



TECHNICAL NOTES:

1) This book has been written as an electronic document – an eBook. References (to sources etc.) are to be found using the links. If you print the book, you will have to use the eBook to locate these references.

2) **VERY USEFUL TIP:** To go from an (internal) link to the target, left-click on the link. To return to the link, hold down the Alt key and hit the Left Arrow key (not the Backspace key).

RACISM, GUILT, SELF-HATRED AND SELF-DECEIT	I
PREFACE	I
HOW THIS BOOK CAME TO BE WRITTEN.....	I
A Tabula Rasa.....	i
Important Discoveries	i
Blacks Accept White Superiority as a Commonplace Fact	i
Whites' Unquestioned Assumptions Notwithstanding, Blacks Are <i>Not</i> Uptight About Racial Differences	i
Marked Physical Differences Within Africa	ii
Major Insight: Blacks Don't Believe Races Equal But Learn to Manipulate White Guilt.....	ii
WHY I WROTE THIS BOOK	II
Making Race Discussable.....	ii
Claims, Conclusions and 'Opinions'	iii
The Folly of Trying To Make the Unpalatable 'Palatable'	iii
Trying To Make Views 'Palatable' Gives Weapon to Racial Bullies	iii
Appeasement Is Self-Fulfilling and Self-Defeating.....	iv
ON SUPERIORITY/INFERIORITY	IV
Some Things Are Simply <i>Better</i> Than Others.....	iv
Aside	iv
Philosophical Insincerity.....	v
BLACKS AND THE CONCEPT OF TIME	V
Promising	v
Littering	v
THE SCANDAL OF 20TH CENTURY WESTERN PHILOSOPHY	V
What Has 20 th -Century Western Philosophy 'Produced'?	v
Deliberate Obfuscation Hides Emptiness of Thought	vi
Calculated Incoherence	vi
Philosophy <i>Can</i> Be of Practical Value.....	vi
PART I: PAPUA NEW GUINEA.....	I
BLACK INSIGHT INTO WHITE RACIAL GUILT.....	1
Emblematic Whites: 'Kick them and they wag their tails'	1
Racial Rubbish from Whites	1
Asians in Kenya and Straight-Talking From Africans.....	2
<i>Uhuru</i>	2
RACIAL SENSITIVITY: 'DIFFICULTIES' WITH THE CONCEPT OF AVERAGES	3
'But Some Blacks Are Extremely Intelligent!'	3
Philosopher Talks Sense, Journalist Nonsense	3
From Black Shrinks, Nazis, Liberal Jews and Academics: Intemperate Nonsense.....	4
Absolute Generalizations	4
Apologism (Blacks Can Do No Wrong): Examples.....	4
<i>The Bell Curve</i>	4
HOW BLACKS PERCEIVE WHITES	5
Apologism Distinguished from Racism.....	5
'The White Man Is Next To God'	5
'Bush' Beliefs In White Superiority Sincere Though Naive.....	5
CONVERSATIONS IN PAPUA NEW GUINEA (PNG) <i>CIRCA</i> 1986	6
'Do Blacks Think Very Much?'.....	6
Did Prehistoric Man Associate Sex With Pregnancy?	7
A WAKEUP CALL	7
'Of Course Whites Are Smarter! Any Fool Knows That!'	7
ELITES GRAPPLE WITH THE CONCEPT OF AVERAGES	7
Southerner Parades His Liberal <i>Bona Fides</i>	7

How Traits Can Be ‘Typical’ of a Group Even Though Most of Its Members Don’t Have It	8
‘RACIAL PROFILING’ MAKES AN APPEARANCE	9
Fearing Blacks Is ‘Realistic’ but ‘Racist’, Meaning: We Should <i>Not</i> Be Realistic!	9
Bernard Goetz.....	9
Prelude To a Continuing Discussion: Can A <i>Fact</i> Be Racist?	10
Can ‘ <i>Truth Itself</i> ’ Be Wrong?.....	10
No One Can Be Blamed for Acting on Reasonable and Justified Presumptions.....	11
Racial Profiling Supported by Jesse Jackson.....	11
If It’s Good Enough for Jesse, It’s Good Enough for Me!.....	12
Race and Crime: Towards Explaining Black Criminality	12
MAJOR INSIGHT INTO BLACK BEHAVIOR.....	13
American Linguist: Blacks Do Not Internalize Moral Norms	13
Confirmation from Liberal Anthropologist.....	13
How This Helps Explain Black ‘Pathologies’	14
Black Propensity for Violence Was Always There But Was Kept In Check.....	15
More Insight Into Black Behaviour.....	15
Post-Apartheid South Africa	15
New Orleans	15
Brass Tacks: Originally Accepted <i>Because</i> It Was White, South Africa Is Then <i>Ostracized</i> For Being White and Finally Rejected For No <i>Longer</i> Being White!	16
RACIAL REALISM FROM SURPRISING QUARTERS	16
Black American	16
Black Harvard Professor: ‘Despite myself, longing for the missionaries’	17
Swazi Insight	17
Swazi Potter	18
Black Advertising Exec on Black ‘Distrust’	18
Liberal Whites in South Africa	19
Young Black Author in UK.....	19
Black American Lawyer in South Africa.....	20
Conference on ‘African Culture’ in US.....	20
BLACK RULE ‘NO MATTER WHAT’	20
Horror At ‘Whites Only’ Sign	20
‘Blacks Must Have Black Rule Even If They <i>Don’t</i> Want It!’	21
Apartheid ‘Has Failed’: The Bottom Line.....	21
PART II: LESOTHO.....	22
MORE CONVERSATIONS	22
Apartheid Is Not ‘One Single Thing’	22
‘Blacks Know Difference Between Right and Wrong But Will Usually Do the Wrong Thing’	23
‘So You <i>Have</i> Been To Tanzania!’	23
Talking with Students in Lesotho <i>Circa</i> 1988.....	24
Blacks Well Off In South Africa	24
‘No, No, No: Students Won’t Consider You Racist!’	24
Liberal Ideology at the South African Trade Mission	25
Mine-Working Student Again: On Intimidation	25
Teaching Assistant: Yes, Blacks Are Less Honest and Not Because of Poverty	26
‘Men Stronger Than Women’ Means ‘Every Man Stronger Than Every Women’	26
‘How Did You Know?’	27
A Nigeria Story: <i>Par For The Course!</i>	28
In Johannesburg, Black Gangsterism and Intimidation the Norm.....	28
PARALLELS BETWEEN SOUTH AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST.....	28
How Weakness Breeds Contempt.....	28
Do Palestinians Want Arab Rule?	29
How ‘Guilt’ Strengthens Your Adversaries	30

BLACK 'JUSTICE'	30
Black 'Evidence': Rumours, Whispers and Dreams.....	30
We Must Stop Passing The Buck'	31
BLACKS AND WEALTH CREATION.....	31
Black Rule Means Instant Wealth.....	31
American Blacks Not That Different.....	32
Is America's Black 'Middle-Class' an Illusion?	33
Elections: 'To the Victor Belongs the Spoils'	33
THE RISE OF BLACK 'ENTERPRISE'	33
White Rhetoric vs. Black Realism.....	33
The Three Businesses that Flourish in Africa.....	34
NEW YORK TIMES LIBERAL LOOKS AT SOUTH AFRICA	35
Two-Cents Worth from Bishop Tutu: The 'Nightmare' of South Africa	35
Inexcusable Behaviour Under Apartheid Does Not Answer Question of Who Is To Rule	35
Go Figure – 'Oppressed' Black Man Brings Son to His 'Oppressor' for Discipline!	35
If Bribery Is 'Part of Black Culture', Then It Must Be Part of White Culture Too!	36
Liberal 'Explanations' for Black Failure	36
Contrast Between White and Black Africa	37
Whites Created 'Homelands' For the <i>Purpose</i> of Disillusioning Blacks Against Black Rule!	38
Why Aren't Blacks Angrier?.....	39
Willful Blindness	39
Example of <i>Genuine</i> Racism	40
Afrikaners' Years of Experience Given Short Shrift.....	40
Transfer of Wealth from Whites to Blacks	41
Thoughts on Natural Dominance From the Prime Minister of Malaysia	41
Acknowledging Things 'No Self-Respecting Blacks Can Acknowledge'.....	42
<i>Wake Up and Smell the Coffee!</i>	42
Bedrock Issue Skirted	42
Leaving Your Baggage At Home	43
PART III: BLOEMFONTEIN.....	44
BLACK NURSING CARE	44
Black Nurses Get Angry When Someone Helps Their Patients.....	44
"Patients Die As Nurses Steal Drips To Sell On The Street"	44
Immigrant Doctors Deny Racial Differences; A Few Years Later: Modern Medicine Is 'Alien' to Africans	45
Nurses Refuse to Dress Wound or Provide Bed Pan.....	45
Adversarial Nursing.....	45
A LIBERTARIAN PERSPECTIVE ON SOUTH AFRICA.....	46
Lack of Economic Freedom Reason for African Poverty	46
African 'Successes'	46
Kenya.....	46
Ivory Coast.....	46
What Thwarts Black Enterprise?.....	48
Idi Amin's Social Science Experiment.....	48
Nigeria, Land Where <i>Nothing Works</i>	48
A Pollyannaish View of Africa	48
BLACK SEXUALITY	49
Absence of Public Display of Affection, in Africa <i>and</i> America	49
Unproblematic Male Dominance.....	49
Heightened Libido	49
'The Most Disgusting Experience'	49
'Use a Condom – But Not For More Than Two Hours'	50
The Mistake of Appealing To Blacks	50
Like a Lion	50

The Concept of 'Rape' in Africa.....	50
A Consistent Pattern: 'They Don't See It as Rape'	51
Romantic Love	51
Impotence, Neurosis and Self-Consciousness	52
Mutual Black Distrust: How Kenyan Students 'Collect' Women	52
Deception and Trickery On All Sides	53
Not Just Kenya: 'Jackrolling' and 'Running a Train'	53
Prostitution In Africa	53
Homosexuality in Africa	54
Peter Akinola	54
Homosexual Marriage: Black Instincts Rule	54
BLACKS' LACK OF RACIAL 'SENSITIVITY'	55
'If You Do It, Foreigners Must Redo It Tomorrow'	55
'When That Day Comes, I'll Kill Myself'	55
American Blacks 'So Full Of Themselves'	56
BLACK ENTREPRENEURIAL SUCCESS: THE ANTI-RACISM INDUSTRY.....	56
Black Psychological Shrewdness: Manipulating White Guilt	56
Whites Bullied, Browbeaten and Blackmailed: 'That's Not What We Want!'	57
'Racism Awareness Training'	58
'You've Done Nothing!'	58
WHITE PANDERING	59
African Libraries: An Oxymoron?	59
Zambia, Lesotho, Nigeria, Zimbabwe.....	59
Whites Who Invite Blacks To Steal From Them.....	60
INTIMIDATION	60
Black Principal Slaps Student's Hands and Has His House Burned Down	60
Gestapo Tactics	60
For 'Disobeying', Women Paraded Naked.....	61
Mob Psychology and 'Double-Talking'	62
INSIGHT INTO THE NATURE OF RACISM: BEING 'BORN THE WRONG COLOUR'	62
Colour As a Bad Trait vs. Colour As an <i>Indication</i> of Bad Traits.....	62
The Ambiguity of 'Equal To Everyone and Superior To None'	63
A Fatal Confusion	63
Example: All Jews – and Only Jews – Have a 'Spark' Which Makes Them More Valuable	63
More Ambiguity: 'Whatever Whites Can Do, Blacks Can Do'	64
White <i>Men</i> vs. the White <i>Man</i>	64
Importance of Distinction Between Talking About Individuals vs. Talking About Groups	65
Example: South Africa's First Black Ophthalmologist	65
'The Colour Of People's Skin Means Nothing': Bad-Making- vs. Bad- <i>Indicating</i> -Traits.....	65
Black Law Prof Commits Very Mistake of Which We Speak	66
Racism and Apologism: 'Skin Color Is Irrelevant'	66
AN AMERICAN PHILOSOPHER TACKLES RACE.....	67
Preferential Treatment, aka 'Affirmative Action'	67
Do Blacks Treat Blacks Better Than Whites Do?.....	67
Stark Confirmation From <i>The New York Times</i>	68
'Role Models'	68
Why <i>Would</i> People Rather Be Born White?	69
Is It Racist To Prefer White Over Black?	69
The Reverend James D Manning: The Blunt Truth	70
Blacks' Status-Seeking and Mistreatment of Other Blacks	70
Brazil: A 'Test Case'	70
The 'Myth' of Black Inferiority	71
Black Entrepreneur Learns the Hard Way	71

Encounter With American Blacks.....	72
Reprise: Skin Colour As an Undesirable Trait vs. As an <i>Indication</i> of Undesirable Traits	72
Personal Hygiene in Africa.....	73
Deodorants Aside.....	74
Questions for Wasserstrom: Are Racial Differences <i>Possible</i> ? If So, Can One <i>Honestly Believe</i> They Exist? If So,	
How Can Such Beliefs Be Racist and Hence Bad?.....	74
On 'Meritocracy'	74
More Examples of Good-Making vs. Good-Indicating-Characteristics	74
Thought-Experiments	75
'Real-Life' Example.....	75
Philosopher's 'Solution': Race Differences Do Not Exist Because Race Itself Does Not Exist!.....	76
A Passing Thought For The Simple-Minded.....	77
MORE 'ANGER': FEMINISM.....	77
'Gender': A Euphemism To Shield Us From ... What?	77
Racism, Sexism and Homophobia: The Three Great Shibboleths Of Our Time.....	77
<i>Real</i> Sexual Harassment	77
Perceiving Someone 'As a Woman' Is 'Discriminatory'	78
Hobbling Speech	78
Emasculation: Title IX and TV	79
'Channeling'	79
Why a World Without Male Aggressiveness 'Won't Work'	80
FEMINISM AND THE DECLINE OF THE WEST.....	80
Equality Of Opportunity Means Women In the Workforce Is the Norm	80
Low Birthrates and The Menace of Islam.....	81
Working Women Have Fewer Children.....	81
Effects of Longer Generations	81
Feminism, All By Itself, Will Destroy the West	81
SOUTH AFRICAN OPINION AT THE TWILIGHT OF APARTHEID.....	82
From Conservative Afrikaner: 'Black rule inevitable'	82
'African States Not Fit To Govern Themselves'	82
Sam Mabe, Straight-Talking Black	83
From a Liberal	83
White Affluence Built On Black Poverty'.....	83
Caving In: <i>The Slippery Slope</i> and <i>The Thin Wedge</i>	84
Personal Encounter	84
IS IT UNFAIR FOR WHITES TO BENEFIT DISPROPORTIONATELY FROM THE WEALTH THEY HAVE CREATED?.....	85
Patrons vs. Administrators; Neighbourhoods vs. Schools and Hospitals.....	85
Is It Unfair?	85
The Problem in a Nutshell	86
Paternalism.....	86
Blacks' Ability To Maintain Whites' Legacy.....	87
HENDRIK VERWOERD OPPOSED 'RACIAL DOMINATION'.....	87
Verwoerd Accepted Pivotal Liberal Assumption – That the Idea of Racial Superiority Is Wicked.....	87
'Bantustans' Based On Profound Philosophical Error.....	88
PUTTING CART OF REWARD BEFORE HORSE OF INCENTIVE	88
Paying Blacks More <i>So That</i> They Will Be More Productive	88
How Blacks Respond To Discipline.....	89
CARGO CULTS.....	90
Profound Insight from Black Author	90
What Would African 'Development' Look Like?.....	93
Developing Euphemisms	93
Cargo Cult Thinking in America.....	94

RECALLING KENYA.....	95
'I Don't Want Stories, Excuses or Explanations!'	95
I Drive a Hard Bargain	95
Defining a 'Liberal'	96
EXPLORING JOHANNESBURG.....	96
My First Time in Soweto.....	96
Walkabout: I See The Beginning Of the End.....	97
How Easily Whites Capitulate: Irresoluteness and Weakness of Will.....	97
Shiva Naipaul	98
THE PARADOX OF INTEGRATION	98
Too Many Blacks Means Destruction of the Very Things They Want.....	98
Lemming-Like Behaviour	98
If You Allow One, How Do You Stop Others?	99
The 'Thin Wedge' Again.....	99
Whites' Fears a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy	99
What's Needed Is Frankness.....	100
THE PROS AND CONS OF APARTHEID.....	100
Whenever You Have Rules Separating Races, There Are Bound To Be Inequities	100
Apartheid Aimed At Keeping Blacks Out of White <i>And</i> Black Areas	101
Grievous Error In Whites' Thinking	101
Liberal Jewish Activist Advocates Apartheid.....	101
BLACK DEFICIENCY IN ABSTRACT THINKING, AS SUPPORTED BY THE ENGLISH-ZULU DICTIONARY	102
'Why Do You Need a Dictionary?' Written vs. Oral Languages	102
Important Consequences	102
The Concept of Precision	103
The Nature of Abstract Entities	103
Acquiring Abstract Concepts Requires Self-Consciousness.....	103
The Concept of Promising In Zulu: ' <i>I'll try</i> '	104
FW de Klerk Addresses This Very Issue	104
Mandela Responds In Typical African Fashion: <i>BDO</i> and Arrogance.....	104
'Good-Cop-Bad-Cop': Black Psychological Shrewdness	105
Making the Abstract Concrete.....	105
Blacks and Time	106
Future, Time and Space All the Same Word in Zulu.....	106
A Metaphysical Argument Regarding Time	106
Where Blacks <i>Do</i> Pay Attention To Time	107
Math and Geometry: A Problem for South African <i>and</i> American Blacks	107
Maintenance.....	107
Motivation and Ambition	108
An Evolutionary Explanation	108
Moral Shamelessness.....	109
BLACK MUSICALITY AND RHYTHMICITY	109
What Would Be the Evolutionary Purpose of Black Rhythmicity?	109
An 'Artifact' Theory of Female Orgasm.....	109
Evidence For Black Rhythmicity	110
An Extraordinary Aspect of Black Musicality.....	110
Harmonizing Extemporaneously.....	110
Black Acting Ability.....	111
Excellence Where Least Expected.....	112
White Tutelage.....	112
NATURE-NURTURE AGAIN.....	112
'Environmental Effects' on Physical and Mental Abilities.....	112
What Are People Who Deny Racial Differences Actually Denying?	113

Racial vs. Sexual Differences.....	113
Racism Ass-Backwards	113
Black Children Improve With Good Education; <i>Ergo</i> , There Are No Racial Differences	114
‘If I’ve Heard It Once, I’ve Heard It a Hundred Times’	114
BLACK YOUNGSTERS WHO SAY PRECISELY WHAT I’VE BEEN SAYING	115
“Go To a Black School with a Black Principal and You Will See the Difference”	115
Matter-Of-Fact Openness <i>Re</i> Promise-Keeping, Black Disorder, White Leadership, <i>Etc.</i>	116
AS THE END OF APARTHEID LOOMS, WHITES JUMP ON THE BANDWAGON	116
White Contrition for ‘Racism’, Real or Imagined	116
Afrikaner Gnashing of Teeth and Grovelling	117
Separate Cannot Be Equal If Groups Are Not Equal.....	117
HOW ‘SENSITIVITY’ PREVENTS WHITES FROM LEARNING ABOUT BLACKS.....	118
White ‘Experts’ Who’ve Never Talked To Blacks	118
Surprising Lack of Black Awareness that Race Is a ‘Sensitive Issue’	119
BLACK AWARENESS OF WHITE SUPERIORITY	119
Actions Speak Louder Than Words	119
Encounter in New Orleans.....	119
Confirmation from Elite and ‘Angry’ Blacks	120
More Examples	120
How Blacks Are Impressed By White Ingenuity.....	121
“Heaven!!”	121
Further Conversations	122
UC Irvine	122
Travelocity	122
Johannesburg.....	123
Some Exceptions To This Experience	123
Are There Any Large Black Enterprises that Run Without White Help?	124
Blacks’ Interest In Racial ‘Incorrectness’	124
HOW WHITE GUILT AND APPEASEMENT <i>CREATE</i> THE SCAM OF BLACK ‘ANGER’	125
Black Riots in the US: 1968	125
1992: The Rodney King Riots	125
The Power of Liberal Dishonesty	126
‘No Justice, No Peace!’	126
American Black Turns Black ‘Anger’ On Its Head.....	127
African Leader Ridicules ‘Demands’ for Atonement for Slavery	127
Skeptic Becomes ‘Much Less Skeptical’	127
<i>De Facto</i> Support From Prominent Black American Intellectual.....	128
White Breast-Beating; Black Credulity, Theatrics, Testosterone and Hair-Trigger Volatility.....	128
A Knock-Down-Drag-Out Argument Proving Black ‘Anger’ Is a Scam.....	129
Window On Reality: While Whites Grovel, Blacks See Things Differently.....	129
<i>Black Theology and Black Power</i> : Confirmation In Spades!.....	130
Blacks Were Aware of White Self-Hatred Long Before Whites!	130
RACISM AND ANTISEMITISM	131
The Nature of Antisemitism	131
A Side Order of Logic.....	131
BLACK ARROGANCE AND WHITE SELF-ABNEGATION	132
‘Paralyzing Fear’ of ‘Superior’ Whites	132
Attack Before You Are Attacked!.....	133
Storm Trooper Tactics: Black ‘Anger’ In Action	133
Liberalism’s Firm Grip: White Weakness and Self-Doubt	134
In South Africa, Blacks Burn Down Winnie Mandela’s House; In UK, Teacher Humiliated for <i>Not</i> ‘Reverencing’ Mandela	134
2008: 11½-Year-Old Never Heard of Nelson Mandela	136

