that fundamentalism is merely another wonderful colour in

the multicultural rainbow of liberal society. In the West, they are largely correct, but the argument only holds as long as fundamentalists do not become a plurality or a majority that can restrict the liberties of others.”¹⁰

How is Islamic fundamentalism “another wonderful colour in the multicultural rainbow of liberal society”? Many Muslims in the West live in parallel societies; some are hostile to the West and its institutions and too many preach hatred and support terrorism. Moreover, as part of their contribution to the paintwork of liberal society they bring with them colourful forms of behaviour such as female circumcision, cruel forms of animal slaughter, honour killings and arranged marriages (with all the attendant medical problems). In Norway and Sweden Islamic immigrants are responsible for the increase in exceptionally violent rapes of indigenous girls. The question we have to ask here is that if the indigenous population is enduring all these problems now what will things be like if their high birth rates, supported by the generous welfare and the superior health provision of Western states provide Islamic immigrants with a large electoral majority? Kaufmann is aware of the political implications of differential population growth but lacks the intellectual honesty to admit that these problems, present and future, have been caused by a complete failure to police our borders.

Especially revealing is Kaufmann’s depiction of Wahhabism in the West as another wonderful colour and his reaction to its becoming a majority. Kaufmann’s point is that as long as Islamic fundamentalists remain an electoral minority – liberals pretend not to see the baggage – they are a wonderful colour. However if their numbers grow and this translates into real power such that Salafists can impose their will on the unbelievers, they lose their wonderful-colour status. Islamic fundamentalists could argue – they will argue – that if they have the electoral mandate of the believers to impose *sharia* and much else on the unbelievers they can: and they will do it. Kaufmann’s concern about the demographic rise of Islam underlines the hypocrisy of modern liberalism: free speech and free and fair elections are wonderful (provided the electorate votes for policies approved by liberals). Liberals (and this includes a great many so-called conservatives) for all the talk of rights and tolerance are just as intolerant and hostile to individual freedoms as Wahhabists. The key difference is that the latter are honest about their goals and aspirations and undoubtedly will impose totalitarianism on the unbelievers if they can, whereas liberals preach tolerance for their chosen causes – multiculturalism and mass immigration – yet use censorship, legal and administrative terror, secondary violence and media and legal harassment to impose their totalitarian agenda.



200 SURROGATES BY ALLAN MCOLLUM, SOTHEBYS CATALOGUE, ESTIMATE US\$40,000 - 60,000

Kaufmann's explanation for why Muslims in Britain stick to Islam is also far from convincing and betrays a clear refusal to face the empirical reality of Islam all over Europe:

“Second-generation Muslims are detached from their ethnic roots but also feel spurned by the white majorities in their nation states. This condition of existential purgatory makes the option of Muslim identity more enticing.”¹¹

Second-generation Muslims do not have to remain detached from their ethnic (racial) roots. They may feel spurned but the nation states in which they are resident are not their nation states. Why do they exercise the option of remaining in a white, north-west European country if they feel detached from the land and culture of their origin? The answer is that given the choice of remaining detached and enjoying all the benefits of a First World economy or returning to the corrupt and backward Third World countries whence they came, they prefer to remain in a state of affluent, second-generation detachment.

On the clear and present danger posed by Islamism in Britain and the rest of Europe Kaufmann is thoroughly evasive and unable to face the threat:

“The principal reason that most Europeans worry about the growing Muslim population has less to do with *sharia* and *jihad* than old-fashioned ethnic nationalism – the wish to see the dominant ethnic majority remain congruent with the nation state. We shouldn’t exhibit the presentist myopia that views Muslim immigration as a greater challenge because Islam is more exotic or conservative than Catholicism.”¹²