PART IV: JOHANNESBURG.....	137
BLACK 'ANGER' OVER EDUCATION.....	137
The 'Hell' Of Black Education.....	137
'Drinking and Dancing During Lessons'	137
Magic Bullet: 'Complete Desegregation'	138
'Magic Bullet' Means a White Presence.....	139
Not Enough Whites To 'Go Round'	139
Factors Militating Against Black Education	139
Blacks Helping Blacks?.....	139
Insight Despite Herself	140
In Truth, Blacks Want To Be Educated <i>By Whites</i>	140
The Four No-Exit Options	140
Specific Confirmation of This Claim	141
BLACK EDUCATION AND WEALTH CREATION	141
Blacks Can't Take Part in Economy Without 'White Standard of Schooling'	141
Why Don't Blacks Create Wealth <i>Anywhere</i> ?	141
The <i>Catch-22</i> of Black Education.....	142
EDUCATION AS WHITE MAN'S WITCHCRAFT.....	142
Whites' 'Secret Formula' for Education	142
The Talisman Called a 'Degree'	143
BLACK EDUCATION IN AMERICA AND ITS PARALLELS WITH AFRICA	143
Differences in 'Learning Styles'	143
American Blacks 'Approximate Space, Numbers and Time'	144
The Nonsense of Calling America a 'Racist Society'	145
The Fallacy Of 'Equal Diversity'.....	145
Grasping Gradations, My Ailing Back and Black Nursing Care	146
Nature-Nurture	146
Another High Status Academic Failing to Recognize Individual/Group Distinction	147
Micro- vs. Macro-Judgements	147
SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN AMERICA.....	147
Why Should 'Separate' Be 'Inherently Unequal'?.....	147
US Supreme Court Decision 'Assumes Black Inferiority'	148
The 'Stigma' of Inferiority.....	148
The Problem Isn't Blacks <i>Per Se</i> , But Blacks <i>Too Many</i>	149
IS IT RACIST TO RESIST BLACKS IN YOUR NEIGHBOURHOODS AND SCHOOLS?	149
Residential Integration In America	149
No Matter How You Slice It, Blacks Are Seen as a Pestilence – by Whites <i>and</i> Blacks.....	150
White Resistance.....	150
'We've Done Nothing Wrong'	150
In Italy.....	150
Rural South Africa: 'Prisoners After Dark'	151
Quasi-Military 'Takeovers'	151
MORE BLACK 'ANGER': THE BEST DEFENCE IS AN OFFENCE [<i>BDO</i>]	152
Blacks Destroy Property, Then Get 'Angry'	152
Black Intelligence: <i>BDO</i>	153
Black Psychological Insight	153
HOW WHITE GUILT FEEDS BLACK 'ANGER'	154
'I Feel Ashamed'	154
Anti-Apartheid Film 'Shocks' Whites; Black Shrugs It Off	154
First Inkings About White Racial Guilt.....	155
Racial Discord Rests on White Racial Guilt.....	155
RACIAL GUILT AND SELF-HATRED: A FATAL FLAW IN THE WHITE RACE.....	156
Campaign Against South Africa Led By White Nations	156

White Guilt Can Never Be Assuaged; Blacks Understand This and Use It To Advantage	156
White Guilt Is <i>False</i> Guilt	156
Apologizing Only Makes Matters Worse; Chicken-or-Egg.....	156
Self-Hatred the Preserve of Whites – With Jews In the Vanguard	157
Examples.....	157
‘It Is Right That Whites Should Be Castrated!’ [spoken by a Jew]	157
Whites Are ‘The Cancer Of History’ [from another Jew]	157
Robert Frost’s Definition of a Liberal	158
Jewish ‘ <i>Cabals</i> ’: A Refutation	158
Jewish Jew-Hatred: Israeli Soldiers Must “Feel the Pain of Their Enemies”	158
Israelis ‘Morally Identify With Those Committed To Its Annihilation’	159
Yes, ‘Liberalism Is a Mental Disorder’	159
Feminism and the Homosexual Lobby: Truly A <i>Sickness Unto Death</i>	159
Explaining The Rise of the Homosexual Movement	160
THE GUILTY MIND SYNDROME (GMS).....	161
Examples.....	161
Examples Analyzed.....	162
The Glaring Light Phenomenon (GLP)	162
Inner Turmoil	163
How “Liberation’ Has Made Things Worse for Homosexuals	164
AFRICANS’ BELIEF IN WITCHCRAFT	164
Blacks’ Understanding of Science	164
Comparing This To White Irrationalities	165
Sincere, If Naive	165
‘Cash Value’	165
Blacks Are ‘Overawed’ By Whites.....	166
Group- vs. Individual-Judgements (Again!)	166
Do ‘Born-Again’ Nigerians Believe In Witchcraft?	166
Blacks ‘Put Their Money Where Their Mouth Is’	167
BLACK CLAPTRAP.....	167
American Journalist.....	167
Barefaced Insincerity.....	168
Stealing Is ‘Stupid’ – But Not Bad	169
Joe Slovo’s Two Cents Worth.....	169
LEARNING ABOUT BLACKS FROM BLACKS.....	170
‘Why Do We Despise Each Other? Why Do We Not Trust Each Other?’.....	170
Jealousy Beyond Comprehension	171
Once Again, Similar Behaviour Found In American Blacks.....	172
Jealousy? ‘Bull’s-Eye’!.....	172
‘Crabs-in-a-bucket’	173
‘Blacks have failed to master the art of <i>co-operation</i> ’.....	173
Your Being ‘Nice’ Means You’re Making Me Inferior!	173
‘I’m not a racist – look how I hate them!’	173
Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Reaction Formation.....	173
Conversation with Black Nurse: ‘Who is more distrustful of blacks?’ Answer: ‘Blacks!’	174
‘Through a Bantu Glass: Palpable Fear of One Another’	175
Black Friendship	175
BLACKS’ MISTREATMENT OF BLACKS: MAKING YOURSELF ‘SUPERIOR’ BY MAKING OTHERS ‘INFERIOR’	176
‘Whites respect one another but we don’t’	176
‘Hostile’ Nurse Doesn’t ‘Have Time To Play’	176
‘Old Mother’ Made To Wash Clothes That Aren’t Dirty.....	177
‘Know-It-All Teacher, Swearing at Students, Calling Them Humiliating Names’	178

GRUESOME CRUELTY EVIDENCE OF BLACK MORAL OPACITY	178
Jeering, Mocking and <i>Laughing</i> at Agony and Death.....	178
Rwanda: ‘Ecstasy of Killing Beyond My Reach’	179
Amy Biehl Trial: ‘Laughing At Woman Groaning In Pain Impossible To Explain To Rational Minds’	179
UNDERSTANDING BLACK MORAL OPACITY.....	179
Subjunctivity, Counterfactuality and The Golden Rule (TGR): Further Towards Explaining Black Behaviour	180
The Golden Rule (TGR)	180
Human Empathy	180
Black ‘Manners’ and the Lack Thereof: Examples Analyzed	181
Conclusion: For Blacks, Rudeness Is Normal, Natural Behaviour	181
Black Littering and ‘Disorganization’	182
How a Thought-Experiment Explains Black Littering	182
BLACK ARROGANCE, STATUS-CONSCIOUSNESS, AUTHORITARIANISM AND MORAL CONFORMITY	182
‘I’m Not Here To Be Interrogated By You!’	182
‘You Can’t Challenge the Head of the Department Like That!’	183
Ditto for American Blacks.....	183
Black Americans’ Authoritarianism	183
Cowardice and Conformity: Fear of ‘Challenging Authority’.....	184
Anecdotes of a White Man on a Bicycle in Africa	184
<i>Danger Man</i>	184
‘The White-Man -on-a-Bicycle-With-a-Flag Will Come and Take You Away!’	184
Bicycle Mobility.....	185
BLACK ‘SELF-HELP’ ORGANIZATIONS RUN BY WHITES.....	186
Black Incapacity	186
Not Wanting to Know the Truth	186
The Panacea of ‘Democracy’.....	186
WHY BLACKS END UP HATING THEIR BENEFACTORS	187
Who’s Been the ‘Friend’ of American Blacks? Jews. Who Do Blacks Now Hate? Jews!	187
MORE UPFRONT CONVERSATIONS	188
Growing Up On a Farm, Gladys ‘Didn’t Know What Apartheid Was’	188
‘Blacks Are Violent’, Make A Lot Of Noise; You Can’t Expect Whites To Put Up With That	188
Why Did Whites Create Education But Not Blacks? Very Simple: ‘The White Man Is So Clever!’	188
Did Apartheid Cause Black Behaviour or Did Black Behaviour Cause Apartheid?	189
‘You’re a Very Interesting Fellow’.....	189
‘What a Brain You Must Have To Write Such A Book!’	189
THE INCOHERENCIES OF ‘BLACK RULE NO MATTER WHAT’	190
‘Liberation, Lousy As It May Be’.....	190
Mind-Boggling Contradictions	191
If Black Rule Means Disaster, How Can It Be Wrong To Prevent It?.....	191
From a Liberal Committed to Black Rule: Blacks ‘Incapable All Over’	191
How Egalitarian Dogma Precludes Blacks Electing Whites	192
An Incidental Paradox	192
WITH BLACK RULE ON THE HORIZON, WHITE CONCERNS.....	192
How a Philosophical Error Left Whites Without a Leg To Stand On	192
Mandela: ‘If whites leave we’re in big trouble’	193
‘Power-Sharing’.....	193
BLACK TAXI DRIVERS PUNISHED DUE TO THIS SAME PHILOSOPHICAL ERROR	193
What <i>Is</i> Discrimination?	193
‘Not Blacks. Niggers.’.....	193
Self-Preservation Requires <i>Policy</i> -Decisions	194
A BLACK MAN’S PENETRATING ANALYSIS OF RACIAL PROFILING	194
‘If God Were a Cop, He Wouldn’t Need Racial Profiling’; Placing Blame Where It Belongs	194
‘Indicators’	194

Example of Black IQ?	196
APPENDIX A	197
WHAT IS RACISM? OR, HOW PHILOSOPHY CAN BE 'PRACTICAL'	197
Outline of Principal Theses	197
What Racism Is <i>Not</i>	197
Moral vs. Nonmoral Badness.....	197
What <i>Kinds</i> of Things Can Be Racist?	198
A Philosophical Touchstone.....	198
Can an <i>Idea</i> Be Racist?.....	198
Propositions and Facts	198
Propositions Are 'Pictures' of Facts.....	199
Can a <i>Fact</i> Be Racist?.....	199
Conventional Wisdom Embodies Philosophical Error.....	200
What Racism <i>Is</i>	200
Two Senses of Belief.....	200
Which Kind of Belief Can Be Racist?	200
A Belief Can Be Racist Only Because Of the <i>Manner In Which It Is Held</i>	201
If a Belief Is Honest It Cannot Be Bad and If It Is Not Bad It Cannot Be Racist.....	201
Why Neither Truth Nor Falsity Determines Whether a Belief Is Racist	202
The Essence of Racism Is Self-Deceit.....	203
Believing What You Know Isn't True.....	203
While Content Never Makes Belief Racist It Can Be Good Indication Of It.....	203
APPENDIX B.....	204
BLACK ACADEMICS ARE INTERESTED IN MY VIEWS.....	204
A Philosopher's Thoughts on "Externalism" vs. "Internalism".....	204
A Surprising Response	206
APPENDIX C.....	207
RACE EQUALITY	207
The Myth that Blacks Want to Rule	207
APPENDIX D	209
THE <i>A PRIORI</i> METHOD.....	209
Introduction	209
Prime Numbers	209
First Example.....	209
Unfretted Stringed Instruments	210
Lesson Begins	210
What I've Demonstrated So Far.....	210
"Use the Knowledge You Already Have!"	211
Success— Putting Two and Two Together.....	211
Second Example	212
Learning to Write Coherently Without Learning Anything New	212
Plato's <i>Meno</i>	212

RACISM, GUILT, SELF-HATRED AND SELF-DECEIT

PREFACE

HOW THIS BOOK CAME TO BE WRITTEN

A Tabula Rasa

In August 1976, when I left America to teach Philosophy at the University of Ibadan in Nigeria, I did so somewhat reluctantly. On the subject of blacks and Africa, I was a *tabula rasa* [a 'blank slate']. I grew up in a typical 'liberal' environment where one was taught never to use the word 'nigger' (the American equivalent of the South African term 'kaffir') – and until 1969, in New Orleans, I don't think I'd ever heard the word actually used. I was not involved in the Civil rights movement but was certainly not opposed to it. My hometown in upstate New York had few blacks, though in the mid-fifties our high school did have a black cheerleader. While I had no black friends as a youth, this was not by design, and when, in 1968, I met a black man (a fireman), I had no difficulty in forming a friendship – a friendship which has remained to this day.

Important Discoveries

Blacks Accept White Superiority as a Commonplace Fact

So when I went to Nigeria I was neither anti-black nor an *afrophile* (a 'lover' of things black). Nevertheless, I immediately felt 'at home' there and because I went without prejudices, I was able to observe things with an unjaundiced eye; and I made some remarkable discoveries.

First, African blacks were not at all uptight about race; second, it was obvious to them that [the white man was 'cleverer'](#) – *and, they were not the least bit uptight about this*. Only later did I realize that racial 'sensitivity' was essentially a Western phenomenon with its roots in white guilt.

Whites' Unquestioned Assumptions Notwithstanding, Blacks Are *Not* Uptight About Racial Differences

Few things I've learned in Africa are more important than this lack of racial sensitivity. Much of our 'Western' perspective is based on the ingrained assumption that blacks are deeply offended by any suggestion of racial differences; this in turn is based on the equally unquestioned belief – *never examined* – that the idea of such differences is morally offensive. To acknowledge that throughout Africa people are *not* uptight about race *must* have a profound impact on one's thinking.

I spent the next five years at the University of Nairobi, where I began to observe things more carefully and eventually to formulate certain ideas. Everything I had noticed in Nigeria (about the lack of racial sensitivity, etc.) was confirmed, but it was in Kenya that I learned (e.g.) how Africans distrust each other, how little they confide in each other and [how rarely they form real friendships](#).

Marked Physical Differences Within Africa

In 1985 I took a position at the University of Papua New Guinea. The people are called Melanesians but are Negroid, and though there are noticeable physical differences between different groups there, just as there are between West, East and North Africans, they are identifiably black.

West Africans, e.g., tend to be mesomorphic, with large bulging muscles, East and North Africans to be more ectomorphic – thinner, with longer, striated muscles. The former lends itself to short bursts of energy, the latter to more sustained efforts. And since American blacks mainly originated from West Africa, you find amongst them and West Africans great sprinters, whilst from East and North Africa (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Ethiopia and Somalia) you find the great distance runners; and rarely – if ever – is it the other way round.

Major Insight: Blacks Don't Believe Races Equal But Learn to Manipulate White Guilt

In 1986 I found myself in South Africa for a month; the contrast with black Africa was phenomenal. It was on this visit that I had a major insight, viz., that westernized blacks, having cottoned on to white racial 'guilt', had learned to take advantage of this and use it for the purpose of psychological blackmail. They didn't believe in *racial egalitarianism* – the idea that there were no differences between the races, couldn't be and that it was bad to say there was – any more than 'ordinary', non-westernized blacks, but they knew a good thing when they saw it.

In 1986 I began writing down my thoughts about race and racism. In 1987 I took a job in Lesotho (a small country completely surrounded by South Africa) and since late 1988 I have lived in South Africa. I began keeping a journal, which eventually became this book. Thus there are things at which I express amazement – such as the [liberalism of South African whites](#) – which later became manifest as my thinking underwent a slow but inexorable evolution. Hence, many ideas in the earlier parts of this book represent my perceptions at that time, and as much as possible I have left this as is. The result, as one reader has said (wishing to remain anonymous), is that the book 'exhibits a gradual organic growth in complexity, subtlety, detail, completeness and acuity that much increases its overall impact'.

WHY I WROTE THIS BOOK

Making Race Discussable

From the very beginning, my experience in Africa has been at odds with 'accepted wisdom', which I gradually came to see as a hoax. One of my principal claims is that until racial issues are made discussable, the problems surrounding race can never be addressed. Hence, I felt that what I had to say *needed* to be said – and to be heard.

Claims, Conclusions and ‘Opinions’

Several people, on reading this book, conclude that my clearly stated belief that whites are, on average and in certain respects, superior to blacks, is *the* ‘thesis’ of the book. In fact, not only is this not *the* thesis, it is not a thesis at all.

There is a difference between a *claim* (‘thesis’) and a *conclusion* (‘opinion’). A claim is something which I think I could *prove*. A conclusion (or opinion), on the other hand, is something which I would assert, and might even think I *know* to be so, but would *not* say I could prove.

Thus, one of my (‘empirical’) claims is that indigenous blacks are not sensitive about race; and, I think I could prove that. ‘Let us walk on the streets of any city in black Africa and ask people why it is the blacks never make airplanes or computers. You will see for yourself that they will say something like “Because he doesn’t have the brain for it” – *and*, will be quite unfazed by this.’

But the issue of racial superiority itself – as opposed to what is *believed* about it – is a different matter. If it can be ‘settled’, it will be by scientists doing ‘hard’ research. As a philosopher, I have no such expertise – though that doesn’t preclude me from coming to certain conclusions, for which I may in fact have compelling evidence.

While it seems obvious to me that there are fundamental racial differences, this is far from being a novel idea, and I think it would be ludicrous for me to write a book attempting to establish such a thesis. I have an opinion – which I think is well-founded – but I am in no position to make claims.

What *is* worth writing a book about – and about which I do make claims – is (*inter alia*): this lack of racial sensitivity; the fact that whites, almost universally, assume precisely the opposite; that they make this assumption because they also assume that the idea of racial superiority is wicked and evil; that *this* assumption is at the root of virtually all racial problems in the West – *and*, that it is simply false. The latter – along with my [analysis of racism](#) – is a philosophical (as opposed to ‘empirical’) claim, which I would defend it in that light.

The Folly of Trying To Make the Unpalatable ‘Palatable’

Trying To Make Views ‘Palatable’ Gives Weapon to Racial Bullies

Many who agree with my views feel that I somehow ought to put them in a ‘nicer’ way.

The problem with trying to make these ideas more ‘palatable’ is precisely that you are *giving in* to the psychological warfare by which whites are being intimidated, bamboozled, browbeaten and blackmailed. Camouflaged ideas will still be deciphered – otherwise the whole exercise would be otiose. But the psychologically astute ‘angry’ black will immediately pick up on the fact that I felt the need to ‘cloak’ my ideas and will – instinctively – ask himself *why is he doing this?* Answer? Because this whitey thinks that what he’s saying is *bad*. And I know how to fix his ass! *You racist mother, here I come!!*

Trying to somehow ‘sweeten’ the truth in order to ‘sneak it by’ the reader is playing into the enemy’s hands and ‘giving the game away’, because by doing so you are, by implication, granting the crucial premise – that any talk of racial superiority is *bad* (which is why it must be disguised), and that if I

believe such things I should be ashamed of myself and hence that the black man has a moral claim against me and so has a *right* to be ‘angry’ – *etc.*

In short, anyone likely to be ‘outraged’ by a discussion of racial differences is much more likely to be so precisely if he thinks others *expect* him to be; and trying to disguise your intent will itself increase that expectation. In the absence of such expectations the response is likely to be very different. The psychology of the bully, after all, is to pick on someone who’s afraid; dissembling here signals to these psychological gangsters exactly that, thereby precipitating the very attack one is trying to avoid by such ‘sanitizing’.

Appeasement Is Self-Fulfilling and Self-Defeating

Appeasement is typically based on fear, which is often *self-fulfilling*. If you are frightened of blacks, and they pick up on this -- which is just the sort of thing at which they excel – they are more likely to target you specifically because of this fear. In short, precisely *because* you fear them you will have *reason* to fear them; and conversely, someone who does not fear them will, for that very reason, have less to fear. It is obvious, therefore, that appeasement, based as it usually is on fear, is inherently self-defeating. We not only need truth here; we need it openly and unadorned.

ON SUPERIORITY/INFERIORITY

It has become fashionable to eschew all talk of superiority and inferiority. Even Michael Levin, e.g., in his book [Why Race Matters](#) (1997), insists that he is not saying that blacks are inferior but merely that they are less intelligent, less honest, more violent, more criminal, *etc.*

Some Things Are Simply *Better* Than Others

But does anyone really doubt that some things are simply *better* than others? – that order, e.g., is better than disorder and chaos, that [cleanliness is better than filth](#), that health is better than sickness, that honesty is better than dishonesty and that a peaceful, law-abiding society is better than anarchy? Yet ‘better’ here just *means* ‘superior’. If whites are more intelligent, more honest (*etc.*) then – at least in these respects and to this extent – they are better and therefore are superior, end of story. Refusing to use a word when it is apposite is, once again, merely giving in to black psychological blackmail, and rather than gain the appeaser respite, is likely to achieve precisely the opposite.

Aside

I have recently had to query the statement that no one doubts the value of cleanliness. A friend, after firing her maid, went into her quarters to find it filthy beyond belief. This was the person cleaning her house! It struck me that the maid never really understood the virtue of cleanliness, but was mindlessly ‘cleaning’ the house because that’s what she was paid to do. But knowing that cleanliness and order are better than filth and disorder – as, e.g., knowing it is wrong to take what doesn’t belong to you – is part of our *moral sense*, and such examples provide evidence that many blacks [are deficient in this respect](#).

Philosophical Insincerity

While denying the existence of moral facts, Levin ends up admitting (elsewhere) that everyone, including himself, does *believe* they exist and of necessity *must* do so. What he seems to ignore is the fact that if he indeed believes moral truths exist then, *from his point of view*, the existence of such truths *is a fact*, plain and simple, so that he cannot, without contradicting himself, assert, in his ‘philosophical mode’, that such truths do not exist. This philosophical insincerity – in which one asserts things which one’s actions and words constantly belie – is one of the things which gives academic philosophy such a bad name.

BLACKS AND THE CONCEPT OF TIME

Promising

It was only after living amongst blacks for nearly twenty-five years that I discovered a most important fact. Put simply: blacks *lack a full-blooded concept of time*. It seems evident that if any African language contains a concept of time it will be in an extremely diminished form, and similarly with respect to the *future*. I discuss this at some [length](#) and would here simply emphasize that many things we find mystifying become clear once we realize this. Thus, I claim, blacks lack a proper concept of promising, because a promise is always an undertaking to do something *in the future*. Hence, without a clear sense of the future, there will, practically speaking, be no such thing as promising.

Littering

It is obvious why the inability to think ahead contributes to anti-social behaviour: deterrence requires thinking of consequences. Throwing rubbish everywhere? Well, aside from involving generalization-type reasoning (What would happen if everyone did this?), abstaining from such behaviour requires thinking of the future (it *will* make a mess). Spread of STD and AIDS, as well as the poorer health of black Americans? Obviously, people who don’t think ahead will tend not to take good care of themselves. All planning – personal, business and government – involves thinking of the future. The scourge of malaria in Africa? Ditto. People educate their children, build up savings, get insurance, because they are thinking of the future.

THE SCANDAL OF 20TH CENTURY WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

What Has 20th-Century Western Philosophy ‘Produced’?

Philosophy, as practiced in the West, is written for ‘professionals’, who have tried to turn it into a ‘technical’ subject. But that won’t wash. The ‘hard’ disciplines – math, physics, chemistry – are inherently technical, and so it is inevitable that they are often incomprehensible to the layman. But we know that science is not nonsense because it is responsible for modern technology.

If philosophy does not ‘produce’ in this way, just what does it do? Without suggesting it must show ‘results’, it is reasonable to ask what, of any lasting value, Western academic philosophy has produced. And I think the answer is: *precious little*.

If philosophers wrote things which ordinary people found interesting, stimulating thought and argument, that alone would justify their existence. But that is seldom the case: no one, except a small coterie, reads a word they write, because often it is incomprehensible even to many of them.

Deliberate Obfuscation Hides Emptiness of Thought

Yet much of philosophy – such as the nature of racism and self-deception – is *not* inherently technical, but concerns things with which virtually everyone is familiar and in which many are capable of becoming interested. Philosophy should be accessible and interesting to such people, though this is rarely the case, one reason being, I suspect, that philosophers (like other ‘soft’ academics) frequently have very little to say of any real consequence; if they spoke plainly and forthrightly, this would be evident; so they cloak themselves in convoluted jargon and the average joe is impressed. ‘I don’t understand a word he’s talking about, but it must be profound, because it’s way beyond me!’

Calculated Incoherence

Vis a vis calculated incoherence, [Anatomy of Racism](#) (1990), edited by David Theo Goldberg, a South African who’s apparently ‘made it’ in American academia, no doubt helped by his virulently anti-South African posturing (‘Oh, he’s a *good* South African!’), is a prime exhibit. Almost any sentence from his *Introduction* will illustrate the deliberate obfuscation and obscurantism of which I speak. The following is typical (p. viii):

Thus, the presumption of a single monolithic racism is being displaced by a mapping of multifarious historical formulations of *racisms*. The shift here is from a synchronic description of surface expressions reflecting “race relations” to critical anatomies of diachronic transformations between successive racist standpoints assumed and discarded since the sixteenth century.

If you can make any sense out of that you’re a better man than I am!

As an exception to philosophers’ lack of interest in mundane affairs, there is Michael Levin’s contra-feminist book, [Feminism and Freedom](#) (1987). Levin has since written another excellent book, [Why Race Matters](#). Though my name is not mentioned, many of the ideas and arguments in his book are to be found in the present work. Indeed, in personal communication (4 December 1990), and speaking of the book he was about to undertake and of my book as it existed at that time, Levin wrote: ‘I have to say all the major points that need to be made are made in your book, and made clearly’.

Philosophy Can Be of Practical Value

It is a scandal that Western academic philosophy has so little impact on the everyday world; governments and industry frequently consult sociologists, political scientists and even anthropologists, but almost never philosophers! That should not be so, and I hope it is a virtue of this book that it

demonstrates, by example, that philosophy can be of great practical value *and* interesting to the proverbial man-in-the-street.

Gedaliah Braun
Johannesburg, South Africa
November 2008

PART I: PAPUA NEW GUINEA

BLACK INSIGHT INTO WHITE RACIAL GUILT

Emblematic Whites: 'Kick them and they wag their tails'

I heard on the radio (October 1986) about a U.N. meeting of the Red Cross, in which a Kenyan moved that the South African delegation be removed, because its government did not 'democratically represent its people'. I immediately thought how ridiculous this was, since President Moi (of Kenya) was – of course – never elected. He has the chutzpah to say this because he knows that no one is going to shout '*People in glass houses shouldn't throw stones!*'.

In the novel [*Richer Than All His Tribe*](#) (1968), by Nicholas Monsarrat, set in Africa, the newly declared President of the newly independent and former British colony of Pharamaul makes a speech at the U.N. (p.119):

Freeing the slaves must always bring a warm feeling of self-satisfaction: the feeling of a philanthropist who inherits a zoo and frees the animals. But it should not be forgotten that this liquidation of the British Empire was a forced liquidation, under the pressure of history, and any self-satisfaction must be tempered by the thought of what might have happened if freedom had been denied; since, in fact, the zoo was falling apart anyway, the bars were coming loose, and many of the cages were in ruins.

Forced liquidation is only bankruptcy under another name – in this case, bankruptcy of thought, feeling, and common humanity. So it is not for us, the newly-free, to touch our hats in gratitude to our late masters. It is for us to tell them two things, in unmistakable words: not to be too smug about it, and never to do it again.

Telling him, "That was a jolly good speech, sir", his white military attaché indicates that the British Ambassador is trying to catch his attention.

Dinamaula [the President] leant forward again, peered down the rows of seats, found the British delegation, and watched as the ambassador, clasping his two hands together, went through a pantomime of congratulations.

He smiled back, and bowed. But part of his brain, still sharp from the glare of exposure, thought: *You kick them, and still they wag their tails* [emphasis added].

A most, *most* profound observation, showing how easily whites can be bullied, blackmailed and bamboozled, justifying the perception that though the white man is very clever, he is in other ways a perfect fool.

Racial Rubbish from Whites

From an article by Blaine Harden in the *International Herald Tribune* (27-28 December 1986, p.5):

[Mozambique's civil war] is widely perceived across Africa as far more than just another civil conflict. It is viewed as a *moral contest* that pits agents of white-ruled South Africa against the *democratic values of black-ruled nations* [emphasis added].

How does one explain such nonsense? It is ludicrous to say this war is 'widely perceived across Africa' as *anything*, since the vast majority haven't the foggiest idea where Mozambique is – or, indeed, that it even exists – and in any case don't think in terms of 'moral contests'. Most ridiculous is the reference to 'democratic values of black-ruled nations'. Mr. Harden has lived in black Africa long enough to know what utter tripe this is. (He has, however, also written [Africa: Dispatches from a Fragile Continent](#) [1990], which is readable, upfront and honest. Go figure. [See also, [here](#).])

Asians in Kenya and Straight-Talking From Africans

I've been musing about the Indians ('Asians') in Kenya, and of a specific shop in Nairobi. I was asking the owner, a typical middle class Asian businessman, not very well educated, about his employees. Most had been working for him all their adult lives. Their wages were small – 500-900 shillings a month (\$50-90 in the early 80s) – but one of them he'd given money to build a house, another he helped with school fees, and when they got sick, he'd pay for a doctor (etc.). Very paternalistic.

But is that bad? Couldn't it in fact be part of the economic backbone of Kenya? If Asians can run businesses better than Africans – if Africans really can't run them at all – is it wrong for Asians to run them? If the Asians deliberately kept Africans down and wouldn't *let* them 'develop', that would be different. But that certainly isn't the case now and I doubt it ever was. The Africans are unquestionably better off than they would be without the Asians or were they to leave (as their expulsion from [Uganda](#) amply demonstrates).

Uhuru

Which makes me wonder about **Uhuru** ("freedom" in Swahili). Why did the masses think they would be better off running the show? Indeed, *did* they? It is so out of character with what I know that I find it hard to believe that most had any idea what 'independence' was all about, or that they wanted the white man to hand things over to blacks.

In an interview on the BBC's *Newshour* (27 December 1992), Pius Nyamora, editor of a Nairobi-based magazine, *Society*, was asked about Kenya's Asians, in light of the upcoming Presidential elections. "Our Asians have nothing to fear", he said. "Africans know their value. Somehow, whenever a business is run by an African, it never succeeds. In order to succeed, it seems it must have an Asian" (or words to that effect). Note the straightforwardness and the absence of any 'touchiness'. (This man, I have since learned, had to flee Kenya in 1994 because of his outspokenness, and now lives with his family in America.)

RACIAL SENSITIVITY: 'DIFFICULTIES' WITH THE CONCEPT OF AVERAGES

'But Some Blacks Are Extremely Intelligent!'

On a visit to America in 1986, a well-educated friend responded to my view that blacks were on average less intelligent by saying, '*But some of the blacks working in my office are extremely intelligent!*'. But of course I wasn't saying that *no* blacks are smart but only that fewer were, indicating how people can *act as if* they don't understand the concept of averages.

As applied to individuals this creates *presumptions*: if I had to guess who was smarter, this random white or this random black, it would be rational to pick the white; but in any given case I could well be wrong. Most people understand this, but when it comes to 'sensitive' issues common sense flies out the window.

Furthermore, whatever the average difference, there *must* be an overlap, i.e., blacks who are more intelligent than many (or even most) whites. That this (random) white is *probably* more intelligent than this (random) black is one thing; but that he *must* be is something for which I cannot imagine any possible grounds.

Philosopher Talks Sense, Journalist Nonsense

I came across this from a well-known British philosopher, Anthony Flew:

... the fact that I belong to some set which is on average less this or more than than another set, to which you belong, carries no implication that I, as an individual, am less this or more than than you. ... [As for] the correspondent who told [Arthur] Jensen that "If the group is to be labelled intellectually inferior, I, as a member of that group, am also inevitably and automatically labelled", his argument was ... fallacious. [The reference is from Arthur Jensen's [Genetics and Education](#) (1972, p.15). The entire quote is from "'Education against Racism': three comments", by Anthony Flew, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, vol. 21, no. 1, 1987, p.136.]

In [The Race Gallery](#) (1996), Marek Kohn, discussing [The Bell Curve](#), writes (p.115):

... what counts [Herrnstein and Murray say] is an individual's capabilities, and an individual of any ethnic group may have a high IQ. Many critics did not feel that this was an adequate solution to the racial intelligence question. 'What's the difference between thinking that the black male next to me is dumb and thinking there's a 25 per cent chance that he's dumb?' [meaning that there's a 75% chance that he's *not* dumb] asked Alan Wolfe, one of twenty commentators given space in *The New Republic* after Andrew Sullivan's decision to publish a piece by Herrnstein and Murray caused almost his entire editorial staff to revolt.

While I might not expect an uneducated African adolescent to understand *probability* (which is what this amounts to), I certainly would of someone writing in *The New Republic*. If this man Wolfe is really such an imbecile that he cannot understand this simple statement of probability, then he should look for a new line of work, because he would truly be a disgrace to his profession – indeed, to almost any profession.

From Black Shrinks, Nazis, Liberal Jews and Academics: Intemperate Nonsense

Absolute Generalizations

In [*Black Rage*](#) (1968 [1992 edition], pp.132-33), the authors, black psychiatrists William H Grier and Price M Cobbs, state: ‘The essence ... of white supremacy is that *every* white man is inherently superior to *every* black man’. Their penchant for talking in absolutes is also illustrated by their claim that ‘*All* blacks are angry’ (p.4; all emphases added).

While on the subject of absolute generalizations (and its relation to *genuine* racial prejudice), here is a quote from a neo-Nazi Web site (NSWPP [National Socialist White People’s Party]; www.nswpp.org) (“NA/Nizkor Similarities”, 15.5.97):

We KNOW where all this stuff comes from, and you might as well not waste everyone’s time whining about "proof". *You are Jews and your word on anything is worthless.* [Italics added.]

It is precisely the *universality* of the charge here – that being Jewish is *by itself sufficient* to make you a liar, and hence that *all* Jews are liars – that unambiguously certifies this statement as *bona-fide* racial prejudice (in this case, antisemitism), since the only explanation for such a belief is *blind racial hatred*. (See also [here](#).)

Apologism (Blacks Can Do No Wrong): Examples

For sheer emotionality, nothing could surpass a conversation in April 1997 with an elderly but educated American Jewish woman. Upon hearing my view that whites were naturally more intelligent than blacks, she said, with the greatest of fervour, ‘*I refuse to believe that!*’.

The president of City College of New York had this to say about the views of Michael Levin (that whites are smarter than blacks): ‘[Levin’s] views are offensive to the basic values of human equality and decency and simply have no place here at City College’ ([*The Shadow University*](#), 1998, p.133).

The Bell Curve

But the following must surely Take The Cake. In early 2003 I was talking with a middle-aged Jewish man teaching math at the largest Jewish day school in South Africa. IQ differences between blacks and whites? Impossible – IQ tests are culturally biased, etc. etc.. Have you heard of Arthur Jensen? Yes. Have you read [*The Bell Curve*](#)? Yes. Do you remember their account of Jensen’s research on reaction time? Not sure. I explained: an array of lights with

instructions to press the corresponding button when a light came on. Jensen discovered that whites have a faster reaction time *and* that reaction time is highly correlated with IQ.

Using the analogy of a computer's processing speed, the idea is that the faster one's reaction time the more intelligent he is likely to be, because 'Smarter people process [information] faster than less smart people' (p.284). Finally, '[t]he consistent result of many studies is that white reaction time is faster than black reaction time' (*ibid*), and it is clear from the data that the usual 'environmental' explanations for such differences are not consistent with the facts.

How, I asked, is this research culturally biased? Answer? *American blacks have limited experience with light bulbs and electricity!*

HOW BLACKS PERCEIVE WHITES

Apologism Distinguished from Racism

An apologist is the mirror image of a racist: while the racist refuses to see anything good about blacks, the apologist refuses to see anything bad; the nature of their thinking, however, is essentially the same. White apologism is exemplified by my friend who 'just couldn't accept' that blacks were less intelligent and by her husband, whose response to my claim that Africans themselves accepted this with any qualms, was: 'Gedaliah, that simply *cannot* be true!'; and, of course, by the examples just [above](#).

'The White Man Is Next To God'

Similar reasoning underlies the attitude of many 'bush' blacks, who think [whites almost god-like](#). Nigerians in fact had a saying – which I failed to appreciate at the time – that '*The white man is next to God*'. They see that the white man is superior (technology, science, education, etc.), and, failing to distinguish between the white *man* and white *men*, they think that *every* white is superior. (See [below](#).)

There are, however, important differences between this 'bush' belief in white superiority and racism/apologism. The latter involve *self-deceit*: anyone who believes that blacks can do no right (the racist) or no wrong (the apologist) knows in his heart that this belief is false and hence is believing something which *he doesn't think is true*. They are, to be sure, acting from different motives – the racist from racial hatred, the apologist from racial guilt; and while racism may be more despicable, the effects of apologism are probably more harmful since, unlike racism, it *appears* to be 'good' and hence is encouraged, while racism, real or imagined, certainly is not. Both, however, are equally dishonest.

'Bush' Beliefs In White Superiority Sincere Though Naive

The 'bush' black, on the other hand, who thinks whites are god-like, is perfectly sincere, even if terribly naïve. His is a *genuine* inability to distinguish between groups and individuals

and here I see no dishonesty. (Compare 'bush' beliefs in magic – which, though naive, are sincere – with Western beliefs in astrology (etc.) which, I say, [are not](#).)

I spoke again with [Erich Leistner](#). He told me of a black man who had not seen a white until the age of seventeen, who literally thought the white man was a god, and couldn't believe he '*had to go to the toilet*'. If you can 'get your mind around that' you may just begin to fathom how blacks view whites.

Though this bush perspective reflects a hard kernel of truth – that in certain respects the white race *is* vastly superior – it is mistaken firstly, in applying this superiority to (all) individual whites as opposed to the group, and secondly, by profoundly exaggerating the nature of the superiority – as so provocatively illustrated by this incredulity at the white man's having to heed the calls of nature.

CONVERSATIONS IN PAPUA NEW GUINEA (PNG) CIRCA 1986

'Do Blacks Think Very Much?'

I talked this evening with three black women. Do black people think very much? I asked. No. Do whites? Yes (with vigorous nodding of heads); they do everything. Why do white people think more than blacks? Is it because God made them different? Yes. Or is it because they go to school more? Yes. Who would you rather see running things – the black man like now or the white man as before? The white man. Why?

Here we reached a barrier. My impression is that the notion of *reasons* – for doing something, for believing something, for why something is so – is basically alien to people here. They just *do not think*: why did this or that happen? why did so and so do that? should I or shouldn't I do it? Etc.

Another conversation with two females. One is married, in her mid-twenties, with two children, the other her 15 year old niece. I was trying find out if they ever thought about the danger of getting pregnant; I could see there was no question of them thinking about birth control. 'If you [indicating the niece] went to bed with a man you could get pregnant.' No response. '*You know [to the aunt] how women get pregnant; you've had two children.*' She nodded, laughing, but it was clear that neither had given it the slightest thought.

Many women here seem incapable of considering that they might get pregnant if they have sex, and *a fortiori*, what that might mean – what their parents or spouse would do; e.g., 'I better not do this because I might get pregnant and then I couldn't go to school ...', etc.. They will just go ahead with no thought to the consequences and so will obviously be unable to *avoid* it. Such an inability is surely a sign of (practical) *unintelligence*.

Did Prehistoric Man Associate Sex With Pregnancy?

In the novel [Clan of the Cave Bears](#) (1980) the author implies that prehistoric man did not associate sexual intercourse with pregnancy, and I've since come across this idea elsewhere. Heinrich Harrer ([I Come From the Stone Age](#) (1963, p.157), referring to Stone Age natives in the remote mountainous regions of Papua New Guinea, observes that

It seems doubtful whether the Danis realize the connection between sexual intercourse, which they regard merely as the satisfaction of their physical desires, and pregnancy. I certainly heard no word at any time to suggest that they did.

A WAKEUP CALL

'Of Course Whites Are Smarter! Any Fool Knows That!'

Not long after arriving in Nigeria (in 1976) a Yoruba man with whom I'd become pretty good friends said something clearly implying that the white man was cleverer than the black man. 'Are you saying that you think the white man is more intelligent than the black man?', I said, expressing my amazement.

Aborisade (pronounced "Aborishodee") got very annoyed. 'Do you think I am stupid, man! Didn't I tell you I lived in Germany for ten years. Didn't I see every day the incredible things the white man makes which the black man still can't, even if the white man is looking over his shoulder? Of *course* the white man is smarter! Any fool knows that!'

And that was the end of that conversation – except that as result, I began asking people about this and found that indeed 'everyone knew' this and no one was in the least troubled by it. Liberals assume that such ideas are [shameful and abhorrent](#) and automatically assume that blacks think the same, but they could not be further from the [truth](#). Africans regard the fact that whites have a 'stronger brain' (as Nigerians would put it) as completely obvious and about as controversial as the sun's rising and setting.

As an example of Africans' remarkable upfrontness about race, I recall, during my first few months in Nigeria, riding in a crowded 'togzi' (taxi) and hearing the passengers talking about some acts of cruelty perpetrated by Nigerians, and the driver saying, resignedly, 'Yes, we Nigerians, [we have no human sympathy!](#)'.

ELITES GRAPPLE WITH THE CONCEPT OF AVERAGES

Southerner Parades His Liberal *Bona Fides*

Tom Wicker is a 'holier than thou' Southerner. For much of his lifetime, *de jure* segregation in the South was the norm. On the *Op-Ed* pages of the *New York Times* (21 January 1987), he writes:

The Greatest Tragedy

*On Evolution and the false
notion of white
superiority*

It couldn't have happened at a more appropriate time than the eve of the Martin Luther King birthday observances: Jimmy Snyder, a sports tipster known also as The Greek, was fired from his television job for a number of remarks claiming that blacks had been bred since the Civil War to be better athletes than whites.

But now Roy Innis, the black chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality, has charged that Mr. Snyder "spoke only the truth", and that his dismissal by CBS was a tragedy. This suggests what many believe – that Mr. Snyder lost his job not for being wrong on the facts but for violating a taboo and offending some television viewers. [This clearly implies that one *should* be fired 'for being wrong on the facts' – or at least for being wrong about *these* facts, which then *would* amount to a 'taboo'.]