First, what is wrong with “old-fashioned ethnic nationalism”? The wish of Europeans (*ipso facto* white) to see their countries remain European and the wish that the white indigenous majority populations remain totally dominant is perfectly rational and wholesome. Why should Europeans want it any other way? Kaufmann provides no answer. He just begs the question. Would the Japanese welcome being culturally and racially dispossessed in the Land of the Rising Sun or the Chinese in the Ancient Kingdom? Even Kaufmann concedes that: “Global demographic change cannot affect states unless they open themselves up to it”.¹³ The Japanese and the Chinese want none of it. So why should Europeans be expected to welcome their own racial, cultural and physical dispossession; their being targeted for displacement in their ancient homelands? Only a person with a cultural death wish would welcome the colonization of white, Christian-heritage Europe or pretend that it is something beneficial for whites when it heralds their dispossession. Second, given that *sharia* and *jihad* and all the other non-European baggage represent the behavioural, cultural, psychological and intellectual manifestations of distinct, non-white racial groups – Turks, Africans, Arabs and Pakistanis – the conflation of Europeans’ fears about the racial origins of the immigrants and the fears that they, Europeans, will be displaced as the rightful majority are logical and fully justified. Europeans are the rightful majority precisely because whites are the indigenous population with effective possession of their lands sanctioned by millennia of occupation. Third, it is not “presentist myopia” for Europeans to worry about the threat posed by Islamism to Europe. On the contrary, it demonstrates a sense of the past – recall Charles Martel at Poitiers – and a sense of the future; an awareness that if this invasion succeeds, it is the end of Europe. Fourth, Kaufmann’s evasive assertion that we should not worry about Islamic fundamentalism because it is “more exotic or conservative than Catholicism” misses the point (or ignores the point). It is the nature of Salafist exoticism and conservatism that worries Europeans: suicide-homicide bombers, *sharia*, *jihad*, the obscene practice of female circumcision, honour killings, stoning women to death, polygamy, the sexual grooming of white girls, extreme censorship, hatred of free speech, hatred of white European host societies and the

cruel murders of Christians in the Middle East (and Turkey). Catholicism, with all its faults and demonstrable historical sins, is, for better or for worse, part of Europe's heritage: Islam's historical incursions and invasions have always been unwelcome and rejected as something utterly alien.

The basic plot of *Shall the Religious Inherit the Earth?* is undoubtedly compelling. When Kaufmann confines himself to the rise of various religious groups in their relevant societies and how they might succeed in inheriting the Earth he adds a great deal to our understanding of major historical shifts and even cyclical changes. For this he is to be applauded. The fatal weakness of this book however is the author's refusal to acknowledge the indefeasible rights, history and culture of the white indigenous population. Why should the English permit England to be overrun? Whenever Kaufmann attempts to integrate the alien Islamist narrative into the narrative of the white population, he sacrifices the legitimate interests of the indigenous majority, above all the English, in order to appease Islamists.

Kaufmann is historically naïve in his interpretation of religious groups making common cause against secularists on issues such as abortion, as if this heralds some kind of permanent rapprochement. This is a mere tactical solution, something analogous to the Nazi-Soviet Non-Aggression Pact. Once the secularists have been defeated or marginalised then the real business of determining which religion shall rule the Earth can begin in earnest. This question has exercised the minds of men since they invented or received religion and it will not be resolved in endless synods, commissions about the lack of 'community cohesion' (the reasons for which are obvious) and the publication of more tracts along the lines of the *Macpherson Report* (1999), *The Parekh Report* (2000) and *Our Shared Future* (2007). These publications are little more than government-sponsored propaganda assaults which are intended to destroy the morale and to weaken the legitimate status of the indigenous population, primarily the English. ♦

Dr FRANK ELLIS is a former soldier and academic, specialising in Russian and German history. © Frank Ellis 2011


Shall the Religious Inherit the Earth?

Demography and Politics in the Twenty-First Century

Eric Kaufmann, London, Profile Books, 2010, pp. xxii + pp.269 + Notes & Index, £10.50 at Amazon

NOTES

1. Kaufmann, *Shall the Religious Inherit the Earth?*, p.ix
 2. *Ibid.*, p.xix
 3. *Ibid.*, p.68
 4. *Ibid.*, p.68
 5. *Ibid.*, p.69
 6. *Ibid.*, p.xx
 7. *Ibid.*, p.xxi
 8. *Ibid.*, p.47
 9. *Ibid.*, p.47
 10. *Ibid.*, p.118
 11. *Ibid.*, p.178
 12. *Ibid.*, p.183
 13. *Ibid.*, p.62
-



Back issues available now

Back issues are £5 (UK) or £7.50/US\$16 (ex-UK) each including postage. We can accept payment by sterling cheque, US check, UK postal order, international money order or credit card by post, telephone or on-line. All cheques payable to Quarterly Review

Quarterly Review, 26 Meadow Road, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 2TD, UK.
Tel. (01507) 339056
www.quarterly-review.org

For a complete list of authors and articles, please see
www.quarterly-review.org

QUARTERLY REVIEW

To subscribe to the *Quarterly Review*, please send your name, address and credit card details, or a sterling cheque made payable to the *Quarterly Review* (£18 UK or £25 rest of world) to:

Quarterly Review, 26 Meadow Lane,
Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 2TD, United Kingdom

Telephone: (01507) 339056

E-mail: editor@quarterly-review.org

Internet: www.quarterly-review.org

We can also accept US dollar checks for overseas subscribers (US\$65) or payment on-line at our website. PDF-only subscriptions £15

Design and typesetting by Luise Hemmer Pihl – skrodhoj@gmail.com

Printed by Imprintdigital.net on FSC-certificated paper.