In fact, Mr. Innis's defense of Mr. Snyder demonstrates that ignorance is not, repeat not, confined to one race or the other, just as intelligence, muscular thighs, sexual prowess, the ability to float and the capacity to manage a baseball team are not, repeat not, measured by skin pigment – much popular myth, intellectual humbug and racial malevolence to the contrary.

In the field of sports, the heroics of Larry Bird, John Elway and Don Mattingly ought to be testimony enough to refute Mr. Snyder's genetic and historical illiteracy. These white superstars [of basketball, football and baseball, respectively] only disprove, however, Mr., Snyder's silly theories about athletes. Unfortunately, many Americans, including some blacks other than Roy Innis, probably agree with the basic premise [about] innate differences – physical, intellectual, even moral and spiritual ...

While this business about breeding blacks might well contain some truth, it clearly isn't the whole story, since Africans have the same superior attributes. While most 12-year-olds know what averages are, many university graduates apparently do not. The issue is the superiority of black athletes. Would a 12-year-old think this means that *all* blacks are supermen and all whites klutzes? Wicker must think this, because he 'disproves' Snyder's 'silly theories' by referring to 'the heroics of Larry Bird, John Elway and Don Mattingly'. I refuse to believe Wicker doesn't know the difference between saying *all* blacks are superior and saying that on *average* they are, to which the existence of white superstars is irrelevant.

How Traits Can Be 'Typical' of a Group Even Though Most of Its Members Don't Have It

Note that blacks could have some (undesirable) trait more than whites even though the vast majority of blacks do *not* have it. Thus, if (say) 2% of whites and 10% of blacks have criminal

propensities, that means five times as many blacks have this tendency as whites; and yet the vast majority – 90% – will not have it.

Similarly, a trait can be *typical* of some group even though the vast majority do not possess it. Jews have a reputation for being ‘stingy’. Consider the 100,000 Jews in South Africa out of a (white) population of five million. Suppose out of the five million, there are 10,000 very stingy people and 6,000 of them are Jewish. That means *most stingy people are Jewish* (60%) even though *most Jews (94%) are not stingy*. I don’t think it would be far-fetched to call this trait ‘typical’ of Jews, even though the vast majority would not be stingy, because a disproportionately high percentage of those who were *stingy* were *Jewish*. Needless to say, I am not saying this *is true* of Jews (though neither am I saying that it’s not); it is the logic that is of interest here.

Finally, in the era of terrorism and suicide bombers, it has been noted by Muslims themselves that whereas not all Muslims are terrorists, nearly all terrorists have been Muslims, meaning – at the very least – that terrorists are indeed *typically* Muslims.

‘RACIAL PROFILING’ MAKES AN APPEARANCE

Fearing Blacks Is ‘Realistic’ but ‘Racist’, Meaning: We Should *Not* Be Realistic!

Bernard Goetz

In December 1984, a young white man, Bernard Goetz, was approached on a New York underground train by four black youths ‘asking’ for \$5. Having been a previous victim of black muggers, and certain that they were about to rob him, Goetz pulled out a gun and shot all four (all of whom had criminal records). Due to pressure from white liberals and black ‘activists’, he was charged with attempted murder and assault but was acquitted (though spending eight months in jail on a lesser charge).

In the *International Herald Tribune* (19 June 1987, p.3; all emphases added) Joseph Berger writes about the case.

Underlying the issue of crime ... was the issue of race. Scholars such as Dr. Kenneth B. Clark [black], ... have expressed doubt that Mr. Goetz would have shot four white youths asking him for money.

However, Marvin E. Wolfgang, a criminologist ..., said that perceptions about who is more likely to commit a crime have some statistical basis. For four violent offenses – homicide, rape, robbery and aggravated assault – the crime rates for blacks are *at least 10 times as high as they are by whites*, he said.

“The expectation that four young blacks are going to do you harm is indeed greater than four young whites”, he said. *“I can understand the black position that this is a racist attitude, but it is not unrealistic”*.

Legal scholars such as Graham Hughes ... said it would be “intolerable to adopt a social norm or legal concept that you can reinforce your argument of reasonable fear just because the person happens to be a young black person”. The courts, for example, have generally ruled that police cannot take race into account as a factor in leading to an arrest.

My response to Kenneth Clark would be, “Of course he wouldn’t have shot four whites. First of all, it’s hard to imagine four ordinary, middle-class whites asking someone for five dollars. But if they did, then no, Goetz probably wouldn’t have shot them because he wouldn’t have feared being robbed. Whereas with the blacks he was – *justifiably* – so worried”. We can imagine circumstances in which four whites would be threatening and four blacks not, but the point is, their being black *by itself* is seen as menacing – and on the evidence adduced, quite rightly so.

Which leads to Marvin Wolfgang’s observation that ‘perceptions about who is more likely to commit a crime have some statistical basis’. Some? Given the facts *he* asserts, they have a very good basis and create a presumption that, *other things being equal*, the chances of blacks harming you are much greater than whites.

Yet, according to him, this attitude is ‘racist’ – though ‘*not unrealistic*’. But why *is* it racist – *i.e., bad*? He’s already said that the rate of violent crime is *ten times* higher for blacks and hence that the greater ‘expectation’ of harm is warranted – and given these facts we don’t need a criminologist to tell us this! – which means that the belief that blacks are a threat is true, end of story. Since racism is bad, what Mr Wolfgang is telling us, in a nutshell, is that *we ought not to be realistic!*

Prelude To a Continuing Discussion: Can A Fact Be Racist?

Question: can such a true belief – a *fact* – be racist? The very idea seems absurd. A fact is merely something that *is the case*, and such a thing cannot, in and of itself, be racist. To call something racist is to say it is morally bad and it would seem absurd to call a fact morally bad.

But if a fact cannot be racist, neither can a *proposition*, for a proposition is simply what is made true (or false) by facts. A proposition, therefore, is like a ‘picture’ of a fact: to every fact there corresponds the proposition which would assert that fact, while, conversely, to every proposition there corresponds either a fact (which makes it true) or the absence of that fact (whose absence makes it false). So propositions and facts are intimately related, and if facts cannot be racist neither can propositions.

Can ‘Truth Itself’ Be Wrong?

Similar thoughts are expressed by two Harvard professors, James Q Wilson and Richard J Herrnstein, in their book [*Crime and Human Nature*](#) (1985, p.468; emphases added; Herrnstein was later to co-author *The Bell Curve*):

There is no way to discuss the evidence, such as it is, on constitutional factors underlying the association between race and crime without giving offense. Even to allude to the possibility that races may differ in the distribution of those constitutional factors that are associated with criminality will strike some persons as factually, ethically, or prudentially wrong. We disagree. One cannot dismiss such possible connections as factually wrong without first investigating them. *Honest, open scientific inquiry that results in carefully stated findings cannot be ethically wrong, unless one believes that truth itself is wrong.*

What then *can* be racist? How about beliefs? If by 'beliefs' we mean the *content(s)* of beliefs, then that is the same as a proposition, which we've said cannot be racist. What is racist is not the content of a belief but rather the *manner in which it is held*. Similarly, while facts *per se* cannot be racist, one's attitudes *towards* them can be. If, e.g., one 'enjoys' discovering (e.g.) that blacks' have a higher crime rate, that might indicate racism; but it still wouldn't be the facts which were racist but [how we deal with them](#).

No One Can Be Blamed for Acting on Reasonable and Justified Presumptions

In calling fear of blacks 'racist', Mr Wolfgang is saying it is bad. But *is* it bad? He agrees that it's 'not unrealistic' – meaning that it's reasonable and justified; moreover, it is self-preserved: one defends oneself against dangers and he agrees that blacks are a danger. But if it's not bad, how can it be racist, since to say it is racist is to say it is bad?

And why would it be 'intolerable to reinforce your argument just because the person ... [is] black'? If Mr. Hughes wishes to deny the facts asserted by Mr. Wolfgang he should say so; but if he means that even *given* these, it would still be 'intolerable', I'd like to know why. We're not saying that because a person is black he is a criminal; we are only speaking, as he is, of 'reasonable fear' and of what one is thereby morally entitled to do: specifically, that when four blacks 'ask' for \$5, you are entitled to conclude with a moral certainty that they are about to rob you and to act accordingly.

True, innocent blacks will suffer, being effected by similar presumptions when looking for housing, jobs, etc. But whose fault is that? *No one can be blamed for acting on reasonable and justified presumptions.* If there is fault to be found here it is with black criminals and liberals, who have created a climate where these realities simply cannot be discussed.

Racial Profiling Supported by Jesse Jackson

The latest incarnation of these ideas (*circa* June 1998) is 'racial profiling'. State police in New Jersey (U.S.) have used the facts about black criminality to both prevent and detect it with considerable success. But rather than defend their eminently sensible procedure, the police found it necessary to deny they were taking race into account – even when it was

evident that they were. And so we have another instance where the fear of confronting racial realities has [deadly consequences](#).

If It's Good Enough for Jesse, It's Good Enough for Me!

I note with some satisfaction that that arch-radical black American apologist, Jesse Jackson, has recently been quoted thus (by Clarence Page, himself black, in the *Chicago Tribune*, 5 January 1994, Section 1, p.13):

“There is nothing more painful to me ... than to walk down the street and hear footsteps and start thinking about robbery. Then look around and *see somebody white and feel relieved*” [emphasis added].

Meanwhile, [taxi drivers](#) in Washington, D.C. face a \$500 fine for nothing more than *acting* on precisely this reasoning. Such thoughts – as obvious as the nose on one's face – have long been banished as ‘incorrect’ and almost everyone has danced to the Emperor's Tune. Jesse Jackson's remarks make short shrift of black ‘complaints’ regarding different treatment by store detectives and the like, and one could henceforth reply to such accusations of racism simply by saying, “*Well, if it's good enough for Jesse Jackson, it's good enough for me!*”.

Race and Crime: Towards Explaining Black Criminality

On the issue of race and crime, [Wilson and Herrnstein](#) make some important observations. ‘Wherever it has been examined, criminals ... tend to be more [mesomorphic](#)’ (*Crime and Human Nature*, p.89), plus the fact that ‘Young black males are more mesomorphic ... than are young white males ...’ (p.469). ‘Despite over forty years of confirmation, the correlation between intelligence and crime has yet to penetrate most of the textbooks or the conventional wisdom of criminology’ (p.155). Given, at the very least, the *plausibility* of Jensen's views (of a genetically based 15 point IQ difference), these authors are in effect providing corroborating evidence – as well as a partial explanation – for observed black criminal propensities. To this we may add a third factor. Wilson and Herrnstein suggest that there is ‘evidence for some sort of connection’ between levels of testosterone and aggression – and hence, presumably, violent crime (p.119); from J Philippe Rushton: ‘One neurohormonal contributor to crime ... is testosterone’ (“Statement on Race as a Biological Concept”, *American Renaissance* Website [www.amren.com], 4 November 1996.) And, as Rushton points out in [Race, Evolution, and Behavior](#) (1994, p.170), college-age blacks (in North America) have been found to have 19% higher levels of testosterone than whites of that age.

Thus we have three factors correlated with violent crime: mesomorphy (physical strength), testosterone and IQ. And in all three, blacks are on the ‘wrong’ side.

MAJOR INSIGHT INTO BLACK BEHAVIOR

American Linguist: Blacks Do Not Internalize Moral Norms

In the early 1990s I heard about an American linguist, William Stewart (since deceased), who spent many years in Senegal studying their languages and making some remarkable discoveries (never, to my knowledge, published). Whereas Western cultures *internalize* norms – ‘Don’t do that!’ (to a child) becomes ‘I mustn’t do that’ for an adult – African cultures did not; there the only controls were *external* – tribal elders, etc.. When they were *detrribalized*, these external constraints disappeared; and since there never were any *internal* constraints, you get the results of this lack of self-control – crime, drugs, promiscuity, etc. Where there has been some substitute control – as in white-ruled South Africa, colonial Africa or the segregated American South – this behaviour was kept within tolerable limits. But when even such controls disappear you typically see indiscriminate and unbridled violence.

The question Stewart apparently never asked was *why* African cultures never developed internalized norms – *i.e.*, why they never developed [moral consciousness](#). That it was just an historical accident is highly implausible. Much more likely is that it results from fundamental deficiencies, specifically, in [abstract thinking](#) ability.

Confirmation from Liberal Anthropologist

In a 2005 article in *The Boston Review* by Rebecca Saxe (“[Do the Right Thing](#): Cognitive Science’s Search for a Common Morality”), a distinction is made between ‘conventional’ and ‘moral’ rules. Conventional rules are merely supported by authorities and can be changed; moral rules, on the other hand, are not based on conventional authority and are not subject to such change. ‘Even three-year-old children already distinguish between moral and conventional transgressions’. The only exception, according to James Blair of the NIH, are ‘psychopaths’, those exhibiting ‘persistent aggressive behavior’. For them, all rules are based on external authority, in whose absence ‘anything is permissible’. The conclusion is that ‘healthy individuals in all cultures respect the distinction between conventional ... and moral [rules]’.

But at least one anthropologist argues that ‘the special status of moral rules cannot be part of human nature, but is rather just ... an artifact of Western values’. From the same article (“[Do the Right Thing](#)”):

[Speaking of the Manyika of Zimbabwe, Anita Jacobson-Widding says] “I tried to find a word that would correspond to the English concept ‘morality.’ I explained what I meant by asking my informants to describe the norms for good behavior toward other people. The answer was unanimous. The word for this was *tsika*. But when I asked my bilingual informants to translate *tsika* into English, they said that it was ‘good manners. ... ’”

In short, according to this liberal anthropologist, the Manyika simply *do not have a concept of morality*, and it would be hard to imagine a more startling corroboration of Stewart's idea that blacks do not internalize moral norms, in turn because of their deficiency in abstract thinking ability.

But if awareness of the difference between moral and conventional rules is nearly universal, how does one explain its *absence* in these two widely separated black societies (Senegal and Zimbabwe)? Jacobson-Widding's explanation is the typical nonsense that could only come from an academic – that "*the concept of morality does not exist*". More likely is that the concept of morality, while otherwise universal, is enfeebled specifically in *black* cultures, precisely because of their deficiency in [abstract thinking](#).

The concept of morality may well be universal – in '*healthy*' populations; but among 'psychopathic' groups (to use James Blair's term) – where 'anything is permissible' and where you find the violence and mayhem present in black populations lacking externally imposed authority – the concept of morality may indeed be absent. And that would certainly qualify as 'unhealthy'.

By the way, the notion that blacks are 'children in adult bodies' is not without foundation. The average African adult has the raw IQ score of the average 11-year-old white child. This phenomenon of not internalizing moral norms is another illustration of this idea, since this is precisely how white *children* typically 'understand' morality.

How This Helps Explain Black 'Pathologies'

The year 1994 saw the publication of [The Bell Curve: Intelligence and Class Structure in America Life](#) by Richard J Herrnstein and Charles Murray with its assertion of genetically based race differences in IQ. For the first time a mainstream publishing house dared to say that the Emperor wears no clothes – and the sky hasn't fallen.

In another somewhat 'incorrect' book ([The End of Racism](#), 1995), Dinesh D'Souza agrees that it is rational to 'discriminate' against blacks – including taxi drivers not picking them up – but adds that 'Just because discrimination is rational ... does not mean that it is moral' (p.286); on the contrary, 'whether rational or not, [it] is often painful, dehumanizing and immoral' (p.287). But to say that behaviour that is rational – *and 'legitimate'* – is immoral and therefore deserves condemnation is patently absurd, and something for which D'Souza offers not a shred of an argument. (See "[Myth of the Racist Cabbie](#)", *National Review*, 9 Oct 98, p.40.)

Another such *non sequitur* can be found in *The American Spectator* ("Black America's Moment of Truth", October 1995). Mentioning that black pathologies (illegitimacy, crime, family break-down, etc.) were not nearly as high a generation ago, D'Souza concludes (p.35) that

the dire circumstances of the black community are not the result of genes or racism. The black gene pool has not changed substantially since mid-century, and racism was then far worse.

Black Propensity for Violence Was Always There But Was Kept In Check

But of course there are explanations for this that are consistent with the problem in fact being genetic, and D'Souza himself provides one (p.37) much like the one I have just mentioned.

These pathologies have existed in the black community since slavery, but they have been *restricted* and *contained* both by *white-imposed discipline* and black-imposed norms enforced by churches and local community institutions. But those institutions have been greatly weakened since the 1960s, and in the new environment of social permissiveness ..., black pathologies have proliferated [emphases added].

In other words, blacks' violent propensities were always there, but with external controls, such as existed in the past, were kept in check. Remove these constraints and, absent *internal* constraints, the pathologies reassert themselves. In short, a good illustration of Stewart's thesis.

More Insight Into Black Behaviour

Post-Apartheid South Africa

In February 1990, the last white president of South Africa, FW de Klerk, announced an end to all apartheid laws (such as Group Areas Act, which restricted racial groups to designated residential areas), the unbanning of the ANC and the freeing of Nelson Mandela. At the time I foresaw an upsurge in black-on-white violence, for the obvious reasons: more blacks in white areas and freer movement of blacks, due to the recent abandonment of Pass Laws which had restricted such movement.

But there were other reasons. The naturally shrewd black would (unconsciously) ask himself *why* whites were – voluntarily – relinquishing these controls. It certainly wasn't because they were any less necessary. There could be only one answer: the white man was *weak*, *frightened*, and above all *foolish* – which meant that blacks no longer had to fear white authority. Add to this the constant drumbeat from liberal whites – that blacks had a *justified grudge* against whites because of the sins of apartheid – and you have a recipe for disaster.

New Orleans

Something similar happened in New Orleans, in the American South. When I lived there from 1969-73, the city was at least 40% black, with patch-work segregation: a white area here, adjacent to a black area, adjacent to another white area. I lived less than a block from

a black neighbourhood and never gave it a thought, walking about day or night, hardly locking my doors.

I visited New Orleans in 1979 and '81, and nothing much had changed. By 1986, however, the change was palpable: everyone talked about crime – a friend having their gold chain snatched through a car window in broad daylight, etc.. Neighbourhoods where middle-class whites had long lived comfortably, were becoming out-of-bounds. There had always have been a lot of black-on-*black* crime; now it was increasingly black-on-white.

So why this was happening? While the black population had increased to perhaps 50%, it hadn't become overwhelmingly black (like Washington, D.C. or Detroit). And then I recalled that in 1978 New Orleans had elected its first black mayor. Aside from the effects this would have on the efficacy of law enforcement, to the blacks this meant: *we are as good as whites – the mayor himself is black!* We don't have to *fear* or *respect* the white man (as we used to); he is now *fair game*. In other words, they were *emboldened*.

Brass Tacks: Originally Accepted *Because It Was White*, South Africa Is Then *Ostracized For Being White* and Finally Rejected For No *Longer Being White!*

In 1985, trying to establish a passion-fruit juice business in London *via* my business in Nairobi, I met a wealthy American entrepreneur. She was excited by the prospect of turning my small business into a large one, and said she would speak to her 'banker friends' about financing. But it was *no dice*. '*As soon as they heard the word Africa*', she said – *except for South Africa* (this was before widespread sanctions) – '*they just about hung up the phone*'. In short, in the harsh world of business, *money talks, bullshit walks*. (I believe this pithy proverb comes from Tom Wolfe's [The Bonfire of the Vanities](#) [1988], with its scathing portrayal of black American culture.)

This original unwillingness to get involved with black Africa for hard-headed business reasons, was soon replaced by a refusal to do business with (white) South Africa for political reasons ('We won't do business with you because you're *white!*'); somewhat paradoxically, by the late 1990s this had become a (*sub rosa*) reluctance to do business with the 'new' South Africa because it was *black* (for the same reasons as before). Previously welcomed because it was white, South Africa was then made a *pariah* because it was white, and then, finally, told 'thanks but no thanks' precisely because it had done as 'demanded' and become black!

RACIAL REALISM FROM SURPRISING QUARTERS

Black American

As an indication of the far-flung nature of black criminality, I quote Elizabeth Wright, speculating about why AIDS is becoming a black disease in America, *vis a vis* middle-class blacks' contact with 'underclass' blacks. 'As a black, I challenge anyone to show me *one*, just

one middle class black, who does not have criminals within his sibling and/or first-cousin relations. Just *one!* (emphasis in original; *circa* 1998; original reference lost but statement confirmed in personal communication).

Black Harvard Professor: ‘Despite myself, longing for the missionaries’

For another example of such realism, this time from a self-described racial militant at the pinnacle of academe, this is off the Internet (ar_mail@amren.com, 4 June 97: “*The New Republic* [TNR] – Africa Issue”):

The latest issue of *TNR* (June 16, 1997) ... “Africa is Dying”, has an article by Henry Louis Gates, chairman of Afro-American Studies at Harvard. Gates visited Africa about 25 years ago and just returned [there] with his wife and children.

During his first visit he lived ... with some missionaries in the small village of Kilimatinde He writes “With my kinsmen, there was some common ground: ... we bonded over our common enemy, the white man, embodied for us in the pale faces of our pious missionaries, jockeying for eternity by sacrificing their lives for the benighted tribesman ...”

He returned to Kilimatinde to show it to his family. “An evil thing has happened The missionaries, with whom I fought so fiercely ... about politics and their own racism ..., were gone. Gone, too, were the funds that their churches had sent to maintain the hospital and the homes that formed the compound. A sleepy little village of 500 was now ... a desperately impoverished village of 10,000. AIDS is so prevalent that we were discouraged from visiting the hospital where I had delivered general anesthesia for so many operations ...

“To my surprise and dismay, I found myself – *despite myself* – longing for the order and the resources that the missionaries had [previously] brought The standard of living, and the villagers’ life expectancy, had not been raised one jot over the past two decades. [Being ‘desperately impoverished’, it almost certainly had *decreased*.] Looking around the village, I realized that even if the West stood still for a thousand years, my friends in Kilimatinde would never catch up. And the West, of course, will never stand still.” [Emphases added.]

This is about as close as you will get to an admission of white racial superiority from an elite like Gates, as racial realities become ever more difficult to ignore.

Swazi Insight

When the king of Swaziland ‘called a national convention and invited all ... to speak their minds ...’ (*The Star*, 20 August 1988, p.10: “Swazis air affairs of state – and heart”)

... the most surprising call ... – surprising too for the reaction it provoked – came from a Swazi man who wanted *the return of the “white administration”*. He charged

that the present “educated leaders” were so greedy or corrupt they had brought the country to the brink of financial ruin.

“These educated Swazis [he said] were smart from the beginning When they saw the colonialists were fair and treated every Swazi alike, they ... claimed they were educated enough to govern and, therefore, the foreigners should be sent home”.

The crowd applauded him. ... [Emphases added.]

In other words, since the colonialists insisted that all groups were equal, the only difference could be education; and now that they were educated they must be equally able to rule. And the white man *must* agree, since otherwise he would be saying that blacks were *not* equal; and given his belief in ‘equality’, he can’t say that. And so we can force him to hand the government over to us.

And what was the response from other blacks at these ‘racist’ thoughts, thoughts which, according to your bleeding-heart lelyvelds ‘can no longer be spoken out loud in polite company’ and which ‘no self-respecting black can acknowledge except as an aspect of white pathology’ ([Move Your Shadow](#), pp.26 and [354](#))? ‘*The crowd applauded him.*’

Swazi Potter

In the early 1990s I met one of the leading potters of Swaziland, an unassuming black man in his 40s. I mentioned this incident and asked him whether my understanding of the facts was accurate. He said they were and basically agreed with everything I said. Rian Malan (author of [My Traitor’s Heart](#)) was sitting next to him and was half-listening, in his own words, ‘cringing and goggle-eyed’, later exclaiming, ‘Well, Gedaliah, you were right again!’

The potter had once been the head instructor at an art school, with four black colleagues. When he tried to explain the correct procedure for firing a kiln, they refused to listen, taking perverse pleasure in doing just the opposite. Why was this? I asked. Answer: jealousy. He was successful and they didn’t like that. To follow his advice would mean accepting his ‘superiority’ and hence ‘helping’ him; instead, they did whatever they could – even to their own detriment – to make his life [difficult](#)!

Black Advertising Exec on Black ‘Distrust’

I found this tidbit at the U.S. Information Agency in Harare, Zimbabwe (from the *Washington Post*, 19 January 1986):

'[Iraqi Christians] did it as a family unit, but we as a black group ... have been divided ... we didn't know about pooling because all we know ... is pulling away from each other in order to survive. If you had a piece of bread you had to grab that piece of bread We have been divided and conquered as a people.' Thus the theme of blacks *distrusting themselves* in the buppie [black urban professional] group. Richard Jones, a [black American] advertising executive, recalled the old adage he said still holds true ... :

"If you want to die, go to a black doctor. If you want to go to jail, go to a black lawyer."

Note the theme, from a Western black elite, of American blacks 'distrusting themselves', meaning *each other*. That we independently make the same observation about two such widely separated groups is added evidence for its truth. And South African blacks say the [same things](#).

Liberal Whites in South Africa

In 1993, a liberal-minded friend, teaching in an inner city private school for blacks, mentioned that the teachers there were all white. Aren't you surprised? Yes, he said, and he'd asked the principal about this, who told him that the parents let him know, in no uncertain terms, that their children there because they had white teachers. A few years later this same friend related a conversation with a black street-sweeper. Commenting on how filthy the streets of his newly black suburb were becoming, he was nonplussed when she responded by saying, 'A munt's a munt!' (more or less equivalent to 'nigger').

When Ross Herbert (*The Star*, "Corruption knows no colour", 12 February 1999, p.12), a more-honest-than-average white journalist, 'asked a [black] wildlife scout in Zambia why he had not been issued boots ... in 10 years, he said: "A black man is a black man"' – meaning (along with similar comments from others) that 'blacks would always look for the easy way to make money and when given power over state coffers would always direct it to themselves'. The author replies that 'many people in South Africa would punch me for saying such a thing', further confirming my claim that blacks are [not as 'touchy'](#) about race as is generally assumed.

Young Black Author in UK

Courtia Newland, a 23-year-old black, has written a book about life on the 'estates' in West London:

In [The Scholar](#), Newland has conjured up a world apart from the one which most Londoners know – a world in which differences are settled with bullets, where flick knives flash and where people causally threaten "I'm going to carve you up".

... The truth is unpalatable in places. "Some of my friends asked me why I couldn't write a story with more positive images of black people," he says "But I'm sick of

positive images of black people. I wanted to write about life on the estates as it really is, *because I think black people should face the reality of their situation, otherwise they can't move forward.* [Emphasis added; originally quoted from *The Evening Standard*, 4 iv '97, by Isabel Wolf.]

Black American Lawyer in South Africa

In the *Sunday Star FINANCE* (June 12 1988, p.9), these remarks from Ophelia Jatta, a black American lawyer working in South Africa:

... if Africa is to move from being “the dark continent” into a prosperous future ... South African whites ... will have to play a pivotal role. “*Without white ingenuity, the African continent doesn't stand a chance.* Black folk developing the continent is just an illusion. They will play a part, but you must have the expertise and vision the whites offer. ...” [emphasis added].

Conference on ‘African Culture’ in US

Perhaps the most striking demonstration of black racial straightforwardness surfaced when I submitted an *Abstract* to a conference of black scholars on the subject of black failure, in which I made no attempt to ‘make the unpalatable palatable’. Their [response](#)? ‘*Our reviewers found your paper's thesis very appealing*’. (See also related [discussion](#).)

BLACK RULE ‘NO MATTER WHAT’

Horror At ‘Whites Only’ Sign

In 1987 I spoke with a Canadian academic (in Papua New Guinea) who had excoriated the government for doing business with South Africa. He mentioned how ‘horrified’ he had been to see a ‘Whites Only’ sign in a South African train station. (I had seen the same signs and confess that I was not horrified.)

He was more ‘savvy’ than your typical liberal and agreed that if blacks took power in South Africa they would sooner or later create ‘a fascist’ regime. Nevertheless there must be black rule because ‘eventually’ they would progress in the way whites have.

But Africa *cannot* go through the same historical process of development as Europe, because the culture Europe developed into already exists; and you cannot reinvent the wheel – especially when you know it's already been invented! Western technology has, it is true, been copied by Orientals, but that is not happening in Africa and there's not a scintilla of evidence that it [ever will](#).

This guy seemed to be asserting that *no matter what* South Africa must be ruled by blacks, end of story. But this presented a dilemma, for we both agreed that universal franchise eventually meant zero franchise. Given this, would he still insist blacks must run the

country? Yes. Even if blacks themselves don't want it? Well, *if* that were true it might make a difference; but he didn't think it was.

'Blacks Must Have Black Rule Even If They *Don't* Want It!'

A few minutes later, however, he changed his mind. Even if they didn't want it they must have it. In other words, for whites to deny blacks the vote is absolutely wrong, but for blacks to do the same is all right. Why does something become acceptable just because perpetrators and victims are of the same race?

Given the premise that black rule means oppression, such an absolute principle of democracy means it is perfectly all right for blacks to oppress blacks yet *profoundly* wrong for whites to treat them decently –but without suffrage. The idea that a 'democracy' guaranteed to become repressive must be supported at all costs, strikes me as paradoxical in the extreme. (Here's someone who appears to take [just such a view](#).)

Apartheid 'Has Failed': The Bottom Line

The *Sunday Times* (20 March 1988, p.2) details a speech by a Justice Victor Hiemstra. 'Apartheid', he says, 'has failed as a policy and should be scrapped.' In whatever sense this is true, the bottom line is this: (1) blacks cannot manage a modern industrial democracy; (2) blacks know this and would never think of denying it were it not for white liberals insisting otherwise; (3) except for those black elite who hope to take power, black rule is in no one's interest; (4) blacks know *this* better than anyone and are frightened of black-rule; and (5) whatever changes whites consider, they must keep these facts in mind and not be bowled over by liberal propaganda.

PART II: LESOTHO

MORE CONVERSATIONS

Apartheid Is Not ‘One Single Thing’

Ben is a Zulu, about 60, and works at a garage where I bought a used car; he’s been working there for 26 years and is a South African citizen. Ladybrand is in South Africa, across the border from Maseru, the capital of Lesotho (pronounced ‘Lesoothoo’), a small mountainous country completely surrounded by South Africa and where I taught from 1987-88.

As we drove to the border I asked what he thought about the trouble in South Africa. Did he want to see blacks take over? His answer was straightforward: No, he did not. ‘Our nation [i.e., blacks] is bad’. Why were they bad? I asked. Because they kill anyone who disagrees with them. Blacks could not run things; if they were in charge, nothing would work.

Does he ever go to Soweto. Often, he says; his family lives there. What do people there think about the ANC and black rule? Well, while many *used* to be for the ANC, this has changed because of ‘necklacings’ and [suchlike](#). ‘If they are trying to help the black man, why are they killing so many blacks?’ he asked several times.

But then he began talking about how blacks were ‘oppressed’. I asked for examples; he said if a white man were to beat up a black employee, the police would do nothing. Suppose the boss was black and this happened under a black government? Would the police do anything then? No, he said; but at least you could fight back. In South Africa a black man would be in big trouble if he hit his white boss.

He said that apartheid was bad, though it was changing. Before, blacks had always been separated from whites – separate toilets, entrances, queues, etc.. Everything should be the same for everyone, he said, since doing things separately meant whites didn’t like blacks.

Did that mean going to the same schools? Yes, he said. But since blacks were 80% of the population, whites would have to attend schools that were 80% black. Would such schools be very good? No, he quickly agreed. But how can you expect whites, who pay for the education of whites *and* blacks, to send their children to bad schools? He agreed you couldn’t. If everything should be the same, shouldn’t blacks be allowed to vote? Here he agreed with what he had said earlier: he was happy with whites running things and would not want to live in a country run by blacks.

By this time we were at the border post. He expressed great pleasure at our conversation and said he wished we could talk for two hours. I asked if he’d ever had such a conversation with a white man before and he said emphatically he had not, though he’d worked with them for years.

The upshot was that while against apartheid, he was not in favour of blacks voting and controlling the government, nor did he necessarily think everyone should all go to the same schools. He agreed that apartheid was not 'one single thing'; some parts might be good and others bad. It is clear that many blacks who've been 'persuaded' that apartheid is bad and that they are 'oppressed' would also say they do *not* want black rule.

'Blacks Know Difference Between Right and Wrong But Will Usually Do the Wrong Thing'

During the month I spent in South Africa in January 1986, I took every opportunity to ask blacks what they thought about black vs. white rule (etc.). Almost without exception they said they did not want black rule and for the same reasons: the white man was cleverer and more honest.

The most memorable conversation was with a young woman taking a computer course in central Johannesburg. At first she expressed a noted hostility towards whites, saying she hated white people. All whites? I asked. No, just the Boers (Afrikaners). All Boers? No, just those who hated blacks. So what appeared an extreme view turned out to be quite reasonable: hating those you think hate you.

Nevertheless, there was this antagonism towards whites and so I said to her, 'You must be anxious to see an end to white rule'. Her answer? '*No way!*' She didn't want black rule? Not at all. Why not? Her answer, almost word for word: '*The white man knows the difference between right and wrong and will usually do the right thing. The black man also knows the difference but will usually do the wrong thing!*'. And as I heard these words I knew I would not soon forget them.

'So You Have Been To Tanzania!'

I had an amusing conversation with a Lebanese guy holding a Tanzanian passport and living in Lesotho for eight years. His mother lives in South Africa where she is classified as an Indian. Had he ever experienced any apartheid there? Yes, he said; he once couldn't get into a hotel. How did he feel? Embarrassed, angry? 'Nothing', he said; 'I just went to another hotel.'

Had I ever been to Tanzania? he asked. No, but I've lived in Africa for a long time, so I know pretty much what it's like. We talked about South Africa and what the blacks thought about apartheid etc.. He didn't disagree when I said that blacks wouldn't want black rule because things would become like the rest of Africa – e.g., Tanzania: in the schools there are no books, the English teachers can't speak English or never come to class, the buildings are falling apart; in hospitals there are no beds, no sheets on the beds there are, no medicines (because doctors and nurses steal them), the toilets are overflowing, no lights, no water, etc. etc.. He looked sharply at me and said: 'So you *have* been to Tanzania!'. I laughed, that

my description should have been so accurate. 'No', I said, 'but I have a head on my shoulders with eyes to see and a brain to learn from what I see.'

Talking with Students in Lesotho *Circa 1988*

Blacks Well Off In South Africa

Spoke with a Zulu student. Her parents migrated to Zimbabwe though she still has relatives in Kwazulu (in South Africa). So you must know how things are in South Africa. Yes; and things were quite different than people think. The blacks are quite well off. Do you think people in Kwazulu would want to live in a black country? No way. Things there simply don't work: there's no food, constant shortages of everything; even in Zimbabwe this was beginning.

But if that is so, do blacks in South Africa really want to see blacks take control? Her immediate answer was No, again because things wouldn't work. Then why all the fuss about oppression and the need for black rule when the blacks themselves didn't want it? She agreed, the whole thing was rather absurd.

But though blacks didn't want to take over the government, they did want to share power. Above all, they wanted an end to apartheid – separate entrances at bottle stores, etc.. Blacks were often treated badly; if you went to buy a dress, e.g., they wouldn't let you try it on.

But aren't blacks more likely to steal? Yes, but only because of colonialism and oppression. Well, I said, to the store owner it really doesn't matter: if trying on clothes is a ruse to steal, he must act. He doesn't know which ones are thieves and so he applies a *rule-of-thumb*: no blacks trying on clothes. He's simply acting on reasonable presumptions.

'No, No, No: Students Won't Consider You Racist!'

I gave one of my students a lift into Maseru (the capital of Lesotho). He mentioned that he'd worked for five years for a mining company in South Africa. His uncle was in 'opposition' to the government (of Lesotho) and so he (my student) couldn't get a job or a scholarship. For a few months he worked underground but was soon brought into management. By the time he left in 1985 he was earning R500 a month and when he gave notice they offered him R700 to stay (a lot of money then).

So, I said, he could always go back there, but he said he never would. First, you cannot stay with your family; second, job insecurity; and third, the way blacks were treated. If a white superior didn't like a black worker he would file a complaint and the worker would be dismissed or put onto another job, which might pay less; and there was nothing he could do about it. I asked if he'd rather have a black from another tribe fire him in order to hire one of his own (*re* his uncle in 'opposition', etc.) and he said no.

How did he think South African blacks felt about whites? He said they were very hostile and wanted them out of power. Did he mean ordinary, working-class blacks? He wasn't sure. It turned out he meant was 'conscientized' (i.e., politicized) blacks. He agreed that blacks could not run things and that most blacks knew this but that a minority instigated violence thinking they could gain control.

He said students at the university would be very interested in discussing these ideas and wouldn't at all consider me racist for thinking black rule would be a disaster. 'They won't accuse me of racism when I say these things?' 'No, no, no!' A racist is someone who wouldn't let a black man sit next to him, who wouldn't drink out of the same cup, etc.

Liberal Ideology at the South African Trade Mission

I visited the South African Trade Mission in Maseru. In the *International Bulletin* (vol. 1, no. 3, 1987), from the Africa Institute of South Africa, I read of 'black Africa's passionate desire to eradicate the last vestiges of white domination on African soil'. I was astounded to find such liberal boilerplate in a South African government office!

I spoke with the Trade Rep. Do you assume that blacks want to run things? Yes, he said – they certainly wanted to participate in government. What is your basis for saying that? Well, when we talk to them, they say they do. And do you talk to ordinary, working-class Africans or the elite? Of course – the educated, politically aware Africans. Why do you think they represent the views of ordinary blacks? He didn't know; he just assumed they did. Would it surprise him to hear it claimed that the vast majority of blacks did not want to see a black government? Well, he wasn't sure; he agreed that many blacks were intimidated by 'radicals' and that the majority might not want black rule; the problem was how to get this across.

Then I asked him (and two others present): Do you think whites are more intelligent than blacks? He stopped, putting his hand over his face, hemming and hawing for several seconds. I laughed, slapping my knee. "This is a perfect example of what I'm talking about, how South African whites have been brainwashed into accepting liberal ideology. You all believe, I'm sure, that whites are smarter than blacks, but you've become afraid to say so, because you've accepted that it's bad to say this." They admitted they did believe whites were smarter, and that yes I was correct: they were afraid to say so. A classic demonstration of the influence of liberal dogma and how it has co-opted educated South African opinion.

Mine-Working Student Again: On Intimidation

Had another talk with my mine-working student. He confirmed my thoughts about intimidation. Come strike-time, workers were simply told not to come to work – and that was that. Most obeyed with no idea what it was about; anyone challenging it was beaten.

He mentioned other bad things about South Africa. Some Afrikaner foremen would simply hit African workers who didn't obey; they were so used to doing this in rural areas that they just kept it up in the mines. He also mentioned highway police. 'Do you know how many whites they stop? Almost none. It's always blacks.' But, I asked, aren't blacks more likely to commit crimes? 'I knew you were going to say that', he said, laughing. 'But you should see how they treat blacks: "Get out!", smacking their fist on the window; while with whites they're very polite.'

Re the issue of intimidation, note this statement by a Zambian government minister prior to the 1988 yes-no 'elections': "Those who will not vote or will vote 'no' will be known, do not cheat yourselves" ["DR K plays leapfrog in Zambia", *The Star*, 4 November 1988, p.10]. How will they know? By magic and witchcraft, of course!

Teaching Assistant: Yes, Blacks Are Less Honest and Not Because of Poverty

One day while driving a young black teaching assistant to her village, I asked her whether blacks in South Africa were 'oppressed'. She said many of them seemed quite happy, but she wouldn't be because many were urbanized and had no land, which to her was unthinkable.

She admitted that Lesotho was not run very well – because it was run by blacks. I asked if there were differences in terms of honesty; yes, but only because of poverty.

We got to her place. They had a 'modern' concrete house, with windows and a metal roof; most houses were mud with thatched roofs. Inside, however, the living room floor was torn up. Oh, I said, the house isn't finished. No, she said; that's not it. It wasn't built properly and started to fall apart. The builder said he would fix it but absconded. And so we are fixing it ourselves.

Was the man so poor? Is that why he cheated you? No, she admitted; he was not. Do you think that a *white* would be *as likely* to do this? No, she agreed. Isn't this just the sort of thing which blacks typically do, which is why their businesses so rarely succeed? Yes, she agreed: blacks were different than whites; they were less honest, and not because of poverty. Why had she said otherwise? She looked sheepish. Was it because that was what she was expected to say, as an educated black who is supposed to 'defend' blacks? Something like that, she said.

We talked about whether blacks in South Africa wanted black rule. She said there were some who thought they should run their own country no matter how badly they might do it – that somehow it 'wouldn't be as bad', but I can't believe the majority would choose poverty and oppression just because it [came from blacks](#).

'Men Stronger Than Women' Means 'Every Man Stronger Than Every Women'

I had an interesting conversation with one of my Symbolic Logic students. He comes from an elite family; his father had been a high ranking civil servant and his brothers have gone to

universities in the U.S.. Did South African blacks want black rule? He thought they did. On further questioning, however, it turned out (as with the mine student) he meant the educated elite, not ordinary blacks.

He surprised me by saying that if blacks took over things would ‘deteriorate’ very quickly. But if he realized this, why wouldn’t South African blacks? They probably would, he said, but what they really wanted was an end to discrimination: not being allowed to enter certain restaurants [etc.](#)

Well, I said, whether or not this ‘petty apartheid’ could be justified, it was in fact changing – and pretty quickly. But then he surprised me even more: ‘On the other hand, white people may have good reason not to want blacks to use their facilities. They may think – with good reason – they will be spoiled’. Blacks simply do not take care of things. They only think about the present, not the future. ‘*They lack discipline.*’ (For my own ‘awakening’, years later, see [below.](#))

Was it racist to say whites were smarter than blacks – *on average*? Yes, it was very insulting. What would people at the University think? He said they would get very angry.

It turned out he didn’t fully grasp what it meant to say that one group was – on average – more this or that than another. Saying men were stronger than women, he thought, meant that every man was stronger than every woman. Eventually he understood that it only meant that for a given number, chances are there would be more strong men than women. Similarly, to say whites were on average smarter than blacks means only that if you took the same number of whites and blacks there would likely be more smart whites than blacks. If you had to choose between a white and a black manager knowing neither, it would be wise to choose the white; it was just a matter of probability and, he said, he would do the same himself. These things were not at all insulting and would cause no anger.

‘How Did You Know?’

‘I have only been here a few months’, I said to ‘Emma’, a black academic in Lesotho, ‘but I’d bet that people here are like this ...’, and I described certain traits, of which there were at least three: jealousy – envy of others’ success; inability to accept criticism; and looking down on others – class-consciousness. And she said ‘Yes! You are exactly right! How did you know?’. Well, I said, that’s how people are everywhere I’ve been in Africa and I was beginning to think I could safely extrapolate.

I brought up the question of black-white differences and she said, ‘You know, we [blacks] talk about this and we do wonder: why is it that we can’t do things whites do – make cars, TVs, computers, etc.? And why is it we can never *manage*? And yes, some of us wonder whether it isn’t just because the black man is less clever than the white man’. Very matter-of-fact: ‘We do think about it and we sometimes wonder’.

A Nigeria Story: Par For The Course!

Here is a tale related by an Indian (in Lesotho) who had taught high school in Nigeria from 1981 to 1988. A friend had his car stolen by three men who simply walked into his house and demanded the keys. A few months later they tried to sell it for ₦4,000 (about \$800). The dealer gave them ₦1,000 and told them to come back the next day, at which time they were arrested. All three were policemen. The victim (an Indian) identified them, after which a senior police official told him to leave the country immediately or he would be killed. When he went with another policeman to collect his car, sure enough, the policeman shot and killed him. This policeman, an associate of the thieves, was charged with murder and convicted, but the judge who convicted him was killed and the case 'dropped'.

Moral of the story? Par for the course!

In Johannesburg, Black Gangsterism and Intimidation the Norm

On a visit to South Africa (March 1988), the owner of a secondhand bookstore in Hillbrow mentioned that her black employee was unable to work the cash register, because she was terrorized into stealing for black hoodlums on pain of a beating or a house burning. Being honest she chose not to work the till. Many whites seem to know about this [gangsterism](#) which seems such a natural part of black urban culture, but you'll never read about it.

Then I had an chat with a guy working at a stationery store. Asked about conditions in Hillbrow, he said, 'I'm not a racist, but since there are so many blacks here, it's not such a nice place any more'. I noticed him looking in the direction of some black customers. 'Is it racist to watch blacks more than whites?' No, he agreed. Then why would it be racist to say that a place is no longer nice because there are so many blacks? Would anyone deny that the fewer thieves the better?

Hillbrow used to be the 'entertainment' area of Johannesburg, with sidewalk cafes, movie theatres, etc. When I visited in January 1986, it was vibrant, pleasant and safe – and white. In a few short years it has become black and dangerous. Whites are bewildered at how quickly this has happened.

PARALLELS BETWEEN SOUTH AFRICA AND THE MIDDLE EAST

How Weakness Breeds Contempt

In terms of psychological dynamics, I see important similarities between South Africa and the Middle East. From [The Counterlife](#), a 1987 novel by Philip Roth:

"We'll drive through the village You'll see how Arabs who want to can live in peace, side by side, only a couple of hundred yards away. They come up here and buy our eggs. [Our old] chickens ..., we sell to them for pennies. The army could move in here tomorrow, weed out the troublemakers, and the stone throwing would be over in five minutes. But they don't. They even throw stones at the soldiers. And

when the soldier does nothing, you know what the Arabs think? They think you are a shmuck – and you are a shmuck. Any place in the Middle East, you throw a stone at a soldier and ... [h]e shoots you. But suddenly they discover ... that you throw a stone at an Israeli soldier and he doesn't shoot you. He doesn't do anything. *And that's when the trouble begins. Not because we are cruel, but because they have found out we are weak. They don't respect niceness and they don't respect weakness. What the Arab respects is power.*" [Emphases added.]

And just so, blacks think whites are fools. Recall the (fictional) African leader hurling abuse at whites who respond by [applauding him](#). Of course blacks will think you're a shmuck – 'and you *are* a shmuck'!

Arabs in Israel live better than those in 'Palestine', economically *and* politically. Most know this, but because of Western propaganda, many 'convince' themselves otherwise. In South Africa, most blacks [don't want black rule](#), but Western propaganda will 'convince' them they do. In both cases it is a matter of mob hysteria, intimidation and liberal media influence.

Do Palestinians Want Arab Rule?

In the left-wing newspaper *The Guardian* (reprinted in the *Weekly Mail* [South Africa], 15-21 January 1988, p.14) is this statement: 'Despite the discrimination, Israel's Arab citizens enjoy a range of civil and political rights unknown in any sovereign Arab state'. More than a decade later, an item in the liberal *Washington Post* (reprinted in *The Star* [Johannesburg], 26 July 2000, p.16) titled "Many Palestinians living in dread of Arab rule", reveals that the attitude is: *Thanks, but no thanks*. Despite the supposed "hell" of Israel, it is still somehow "better than the paradise of Arafat":

We know Israeli rule stinks, but Palestinian rule would be worse. The Palestinian Authority is full of thieves. [M]ost said they would prefer to remain under Israeli control rather than risk the economic and political uncertainties of Arafat's [rule].

That so many in a typical Arab neighbourhood would prefer to remain under Israeli rule seems extraordinary, given the discrimination many say they suffer at the hands of the Jewish state.

But most spoke of the financial and social benefits of Israeli administration, and contrasted them with Arafat's record in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Many said they wanted no part of the Palestinians notoriously *corrupt administration, economic mismanagement and brutal police*. "I estimate that close to 70% of Arab residents want to remain under Israeli rule because of the economic benefits", said Fadal Tahubub, a member of the Palestinian National Council and resident of East Jerusalem. [My emphasis.]

I have since seen similar accounts – e.g., from [Daniel Pipes](#) and more recently [here](#).

How 'Guilt' Strengthens Your Adversaries

Excerpts from of an article in *The Jerusalem Post International Edition* (Week ending July 15, 1989, pp.11-12: "Between a Rock and a Hard Place") about Israeli settlers on the West Bank):

THE CHIEF security officer at Tekoa is a shepherd. ... [Miro Cohen] did not come ... for ideological reasons but [for] the possibility of pasturing a flock.

"I'm the only one here whose vehicle is never stoned even though they know I deal with security matters. I go into the Arab villages almost every day and visit their homes."

The Arab restraint [in his case] stems not from fear but from respect and need. For years, Miro has helped diagnose and treat animal diseases. ... "The Arabs feel we relate to them like garbage. Some of the people in the civil administration are from the lowest level in society. ... – they shout and curse at adults in front of their families." When Miro's own flock was stolen once, Bedouin from the area volunteered to search for it and found it

What led to the [1987] intifada? A steady lowering in the level of fear [of] Israel, in Miro's opinion. "It began with the Lebanese War when they saw ... that there were groups in Israel which opposed the government and supported [the Arabs on the West Bank]." [Likewise for] the Jibril exchange of more than 1,000 Arab prisoners for three Israelis. ...

Can Jews and Arabs live together peacefully? "With Arabs you have to *rule or be ruled*. Their society doesn't believe in equal status." [Emphasis added.]

Note the effects on Arabs of seeing that 'groups in Israel supported them', exactly like South African blacks seeing whites supporting the ANC, making them think, 'Well, if *they* think there should be Arab/black rule then maybe it's not such a bad idea [after all](#)'. The remark that Arabs must 'rule or be ruled' brings to mind Shiva Naipaul's observation: 'Let the white man have misgiving about his leadership, and the dark races will at once [attack him](#)'.

BLACK 'JUSTICE'

Black 'Evidence': Rumours, Whispers and Dreams

An editorial from the *Sowetan* (23 March 1988, p.4):

Another Victim Of Mob Justice

[Consider] the horrific murder of 67-year-old Mrs. Christina Mthimkulu, ... the latest victim of mob justice, ... carried out at the drop of a hat. Only yesterday it was five funeral undertakers killed because of a rumour circulating in Soweto. The other day it was a man executed ... because villagers believed he was *responsible for the lightning* that had killed a child. On another occasion it was Maki Skhosana burning

to death in front of television cameras simply because someone whispered that she was a police informer. ...

Ten to 15 people met to try Mrs. Mthimkulu on a charge of being a witch. *The only evidence was that someone had a dream in which she appeared as a witch.* ... One can only imagine the suffering she went through before she died: beaten up, dragged to a railway line to be run over by a train, then finally burnt to death. ... [Emphases added.]

Whatever its faults, mob justice usually involves things which, if true, would deserve punishment. In *these* cases, however, the accusations are utterly preposterous – such as someone causing lightning to strike another. And you couldn't find a better example of what is *not* evidence than appearing in a dream – not to mention, *as a witch!*

We Must Stop Passing The Buck'

A column by Joe Thloloe ("We Have To Stop Passing The Buck", *Sowetan*, 21 March 1988):

Aubrey Ntshikiwana Mageza was ... a mere 37 when he died last Friday. ... A senseless mob set upon him and his colleague ... in Soweto, stabbed them and then set them alight ...

Mr. Mageza was just one of the funeral undertakers who were killed in ..., all because [of] an *unfounded* rumour [about] a car that abducts children ...

How does anybody explain to [his] children that they are now without a father? Their father was a rare talent, a science graduate in a community where people who study science are very few [NB]. ...

... instead of com[ing] to grips with [what is happening], we continue to find the usual scapegoat, apartheid. ... *all respect for human life is gone.* Only the other day it was Maki Skhosana ruthlessly roasted in front of TV cameras. Who can forget that obscene image?

We continue to scream, demanding justice from white South Africa; we continue to protest against detention without trial; we continue demanding democracy. *But we also continue to deny ourselves these things.* And all of this turns our struggle for justice into a mockery. [Emphases in last section added.]

In other words, it is absurd for blacks to 'demand' democracy and justice, because whenever they acquire power they care about neither.

BLACKS AND WEALTH CREATION

Black Rule Means Instant Wealth

A businessman in [Namibia](#) found the same black man sitting in front of his store every day. What was he doing there? 'Oh, this is my store now', he said, and was simply waiting for

the white man to leave. Explanation? SWAPO (the local 'liberation' group) tells blacks that if they pay R50, then when SWAPO comes to power, this property will be theirs.

From *The Star* (18 April 1990, p.1: "Bogus ANC fund for domestics to 'buy' employers' homes"):

... Mr. Gordon Nixon ...[was] surprised ... to be told that his home no longer belonged to him.

"My wife and I went away for the weekend. When we returned yesterday, we found two well-dressed African gentlemen ... taking photographs. ... they had been paid R50 by my maid to take photographs. ...

"When I offered to introduce them to my shotgun ..., they just laughed and said soon all white homes would belong to the people and to the ANC". Mr. Nixon's domestic was dismissed on the spot ...

... When Mrs. Shirley Alston tried to sell her home, [h]er domestic, who had worked for her for 20 years, ... said she had been contributing to an ANC fund and the home belonged to her.

The same thing happened to a Cowies Hill resident and to a Westville couple. this type of incident had also been reported [in Johannesburg].

One reason some blacks may look forward black rule is their expectation of instant wealth, demonstrating their inability to grasp the nature of wealth creation. In spite of this, if you asked them what would happen if these factories, farms and businesses were taken over by blacks, most would say immediately that they would soon fall to rack and ruin.

A coloured woman (in September 1991) called *702 Radio* to say that prior to Nelson Mandela's release on Sunday, 2 February 1990, many blacks were expecting overnight wealth. On the Monday following, she said, blacks came into banks asking for 'their money'. Many believe this is how whites get their money: they go to a bank, which just hands it out! While this demonstrates ignorance and naivety, it's not necessarily stupid. After all, what do they *see*? Whites go into banks and are *given money*. Whites do all kinds of amazing things. Why not this? How are they to know that this money had to be deposited beforehand?

American Blacks Not That Different

And American blacks are not all that different. In [The Closest of Strangers](#) (1990), Jim Sleeper speaks of black demands that certain 'racist' Korean groceries '*be transferred to black ownership*' (p.208; my emphasis). Chutzpah aside, to them these businesses were simply fountains of wealth, divorced from hard work, discipline and self-sacrifice, and strikingly similar to [Cargo Cults](#): wealth is just sitting there waiting to be 'transferred', like the transfer of technology. But technology is like a living organism which, out of its natural context, will die like a fish out of water. Conversely, in an hospitable culture, such as Japan, it was not so much 'transferred' as absorbed. Machines can be transferred; ideas cannot

be. As the adage goes, *you can take a horse to water, but you can't make it drink*; you can present someone with an idea, but you can't make him digest it. What is 'due' Africa – and long since fulfilled – is that it be taken to the water; nothing and no one can make it drink.

Is America's Black 'Middle-Class' an Illusion?

I have long suspected that the so-called black American 'middle-class' was something of a fraud. My suspicions were confirmed by the insightful black writer Elizabeth Wright (*"Affirmative Action: It Will Never Be Enough"*, *Issues & Views*, Fall 1996):

Most of the black middle class suffer with the knowledge of their falsely achieved social status. Their distress is due to the terror of falling into the class below, a situation they fear is possible, if the plug is pulled on the endless array of affirmative action policies that helped them attain their artificial standing. ... For the most part, the incomes of middle class blacks are tied directly to the government sector, or indirectly tied to it through employment in non-profit organizations and academia.

Elections: 'To the Victor Belongs the Spoils'

The owner of a large bakery told me (in February 1994) me that his black workers think that if the ANC wins the forthcoming elections his bakery will belong to them. Blacks view 'elections' as some kind of war, invented by whites, but war nonetheless; and in a war to the victor belongs the spoils.

In war your goal is to kill the enemy. Consider events in Zimbabwe since 2000. Being a member of the 'opposition' makes you the 'enemy'. The utter indifference – indeed, the open sympathy – of South African leaders to the monstrously wicked behaviour on their doorstep should be a wakeup call. Mugabe, e.g., has repeatedly said that if those being attacked 'resist', then they will *really* be in trouble. It is hard to imagine a more morally repellent idea.

THE RISE OF BLACK 'ENTERPRISE'

White Rhetoric vs. Black Realism

In the *Sowetan* ("The hour has come, Black business men are told": 10 August 1988, p.6), Peter Wrighton, South African businessman, speaking to the black Chamber of Commerce, paints a rosy picture.

'... The ... rise of the South African Black Taxi Association is a perfect example of what can be achieved. ... It is now time for you to step out of the shadow of paternalism and take your rightful place in the economy.

It is my earnest wish that a black man, on merit, will [one day] take my job Black entrepreneurs have hungrily taken advantage of opportunities that have emerged ... thousands of carpenters, metal workers, dressmakers, upholsterers and other ...

independent manufacturers have staked their claim to a place in the sun. ... Ladies and gentlemen, the future has already begun ... the process has started towards the society we are striving for. ...'

On the very next page ("We're Leaving Our Townships To Rot", p.7), an article by Sam Mabe:

THERE are a few things that give me reason to lament the future of our townships.

[It seemed that] the 1976 unrest ... [would] usher in a new kind of life

But in the last two years, the situation has changed for the worse. Our townships are decaying. ... we are watching this decay and are doing nothing about it. If you ... drive around Diepkloof ... you would come across a spillage of sewage in the streets ...

... our streets are getting narrower and narrower Residents empty their dustbins across the road and the rubbish has been piling up and falling into the street. ...

Residents ... are aware of the dangers ... but do not seem to be bothered. Our dogs and cats get knocked down by motorcars and we just leave them rotting

I wonder how many of us expect the Government to take us seriously when we cannot take ourselves seriously? if [our people] want to lead a good life, they must learn to create it. ...

Bleeding hearts like Peter Wrighton and the 'ashamed' [Mr. Zimmerman](#), please take note!

The Three Businesses that Flourish in Africa

In every black country in which I have lived, there are three types of businesses seem to flourish: small transport, hairdressing and alcohol; and this appears true in South Africa. All three meet demands that are constant and virtually inexhaustible, so that even with a poor product you're likely to stay in business; further, they are usually one-man operations not requiring much cooperation and organization. I heard an interview (17 September 1990) on the "World Service" of WCSM (the short-wave station of the *Christian Science Monitor*) in which a black American civil rights leader bemoaned the fact that (American) blacks engaged in almost no manufacturing '*except for a few hair care products*'.

Peter Wrighton's euphoria may have been a bit premature. 'Various recent reports have suggested that the black taxi industry is in a state of collapse and... was "fast moving to demise"' ("Plea for slice of pie before wheels fall off" [*The Star*, 30 January 1993, p.11], by Colleen McCaul). A few days later: "The black taxi industry, once regarded as a small-business miracle, is in chaos" ("Greed, red tape drown taximen", by Joe Louw [*The Star*, 7 February 1993, p.3]).

NEW YORK TIMES LIBERAL LOOKS AT SOUTH AFRICA

Two-Cents Worth from Bishop Tutu: The 'Nightmare' of South Africa

I have been reading [Move Your Shadow](#) (1987), by Joseph Lelyveld of the *New York Times*; he was expelled from South Africa in 1966, and returned in 1980.

Blurbs: 'I hope to goodness that many will read this book. ... I know much of what Lelyveld describes and yet it was a nightmarish experience to have it all documented with so much insight and perspicacity'. – *Bishop Desmond M. Tutu*. 'Of late, it has been difficult to refuse sympathy to the whites of that tormented land, who have nowhere to go and cannot bear to see all that they have achieved destroyed. Such sympathy is unlikely to survive a reading of Mr. Lelyveld's book.' – *Bernard Levin, Observer*. In other words, an unremitting diatribe.

Inexcusable Behaviour Under Apartheid Does Not Answer Question of Who Is To Rule

That there were many injustices under apartheid is not to be denied. White cops beating up blacks just for the hell of it (pp.22-23), forced relocations, the 'removal' of District Six, 'a teeming, predominantly colored neighborhood' in the heart of Cape Town (p.27), job reservation, benefitting whites over more able blacks – the list would be long. But none of this means that white-domination was inherently evil, and there is considerable evidence to the contrary.

Go Figure – 'Oppressed' Black Man Brings Son to His 'Oppressor' for Discipline!

A conversation with an Afrikaner farmer (p.51; my emphasis):

It was one of those encounters where an opportunistic reporter represses a shudder of embarrassment and sympathy for his prey, knowing that the words so earnestly expended ... are bound to make exactly the opposite impression from the one intended. "It's very good to have black people like that", van der Linde said, referring to a loyal black worker. "You meet white people who don't have the same quality. Of course, every now and then Sam will get cheeky or something." [I asked] him what he does [then] "It's very like the way you treat your own children. You don't want to be too tough, but if you're not firm, you won't have your farm long. I have to clout one every now and then in the stable." ... he told me how black fathers with unruly sons sometimes asked him to cane them, how the discipline he provided was necessary to contain the ever-present danger of cattle theft.

Did Lelyveld wonder why they bring their sons to *him* for discipline? Does he think they felt 'oppressed'? Is it possible that they liked the white farmer – precisely *because* he disciplined them? *Did he ever ask them to find out?*

'In the real world, Afrikaners who make an effort to speak to blacks are rare specimens' (p.70). True enough, but Lelyveld himself does no better. He talks to blacks who complain bitterly about the system, but he never asks them: *So would you like to see blacks running everything – the hospitals, the schools, the police?*

If Bribery Is 'Part of Black Culture', Then It Must Be Part of White Culture Too!

He visits an employment center in Durban (p.102).

... Supposedly workers were chosen on the basis of their qualification ... and how long they had been waiting. I asked a white official if there wasn't an inevitable temptation of bribery in such circumstances. The question did not make him defensive. "It happens in every line of work", he said "You wouldn't understand it, but it's part of their culture. When you go to see your chief to get a ruling, you must give him a lamb or a goat. They say, 'You must open the chief's mouth'." If the black functionary who picked the candidates for a job had his eyes opened in this manner with cash, I wondered, was he expected to give a cut to white officials out of respect for their grasp of his traditions? ... I would have been stretching my luck to ask that question. I could not have expected a candid answer, but I thought I knew what it might be.

He accepts that bribery is a part of black culture, but he cannot admit something bad about blacks and so must 'explain' it. *Ergo*: whites do it as well and so are in no position to criticize blacks!

Liberal 'Explanations' for Black Failure

He talks with an Afrikaner professor of sociology, Franz Maritz (pp.60-61):

Blacks weren't really interested in freedom "and all that sort of thing", [he] said, but in economic advancement; if whites could help them gain that much, then violent pressures for [other] changes ... might be deferred. The issue thus became how the whites could overcome the passivity of blacks, which was inhibiting their advance. Professor Maritz was obviously a man of decency; of courage, too, considering his willingness to testify on behalf of three young "terrorists". He did not deserve to be glibly judged. But like many Afrikaner intellectuals of apparent good will, he seemed unable to hear how ... patronizing he sounded The concept of black passivity was so central to his understanding ... that he could not seriously consider the possibility that young blacks who went into exile, received military training there, and then returned to their country on dangerous, practically suicidal missions may act ... with deliberation and commitment; or that black adaptation to free-market economics ... [faced] severe legal restraints on ... initiative[,] the search of a job, setting up of a business ...; or that, from a black perspective, the problem was the cultural attitudes

of whites, which ... [assumed] that black advancement was possible only under white tutelage. ...

First he grants Maritz 'decency' and 'courage', and so will not judge him 'glibly' – which is precisely what he proceeds to do! The professor didn't realize he was 'patronizing'. Why doesn't Lelyveld *ask*: Is Mr. Maritz's saying you are 'passive' and lack initiative patronizing? Is it insulting? Indeed, is it true? Armed with the wholly unquestioned assumption that blacks would find such questions 'offensive', he is unlikely to discover that he is simply wrong.

Maritz 'could not consider' that black failure was due to 'severe restraints on initiative'. This must also be why 'independent' black Africa is 'backward' and why American – and Brazilian – and British – and Cuban – and Haitian – and Fijian blacks lag behind. In fact, *he* is the one unwilling to contravene taboos which preclude the possibility that these failures are due to differences in ability and character, so that we remain hoodwinked by the lelyvelds and 'angry' blacks into insisting that they *can't* exist and how dare you suggest otherwise! (In fact, many elite *blacks* don't accept these [taboos](#).)

In the words of the black American writer Shelby Steele ("The Recoloring of Campus Life", *Harper's Magazine*, February 1989, p.55; my emphasis):

University administrators have too often been afraid of their own guilt and have relied on negotiation and capitulation more to appease that guilt than to help blacks. ... [Hence they] *have not really done much for blacks*.

Contrast Between White and Black Africa

At last, a glimpse of reality (pp.182-184):

... I met at an impoverished settlement in Transkei a handsome youth named Bayanda Majole Majole, who was eighteen, wanted to join the police; not Transkei's homeland police ... but the South African police. ... "I'm a strict person, and believe in enforcing rule", he said. "I also want to be able to protect myself."

Growing up in Transkei ... had disillusioned him with the whole idea of black rule. ... The only black government he knew was corrupt and predatory, so ... he said he was not interested in freedom and independence. *It would be better for blacks, he felt sure, if whites ruled the whole of South Africa.*

"The black man must be the most unfortunate creature in the world", Bayanda Majole said.

"Why?" I asked.

"He doesn't think; he doesn't use his brainpower."

"Is that true of you?"

"In varying degrees."

The hillside on which we were standing offered a startling visual example of the deprivation that the South African system seeks to legitimize, On the white side of the river, [was] a homestead and a few farm buildings, many trees, extensive pastures, and terraced cabbage plots, ... irrigated by water pumped from the river. On the black side there were several hundred houses, mostly round and thatched, ... hardly any trees, hardly any grass, erosion out of control, no water pumps, and not even a single tap. Bayanda Majole had this contrast impressed on his mind every day ..., and it made him angry at his own people, rather than ... the other side

... As [Bayanda] saw it, you either sided with the blacks or the whites, and life in independent Transkei had settled that question for him. He was proud, consciously hurt in his pride, but inoculated, it seemed, against slogans about "black pride". ... It was not my place to argue with this young man, and I didn't feel inclined to do so. ... He seemed to be a logical person and a logical outcome of the homeland system, an example, therefore, of what could be described as its success. This ... was what the homelands were all about, showing that, properly channeled, black anger could be turned against black anger.

His first – and only – such conversation, and he would have you think that such individuals were extremely rare. But I would like to tell this smug American that if he had asked ordinary blacks, *Would you like to see blacks running South Africa?*, he would have found the majority thought as Bayanda Majole.

Whites Created 'Homelands' For the *Purpose* of Disillusioning Blacks Against Black Rule!

'Growing up in Transkei had disillusioned him about black rule'; in other words, Majole felt this way because the only black government he knew was deliberately made so by whites! The contrast between the two sides of the river makes Majole 'angry at his own people'. Lelyveld can't understand this because he can't imagine – what Majole takes for granted – that their situation is not the white man's fault but rather due to blacks' own inadequacies. But for Lelyveld everything that goes into his brain comes out the same: it is the fault of whites – and usually by design.

Thus his remarkable conclusion that the whites planned the homelands with the express purpose that blacks would turn against black rule! Perhaps they were also responsible the leaders in the rest of Africa? However absurd this 'explanation', it does indicate that Lelyveld, in spite of himself, *is* aware of black disquiet at the prospect of black rule.

Lelyveld attempts to trap Majole by asking if he is one of those who fail to use his 'brainpower', to which a good answer would have been, 'I didn't say that *no* blacks use their brains, but that too few do, and I happen be one who does'. Expecting such 'subtlety' from him may be too much; but from a 'chosen' writer for the *New York Times*?

Why Aren't Blacks Angrier?

Beginning of Ch. 7 (p.185):

Black anger isn't only a problem for authorities to divert into storage tanks – homelands, hostels, and jails – or subject to an alchemy that leaves the ashen residue of self-contempt. It's a problem for anyone who wonders why there isn't more of it, why it doesn't boil over, why, finally, the system survives.

Lelyveld is so puzzled by this lack of black anger that he can only attribute it to some almost magical 'alchemy'. In fact, there simply isn't all the anger he thinks there should be. What there is of it is a creation of lelyveld-liberals who, insisting it *must* exist, 'convince' many blacks that they are 'oppressed' and so *should* be 'angry' – 'if the white man says we are oppressed and angry, well then, we *will* be oppressed and we *will* be [angry!](#)' – and by these same blacks picking up on white guilt and their resulting status as 'victims'.

If you ask the very different question, Why are blacks content to be *ruled* by whites? – which is not the same as being oppressed by them – the answer is simple: They recognize that whites are more capable of running things and will treat them better – and hence that they are better off with whites in charge.

Willful Blindness

At the end of Ch. 8 (pp.246-248), there is a revealing example of willful blindness. He goes to a 'black and brown' ballroom dancing contest.

... The dress was formal The judges [Trevor and Mandy] were white, ... [as they] demonstrated their expertise. ... [their] intensity was transmuted into English hauteur No connoisseur ..., I found their sudden chin thrusts and sideways stares comical. But there were "oohs" and "ahs" from a group of Zululand nurses and teachers "Thank you", said Trevor, ... gently patting his perfectly unmussed hair, "I know that you people enjoy the tango from the applause you give your own couples when they dance". You people, your own couples. In white ties and sequined gowns, they still didn't come close to making it in his eyes ...

... [After two in the morning] "I would like to say that the standard has improved enormously" [Trevor] said, pronouncing his verdict from on high. "Just keep working on your basics, and I hope to see another improvement next year."

... The tone was of a man who has done his duty. There was no hint that he might have enjoyed himself for a moment. But Steward Dephoko, ... who had just taken the prize in advanced Latin dancing with his partner ... didn't hear the condescension I thought I heard. His own performance had been full of fun and verve and daring gymnastics; I thought he could teach Trevor. But the new champion had danced in a multiracial competition at the Carlton Hotel in Johannesburg, where he had come in only fourth. "I was no match for the white guy", he acknowledged. So he was not

offended by what Trevor had said or the way he had said it. “If he tells me to work on the basics”, Steward Dephoko said, “that’s exactly what I’m going to do.”

Lelyveld is incapable of the slightest insight here – that the black man likes the white man, looks up to, admires and wants to be like him, including his ‘middle-class’ values. Instead, he sees insults where none exist, either intended or received, and in the end, remains puzzled and mystified. A perfect example of doctrinaire liberals who can’t see racial reality even when it stares them in the face.

Example of *Genuine Racism*

In James Michener’s novel [Texas](#) (1985, pp.951-952), set in the 19th century American West, there is an incident in which black troops are attacked by Indians; the blacks fight well and courageously.

When Reed [a white man in charge of the rescuing troops] learned that Toomey had died he went to where the body lay, drew aside the blanket, and saluted: ‘He died bravely, I’m sure’.

‘That he did’, one of the carters said, ‘but I’m bringing charges against them damned niggers. They let us down.’

Reed did not listen, and a few moments later one of the shotgun men came to him: ‘That big [black] sergeant, none braver. He held us together.’

‘I’d expect him to’, Reed said.

In other words, the carter sees the blacks fought well, but out of racial animus lies and says just the opposite – and as if that isn’t enough, will take action *against* them (no doubt to convince himself of his own lies). As a genuine racist, he can see nothing good about blacks, just as an apologist can see nothing bad.

Afrikaners’ Years of Experience Given Short Shrift

On pp.256-257, a conversation with Valerie du Plessis, an Afrikaner farmer’s wife (emphasis added):

... she was trying to explain the place of whites. Her point ... was that it was natural, not imposed. Someone has to think. Someone has to lead. Who else ... could do it? The blacks depend on the whites. That folk belief [says Lelyveld] ... is the armature around which all the fancy ... arguments get wrapped. ...

“You always give; they always receive” ... “That’s how we know them.”

The social order is founded on this one-way flow, not of material benefits, *obviously*, but of authority and foresight. Mrs. du Plessis would have caught the essence of this folk belief had she said, “That’s how we want to know them”.

This description of the ‘racial order’ as ‘natural, not imposed’, is perfectly reasonable; it is, e.g., the relation between blacks and Asians in East Africa and Fiji. In spite of considerable

evidence, Lelyveld is unwilling to consider the possibility that when put together, whites will inevitably 'dominate' blacks. Instead of seeing it for what it is – this woman's distillation of a lifetime's experience – Lelyveld can only see it as dishonest: 'That's how we know them' becomes 'how we *want* to know them'.

Transfer of Wealth from Whites to Blacks

His remark that 'obviously' there have been no 'material benefits' is just another baseless assumption. There *is* such a flow, from the building of schools, hospitals and housing to individual whites' paternalism. The following is from [South Africa: The Solution](#) (p.96):

In the course of this country's history, a staggering amount of wealth has been transferred from whites to blacks. ...

... at least 75% of national tax is paid by the whites and probably more. Whites pay about 90% of income tax and an even higher percentage of company tax. Much of this money pays for black socialism and apartheid. Whites pay for black housing, transport and schools

The authors are in fact critical of such expenditures, but are simply stating facts. And so again, Lelyveld's blithely made assumption is flatly false, indicating his ignorance and anti-white prejudice.

Thoughts on Natural Dominance From the Prime Minister of Malaysia

Apropos 'natural dominance', consider Malaysia, with its large and economically dominant Chinese population. I would have assumed the presence of Western-type racial sensitivity, but as I have since discovered, this was far from true, at least in 1970. In his book, [More Like Us](#) (1990), James Fallows reveals that

The prime minister of Malaysia, Mahatir bin Mohamad, first came to prominence ... with a broadside arguing that Chinese Malaysians were better businessmen than the ethnic Malays because they were *racially superior* [emphasis added]. Mahatir said that centuries of famine and flood in China had produced a race of hardy survivors, whereas the Malays had been weakened by a life that was too abundant. Mahatir, it should be stressed, was speaking as the *Malay's* champion; he said all this to justify a sweeping program of pro-Malay affirmative action, which has been in effect since the end of the 1960s [p.20]. [Fallow's reference is to [The Malay Dilemma](#), by Mahatir bin Muhamad (1970), pp.21, 25, 85.]

This illustrates an extraordinary change in political climate. The public espousal of such views, *by a leading member of the 'inferior' race*, is today (2005) inconceivable. But Fallows will have none of it. 'In fact, no such racial theorizing is necessary, since there are more obvious and straightforward explanations Chinese parents raise their children to compete and excel [Why *is* that?]; Malay parents emphasize such values as gentleness, restraint, obedience to Islam [Why is *that*?]. ... All these factors make for Chinese business

success, and they have nothing to do with the racial analysis on which the recent Malaysian politics have turned' (pp.20-21). Yea, yea, yea. And I have a bridge I wanna sell you!

Acknowledging Things 'No Self-Respecting Blacks Can Acknowledge'

Finally, here is Lelyveld on p.354, talking about the problems of a soaring black population (my emphasis):

... [T]he question of black rights and how these can be reconciled with white power [is] a question *no self-respecting black can acknowledge, no matter how conservative he is ..., except as an aspect of white pathology.*

Wake Up and Smell the Coffee!

Well, Mr. Lelyveld, here are just a few examples of blacks – academics and students – who have no problem with these ideas: '[Emma](#)', the Teaching Assistant; my [Symbolic Logic](#) student; the [student](#) who'd worked in the [mines](#); [Aborisade](#); the South African students who [say what I say](#); not to mention that in Papua New Guinea an entire class of twelve students said without hesitation that whites were cleverer than blacks. And finally, from the horse's mouth, the response from black academics in Africa and the U.S. who found my views '[very appealing](#)'. To the lelyvelds of this world I say: *wake up and smell the coffee!*

He continues:

... white Cabinet ministers [talk about forthcoming] drastic demographic changes ... as an argument for the perpetuation of white dominance. ... [South Africa] ... would return to the African bush under black rule, The proof of black inadequacy to govern ... is in the rest of Africa Ergo, as the transport minister, an amiable bigot named Hendrik Schoeman, tactlessly put it, "In this country four million whites must think and plan for twenty-five million people. It is a question of the protection of the minority with whom the brain power lies". South Africa can reform, but reform must come from the top and only on the initiative of those with brainpower. [I know of one [black lawyer](#) who would agree.] The whites represent order; the blacks, chaos. ... many in South Africa ... imagine themselves to be saying something new and urgent ... when actually they are giving voice to their own tribal ethos, their most primitive chant.

Bedrock Issue Skirted

That these observations about Africa are not 'new' is just as much evidence for their truth as for their falsity. His remark about '[self-respecting blacks](#)' confirms my suspicion that he's so *a priori* cocksure about what blacks think that he feels no need to *ask* them. It's taken as a given, never to be questioned and hence never to be refuted.

Leaving Your Baggage At Home

My advice to Lelyveld? Spend some time with ordinary, nonwesternized, blacks. Ask them what they would think of a country with 20 million blacks and five million whites where there was plenty of food, water and electricity; where manufactured goods were plentiful; where police didn't routinely harass black women; where it was common for blacks to have telephones and refrigerators and cars; where schools had books and hospitals medicines; where whites, responsible for all of this, had even better schools and hospitals, where blacks could only live in black areas, and where only whites could vote for the (white) government. Any bets on what they'll say? And don't *assume* they're 'touchy' about race; take the trouble to ask them and find out! But this time leave behind some of your ideological baggage. *Maybe* you will smell the coffee.

PART III: BLOEMFONTEIN

BLACK NURSING CARE

Black Nurses Get Angry When Someone Helps Their Patients

In April 1988 an SADF (South African Defence Force) doctor told me that in black hospitals the nursing staff was virtually all black. While white nurses would fight to get better care for patients – e.g., if a drip was applied uncomfortably, they would quarrel with the doctors – black nurses were just the opposite: they would quarrel with anyone trying to make things [better](#). If someone changed wet sheets without asking, she would get angry because they were ‘invading her territory’, ‘challenging her authority’, and most of all, making her look bad. He remarked several times that black nurses have no [sympathy](#) for their patients.

None of this surprises me – though what does, a bit, is why there isn’t white supervision. I guess it’s another indication of how blacks are getting the upper hand [in 1988]. If they brought in white matrons, the blacks nurses would scream bloody murder, because they wouldn’t be able to [steal](#) (as this doctor said they were) and because it would be an encroachment on their ‘fiefdoms’.

He related an incident in which a doctor handled an emergency without telling the black matron. She refused to help because she’d not been ‘properly notified’. (Black musicians exhibit [similar behaviour](#).) When the (white) doctor said, ‘Shit, nurse, can’t you see this is an emergency!’, she accused him of calling her a ‘shit nurse’ and there was a big to-do – crap which couldn’t have happened a few years ago. It also illustrates the baleful influence of liberalism: for white administrators to allow white supervisors implies blacks are less than satisfactory – and that’s ‘racist’! And the first to scream? Your bleeding-heart whites. (Shades of the [GMS](#)?)

“Patients Die As Nurses Steal Drips To Sell On The Street”

In 1989 an elderly white woman told me that the black nurses in Johannesburg General Hospital (the huge white hospital here) were ‘very caring’. Note, however, that these nurses were (1) newly working in a white hospital and so would be on their best behaviour; (2) were under white supervision; and (3) were caring for white patients.

Let these nurses become ‘confident’ of their position, so that they’re no longer on their best behaviour, let them work under black supervision, so that they no longer fear discipline (under a matron who will herself ill treat patients and steal), and finally, let them be dealing with [black patients](#), so that they have someone upon whom to look down, and then, aside from exceptional cases, you are likely to get a quite different result. (See [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#).) This headline in the *Sunday Times* (13 June 1993, p.9), about a cholera epidemic in Luanda (Angola), says it all: “Patients die as nurses steal drips to sell on the street”.

Immigrant Doctors Deny Racial Differences; A Few Years Later: Modern Medicine Is ‘Alien’ to Africans

I talked with two Russian doctors (*circa* early 1990s) having extensive experience at Baragwanath Hospital (a huge black hospital next to Soweto with still mostly white doctors). Their reports about the (black) nurses are consistently negative, though both disputed my claims about racial differences.

A few years later I spoke to one of these doctors again and his outlook had markedly altered. He said conditions had deteriorated dramatically, partly because it was impossible to discipline the black staff. Theft – and cockroaches – were rife. A black patient had said to him that ‘Blacks don’t care about other blacks!’, and he said he would no longer challenge my view about differences in character and ability. Modern medicine, he said, was basically ‘alien’ to Africans and they will never really learn to cope with it. Besides their disinclination to help other blacks, black nurses, he said, were simply lazy.

Around the same time, I spoke with a white nurse-in-training. Others were bemoaning black nurses’ behaviour; even with white supervision, they were useless, ‘sitting around at the end of the hall [gossiping](#)’. ‘Is that your experience?’ Yes, she said, sadly. ‘Why don’t the whites exercise some control?’ Well, they are effectively barred from firing black nurses, and without that deterrent, it is difficult to discipline them. Just more evidence of the loss of white authority and of the chaos and disorder which follows. (I say this having in mind a recent item – 21 May 1992 or thereabouts – on the *BBC*’s “Network Africa” about the utter shambles of the Nigerian railway system.)

Nurses Refuse to Dress Wound or Provide Bed Pan

In March 1993 I had occasion to visit a badly injured black woman in Hillbrow Hospital, previously white but now black in what was until recently a white area. The nursing staff was entirely black, the doctors predominantly white. Anna (the patient) was incredibly stoical – with broken ankles, a thigh, pelvis and wrists. But even she complained that in spite of the doctor instructing the nurses to dress her septic wound every day, they simply didn’t do it; though told that she was not to get out of bed, when she asked for a bed pan, it was ‘Oh, you go yourself!’.

Adversarial Nursing

I was hesitant to intervene, fearing I might make things worse, but I did, and was immediately struck by the adversarial stance of the nurses – towards the patients and anyone ‘on their side’. Above all, I was struck by the detailed similarity between their behaviour and that of [Nigerian nurses](#). For what it’s worth, though Anna was subsequently subjected to even worse verbal abuse, they did dress her wound and did bring her a bedpan!

A LIBERTARIAN PERSPECTIVE ON SOUTH AFRICA

Lack of Economic Freedom Reason for African Poverty

I am reading [South Africa: The Solution](#), by Leon Louw and Frances Kendall (1986). In the nineteenth century, he says, blacks were successful farmers; but this ended after 1870 because it interfered with cheap labour for white farmers and the mining industry – and (he says) because whites farmers couldn't compete.

But Louw's discussion of black enterprise is unconvincing.

Many people believe that, by nature, blacks are not achievement oriented. There are even studies that "prove" that blacks have low [motivational](#) and aspirational levels. ... There is considerable evidence to the contrary. ... Black African countries are not impoverished because blacks run them, but because their economic policies are wrong. Most black South Africans are not frustrated simply because whites rule them, but because they suffer under bureaucracy, red tape, over-regulation and officialdom. The real problem is not the colour of the people who control the machine, but the nature of the machine' (pp.64-65).

He cites Botswana and Malawi as countries with high growth rates; but growth rates depend on where you start: if you earn \$10 a month and go up to \$20, that's growth of 100%, and yet you may still be dirt poor.

He may be right about why (e.g.) Tanzania has been worse off than Kenya or Ivory Coast, but that doesn't mean blacks in the Kenya, where I lived and worked for five years, show much enterprise. There is almost no research conducted by blacks, no substantial black manufacturing, and the education and health care sectors are in obvious decline. Nor is there much enterprise in the private sector, due to lack of ability and the traits which seem to predominate: deceit, treachery, untrustworthiness, mutual distrust and [suspicion](#).

African 'Successes'

Kenya

Still, by comparison, Kenya 'works'. (At least it did until the chaos following the December 2007 'elections'.) Surely the dictum '*everything is relative*' applies here. Kenya may have been a paradise compared to Nigeria, but pales in comparison to South Africa – itself no paragon. In addition to overseas aid, there are about 100,000 Asians, whose domination of the business sector is a constant source of tension. What would Kenya be like without the [Asians](#)? Look at [Uganda](#).

Ivory Coast

Ivory Coast, on the other hand, has been virtually an economic satellite of France (*International Herald Tribune*, 15 September 1986, p.6):

**Prosperity In Ivory Coast Is Linked To Ties With France,
But Some Lament The Cost**

by Blaine Harden, Washington Post Service

ABIDJAN Ivory Coast – In the gleaming supermarkets ..., beef imported from France is sold as “beef”. Meat produced here is apologetically [called] “local beef”.

The streets of Abidjan are named for French colonial administrators. There is a street for every French president since Charles de Gaulle, a street has been fashioned after the Champs-Elysees No street is named after an African leader. ...

Over the past quarter century, this nation of 10 million people has been trumpeted as an “African success story”. It has enjoyed one of the world’s highest rates of economic growth. It now leads the world in cocoa production and is the third-largest coffee producer

The highways are smooth and wide, the telephones work, the currency is sound and the stores are full of [things] one rarely sees in Africa. ... there is less official corruption than anywhere else in Black Africa. ...

While beggared countries on its borders struggle to revive economies ruined by inept governments and military coups, the Ivory Coast is politically stable, attractive to foreign investors and far too rich to qualify for handouts from such donors as the U.S. Agency for International Development. ...

There are about 35,000 French nationals in Ivory Coast, more than three times as many as at independence in 1960 The French run or help to run nearly all the important industries. Resident Frenchmen advise the president and most of his key administrators. ...

A senior official at the Ministry of Information... explained[:] “Houphouet-Boigny long ago struck a deal with the French which accorded them priority treatment as investors, assured them of immunity from the threat of nationalizations”, and gave the[m] “the untrammled recreation of the French life-style here”. ...

... French businessmen can, with no restrictions, send their profits home to France. ... the French government guarantees the value of the Ivorian currency ... French businessmen are guaranteed that their profits are convertible to hard currency. The Ivory Coast, with French-backed currency and French technical advice, has grown far faster than [its] neighbors...

Mr. Houphouet-Boigny, 80 ... makes no apologies for the French economic role. Neither does he apologize for the military support provided by French soldiers stationed outside Abidjan. “We have no complexes about this”, [he] has said. ...

Expatriate business leaders and Western diplomats ... say the country is calm not ... because the government consistently has helped trigger widespread farm-based growth. “The reason things are quiet here is that too many people see that things work in the Ivory Coast”, said one Western businessman “They have seen the mess their neighbors have made in the name of independence”, he said. ... [All emphases added.]

What Thwarts Black Enterprise?

Ivory Coast, therefore, offers no support for Louw's claim that lack of economic freedom *per se* explains black failure. To the extent that was a hindrance (which is debatable, since it didn't stop the Asians), contrary evidence is abundant – from black Africa, America, Britain, Brazil, Haiti, Fiji, Papua New Guinea – where there were no legal restrictions and yet in none of which has black enterprise blossomed. Could Louw point to a single black country which prospers without 'assistance'? I don't think so because I don't think there is one. The chaos following Houphouet-Boigny's death in 1993 indicates that Ivory Coast's success was due to such help plus a strong, no-nonsense leader.

Idi Amin's Social Science Experiment

In the 1960s, after independence, Afro-pessimists were rebutted by the example of Uganda. Why, many wondered, is it so prosperous? Is it because of the Asians? What would happen if they were removed? The world found out when Idi Amin expelled them in the early 70s – and the country promptly collapsed.

Now they want them back. From *Time* (19 April 1993, p.46):

“[The return of the Asians is] a good thing”, says Wafulu Oguttu, editor of the *Monitor*, a weekly. “[They] have expertise in commerce. They work hard. Ugandans had their chance, and they did not manage well” ...

Nigeria, Land Where *Nothing Works*

Re 'everything is relative', here is a piece from *The Star* (““South Africa is a country that works””, 14 July 1999, p.13) by a Nigerian journalist visiting South Africa. This headline may strike many here as ludicrous, because they are comparing things to twenty years ago; but compared – *now* – to *Nigeria*, South Africa is indeed seventh heaven and he spells out in no uncertain detail why.

One photo shows a long line of cars with drivers sleeping. Explanation? It can take two days to get petrol in oil-rich Nigeria. Foreign oil companies are there to extract oil, not to refine it, and Nigeria's refineries are *kaput*. In a second picture a smartly dressed South African attendant salutes his customer, where getting petrol takes minutes. Nearly every aspect of life in Johannesburg drives home to any African (as the author says) 'respect for the white settlers who built the country'. If South Africa is country that 'works', Nigeria is a country that *doesn't*.

A Pollyannaish View of Africa

Louw raises the spectre of black Africa (pp.168-169) with their 'socialist dictatorships and one-party states ... [and says that] there, but for white control, go they – into the abyss of poverty and mismanagement'. But 'South African blacks are more sophisticated, better educated and have higher living standards than the vast majority in the rest of Africa'.

Better educated? Higher living standards? Yes. But who is responsible for that? More sophisticated? Perhaps Louw should reflect on the brutal '[necklacings](#)' and people burnt alive because someone *dreamt* they were a witch, while men are killed on suspicion of using children in [magic rituals](#). Sorry, but the whole thing just doesn't wash.

BLACK SEXUALITY

Absence of Public Display of Affection, in Africa *and* America

In all my years in black Africa I never once saw a public display of affection. Africans, I believe, generally do not have the Western notion of '[romance](#)'; relations between men and women are very 'matter of fact' and you rarely see men 'ogling' women. In South Africa, however, you often see couples holding hands (etc.), and I have no doubt whatsoever that they are simply aping the white man. Quite remarkably, I find this in [The Burden of Brown](#) (1984; p.243): '*Black [American high school] students did not hug and kiss in public, and sometimes complained when whites did so*' (my emphases). (For another startling congruence, see [here](#).)

Unproblematic Male Dominance

The following (from Nigeria) is indicative. One afternoon, waiting in a tailor's shack to collect something, I spotted an attractive woman, an 'apprentice'. I suggested that instead of my waiting she bring the things to my place.

She came, that day and regularly thereafter. One day, musing on our 'relationship', I asked her why she came. She looked puzzled. 'Do you like me?', she asked. 'Of course', I said. 'Well ...?' she said, shrugging her shoulders, as if to say: What more needs to be said?. I liked her and that was that, illustrating not only an African attitude towards sexuality but also the prevailing male-female relationship: one of unquestioned – but equally unproblematic – male dominance.

Heightened Libido

'The Most Disgusting Experience'

A white medical doctor related her experience at the STD clinic in Baragwanath Hospital near Soweto. In one day she saw seven black patients. It was the 'most disgusting experience' she'd ever had. Though 'dripping with pus', they all had huge erections. I have been examined by female doctors and the idea of having an erection under such circumstances is mind-boggling; add to this that they were diseased and it's quite astounding. Perhaps the observation that in a nudist colony men do not walk around with erections would be disproved by blacks!

'Use a Condom – But Not For More Than Two Hours'

Two white male doctors tell me that the commonest complaint of black men is a 'low battery' – i.e., impotence. Meaning – for men in their forties – being able to have sex only three times a night! A 17-year-old black girl, asked about preventing AIDS, says: 'I won't get it if I ask my boyfriend to use a condom – but not for more than two hours, because a condom is not that strong' (*The Star*, 28 June 2000, p.3, "What The Youth Say").

The Mistake of Appealing To Blacks

Another item from *The Star* (2 February 1999, p.1, "'Rescuers' attack survivor") tells of an incident in which a 57-year-old white woman's husband drowns and she barely makes it ashore. In her bedraggled state of desperation, she appeals to the first people she sees – three young black men – who promptly attempt to rape her and when that proves too difficult, batter her with a brick and leave her for dead.

All of which leads me to think that many black men must go around with a raging, uncontrollable and totally indiscriminate libido such that almost any woman, under almost any circumstances, will do, the more helpless the better. It also supports Philippe Rushton, who cites studies finding that black (American) college students have 19% higher levels of testosterone than whites ([Race, Evolution and Behavior](#), p.170), as well as the 'stereotype' that blacks are 'highly sexed'.

Like a Lion

Circa 1978, late one night in Ibadan (and six floors up), I heard a noise that sounded like an animal moaning and groaning, possibly even a lion – at night sound travels. The University of Ibadan had one of the few zoos in Nigeria, which was a mile or so from my building. The sound seemed to go on and on. And then a shiver went down my spine as I suddenly realized what it was: it was the young black guy, in the flat below me, *having an orgasm*. The sheer awesome power of it was seared into my brain.

The Concept of 'Rape' in Africa

I have long suspected that the concept of rape cannot mean the same in Africa as elsewhere. And now (over the Internet, *MSNBC Home*), I find this from *Newsweek* ("Breaking The Silence", by Tom Masland, dated 9 July 2000; emphases in original):

According to a three-year study [in Johannesburg] ... more than half of the young people interviewed – both male and female – believe that *forcing sex with someone you know does not constitute sexual violence*. ... [T]he casual manner in which South African teens discuss coercive relationships and unprotected sex is *staggering*.

Masland is stunned by blacks' behaviour, asking 'Why Has The Safe-Sex Effort Failed So Abjectly?' Well, aside from their profoundly different attitude towards sex and violence and

their intense libido, a major factor has to be their diminished concept of time and their inability to think ahead, resulting in a 'just-don't-give-a-damn' attitude.

Nevertheless, I was still surprised by what I found under 'rape' in the Zulu dictionary: *Act hurriedly; Be greedy. Rob, plunder, ... take [possessions] by force.* The 'problem', of course, is that there is no mention of sexual intercourse! In a male-dominated culture, where saying "no" is often not an option, 'taking sex by force' is not part of their mental calculus. Furthermore, rape clearly has a moral dimension. To the extent that Africans do not consider coerced sex to be wrong, then, by our conception, they cannot consider it rape; because rape is bad, and if such behaviour isn't bad it isn't rape.

But why *don't* they think coerced sex is wrong? Insofar as there is no option of saying no, then from their perspective, it isn't really forced; and to the extent blacks are deficient in moral consciousness, they will have difficulty in understanding that even *unambiguously* coercive sex is wrong in the first place. Either way, there seems no place for our notion of rape.

A Consistent Pattern: 'They Don't See It as Rape'

In an article about gang rape in the UK (June 2004) in the left-wing [Guardian](#), there is a quote from a young black woman, speaking of black men (emphasis added): "The thing is, *they don't see it as rape*, as us being forced. They just see it as pleasure for them. Us, we're slags." Add this to the discussion [below](#), and we have references to the same phenomenon amongst blacks in America ('running a train'), Kenya ('collections'), South Africa ('jackrolling', 'collections') and the UK, indicating a remarkably consistent pattern of behaviour.

Romantic Love

I recently (2008) happened to watch a few minutes of a TV program (here in South Africa) in which the topic was *having sex for money*. Of the several women in the audience who spoke up, not a single one questioned the morality of this; indeed, one plaintively asked, 'Why else would I have sex with a man?', clearly indicating that she could not *imagine* any other reason.

I have since had convincing evidence – specifically from the casual way in which blacks throw around the words '*in love with*' – that their understanding of such things is, at best, ludicrously childlike, indeed quite astonishingly so, leaving me in no doubt that this notion is fundamentally alien to Africans; and I would be surprised if it were very different in America. Hearing whites speak of 'love', blacks try to give it a meaning from within their own limited mindset. And this is the result – a truly infantile 'understanding' of this deepest of human emotions. (Compare this to their misunderstanding of the word 'promise'.)

I just located a document dictated to me by a young black woman in June 1993, which I had transcribed word for word; it was, she said, her 'story'. The title she gave it was "How They Changed My Life" and I copy here the last paragraph:

On my way from school, I met a boy. And he proposed me. His name was Mokone. He tell me that he love me. And then I tell him I will give him his answer next week. At night I was crazy about him. I was always thinking about him.

Impotence, Neurosis and Self-Consciousness

I observed early on that blacks have very little self-consciousness. It has been my experience that *neurotic* behaviour – characterized by excessive and unhealthy self-consciousness – is not common amongst blacks. Insofar as they are less self-conscious, they will obviously have less *unhealthy* self-consciousness and hence less neuroses. But blacks not only don't think about *themselves* very much; they don't think about *anything* very much, and at least one sense in which Africa remains a 'dark' continent is the absence of those mental processes which *cast light* on things.

I am also confident that sexual dysfunction, often attributable to such self-consciousness, is less common amongst blacks. Nothing is more inimical to normal sexuality than the halting self-consciousness foisted upon Western males by feminism ('Is she enjoying this?', 'Did she have an orgasm?'), and I would wager that the incidence of [impotence](#) in Africa is infinitesimal compared to the West. Sexuality is ultimately an expression of man's animal nature, and to the extent it becomes an object of self-consciousness it ceases to be such. Hence the myriad of sexual problems – mostly neurotic in nature – so prevalent in the West.

Mutual Black Distrust: How Kenyan Students 'Collect' Women

In the early 1980s (in Nairobi) I heard about a university student who had picked up a prostitute (referred to as 'collections'), paid her Sh200 (\$20 – quite a lot), only to meet her the next day on campus! Very annoyed, he demanded – and got – his money back!

Women there were very suspicious of black men, university students especially, who were like a world unto themselves and would abduct women and after many students had sex with them, take their money and throw them out naked. And so I asked, 'Isn't it difficult for students to pick up such women, since they will be very wary, especially of university students?' Yes, he said; that is quite true. 'So how do they manage it?'

Well, one of them poses as a visiting businessman, dressing up in a suit and tie. They rent a taxi and the 'businessman' goes into town looking for a prospect. He'll bargain with her, offering her a large sum ('collected' from his fellow students), bring her back to the university residences, where they will take back their money – and the usual would ensue.

'But given that black women are suspicious of black men, however well-dressed, aren't they still going to be very reluctant to get into that taxi?' Yes, he said, that is correct. After a lot

of detailed questioning (where he's from, where he's staying, where they're going, etc.), the woman will first of all demand the money up front (which is unusual). 'But still, she's got the money on her and they can take it back.' Right. So she gives it to one of her cohorts for safekeeping. 'But isn't she afraid this woman will run away with it?' Of course. She doesn't really give it to her; she goes through some pantomime of doing so, but in fact keeps it! And the students count on this, since whatever else they don't want to lose their money.

Deception and Trickery On All Sides

In other words, deception and trickery on all sides! The student has to masquerade; the prostitute still doesn't trust him and queries his *bona-fides*; demanding payment beforehand, she is still distrustful, and says she's leaving the money with someone else; but since she can't trust that person either, she only pretends to leave it with her! And the students guess she's lying about leaving the money because they assume she will be unwilling to trust this other person!

I recall a woman (in Nigeria), about to leave my house, preemptively opening her hands and arms wide, saying, 'See, I've taken nothing'. While the furthest thing from my (then) innocent mind, she expected me –with good reason – to be suspicious. In short, everything is based on mutual distrust and suspicion and on the assumption that others are – rightfully – just as distrustful as you are.

Not Just Kenya: 'Jackrolling' and 'Running a Train'

From *The Star* [Johannesburg]: 'Unemployed youths often drove into school grounds and abducted girls for criminal assaults' (31 December 1989: "Black schools in crisis after matric failures", p.2). *Re apartheid's 'scapegoat' role* (*The Star*, 9 June 1993, p.9: "Startling SA rape statistics"): 'Gang rape [said 'the London-based Panos Institute'], known as jackrolling, had become a cult in Soweto, and apartheid carried much of the blame'. And in Kenya? And the [UK](#)? How about America, where the same phenomenon, called 'running a train', seems to be common amongst young middle-class blacks ([Makes Me Wanna Holler](#), Chapter 6 ["Trains"]; 1995)?

Prostitution In Africa

Prostitution in Africa is a matter of degree. There are full-fledged professionals and some wholly non-prostitutes, but the vast majority fall somewhere in between. Most will accept money in return for sex. Some will ask for it, others will 'hint', some will merely hope or ask for 'transport' money, and if that costs 20 cents, will be happy with a dollar (a game of mutual self-deception?). Most wouldn't come if they thought they'd get nothing, but all will happily accept.

Are these women prostitutes? They're having sex with the hope of monetary gain. Clearly they're not wholly non-prostitutes, but then neither are they like the woman soliciting a the street corner. They're somewhere in between.

Don't forget, in much of Africa men still pay a 'bride-price'. In societies that are very male-dominated, where sex is often regarded inconsequentially, it is perhaps just an extension of this to give a woman something for sex. I do know that if you tell a typical African woman that in America a 'nice' woman would be highly insulted if you offered her money, you will be met with complete and utter disbelief. (All of which ties in with our discussion of [rape](#)).

Homosexuality in Africa

When the AIDS pandemic started in Africa there was much speculation about its source, from infected needles to homosexual transmission etc. I knew that neither was true. Hypodermic needles are not generally available in black Africa, and homosexual behaviour is, to understate the matter, highly frowned upon. When I had mentioned to students in Nigeria (in the late 70s) that in America there were men who have sex with other men, they flatly refused to believe it, the very idea filling them with disgust and revulsion.

There are naturally effeminate men in Africa, but since the idea of engaging in sex with men never occurs to them – much as, a few hundred years ago, no one 'missed' electricity – they mostly live ordinary lives, marrying and having children. Their lack of sexual 'freedom' is a [small price to pay](#) compared to the increasingly hysterical [promotion of homosexuality](#) in the West.

Peter Akinola

Note these remarks by Peter Akinola, head of the Anglican Church in Nigeria (whose 18 million members dwarf the four million in all of North America): "I cannot think of how a man in his senses would be having a sexual relationship with another man. Even in the world of animals, dogs, cows, lions, we don't hear of such things" ("[Defender of the Faith](#)", *The Atlantic Monthly*, November 2003). That such a prominent public figure would speak thus indicates that political correctness continues to have little impact on black Africa – *and* on American blacks as well.

Homosexual Marriage: Black Instincts Rule

In the 2008 U.S. elections, California voted on whether to amend the state constitution to define marriage as between a man and a woman. It passed by a 52-48 margin, with a majority of whites voting against it (and hence *for* same sex marriage). The only reason it passed (and homosexual marriage ruled unconstitutional) is that [70% of blacks](#) voted *for* it (and *against* homosexual marriage)! Blacks tend to vote *en masse*, and the vast majority voted for the far-left Barack Obama, but when it came endorsing homosexual marriage, they voted *against* everything they were supposed to believe in. I can only attribute this to the same [instinctive revulsion](#) I found in my students in Nigeria, illustrating another remarkable [congruence](#) between American and African blacks.

Unfortunately, this ‘last-gasp’ attempt to stem the decline of America – a decline manifested by this frantic promotion of sexual perversion – is almost certainly [doomed to failure](#).

BLACKS’ LACK OF RACIAL ‘SENSITIVITY’

‘If You Do It, Foreigners Must Redo It Tomorrow’

In *The Sunday Times* (“Somewhere over the rainbow nation”, 1 November 1998, p.25) Denis Beckett, a well-known author and TV and radio personality, quotes a ‘high-ranking Ugandan administrator’ as saying:

“Local contractors come crying: ‘We are your indigenous brothers. Give us the job’. I tell them: ‘If you do it today, foreigners must redo it tomorrow. Rather I get them now.’” ... Another Ugandan official: “I took on an Italian at \$3,000 a month. People say: ‘How can you do that? You can have me for \$800’. I say: ‘Easy. From him I get \$5,000 worth of work, from you I’d get \$200’.”

Beckett chalked this up to ‘the new anti-African racism among Africans’, but admitted he had little basis for saying it was ‘new’ and conceded that my claim – that Africans recognize white superiority without embarrassment – may indeed be true, and that if so, it undermines some of the most basic liberal assumptions about race.

‘When That Day Comes, I’ll Kill Myself’

In 1988 I talked with a middle-class coloured man in Bloemfontein. He lived in a township of about 50,000. They had their own schools and hospital. The primary school his children attended had seven or eight white teachers (out of 30), but all the principals were coloured and there were no black teachers – which, he admitted, was no accident.

The hospital had white doctors and administrators but black nurses. Were they happy having black nurses? ‘Well, they were okay.’ Did they treat the patients well? ‘They treated their own okay’. Was the hospital good? Yes – the doctors were very good. Was it as good as the whites’? No, that was much better.

He had a car, TV, and phone. I said that in the rest of Africa the number of blacks with such amenities was tiny. ‘Yes’, he said, ‘we’re living in the very wealthy South Africa.’ Did he want to see nonwhites running things? ‘I’d like to see it 50-50.’ But if you give blacks 50% you know they’ll soon demand 80%. Well, he said, he said, I am used to having whites run this country, but ‘Things are better now’ – which I took to mean now that nonwhites were coming to have more power. Not at all. He meant that things are good now with the whites (still) running things. So you would not want to see blacks in charge? ‘When that day comes’, he said, ‘I will kill myself!’

American Blacks ‘So Full Of Themselves’

In 1991, I met two coloured women who were professional dancers. I showed them a flier about this book and they read the first question – ‘Is it bad to say whites are cleverer than blacks?’. Their response was immediate: ‘No; it’s not bad – it’s true!’. (They bought a copy of the book.) At first, however, they said that if blacks had a better education they would be as smart as whites; and so I asked them if they thought blacks would ever, on their own, have invented the computer. Their unequivocal answer was: ‘No – never’. But isn’t that because there is a natural difference in intelligence? Yes, they agreed, there was. (And so, so much for that!)

They expressed vehement disgust with ‘thick Dutchmen’ – narrow-minded Afrikaners, in shorts, with thighs like tree trunks, who can’t stand the sight of blacks or coloureds. But in discussing the likely future of South Africa, one of them said, ‘The day there is a black government here we’re getting airplane tickets and going that way!’, emphatically jerking her thumb over her shoulder.

These women had toured America and remarked, pointedly, that one thing they couldn’t get over was how American blacks were ‘so full of themselves’. And I thought: Yes, but is this ‘fullness’ based on accomplishment or is it a compensatory reaction to their feelings of inferiority?

BLACK ENTREPRENEURIAL SUCCESS: THE ANTI-RACISM INDUSTRY

Black Psychological Shrewdness: Manipulating White Guilt

In *The Star* (21 May 1988, p.6; all emphases added):

Racism – Still A Fatal Presence In U.K. Schools

Most schools in Britain lack an adequate response to our multi-racial society.

PETER WILBY examines the issues behind the Macdonald report
on the murder of an Asian pupil in a Manchester school

[Most] education authorities in Britain have anti-racist and multi-racial education policies. “Most are ragbags of good intentions, bits of ideology, strips of anger and cotton wool balls of love” ... [says] the black radical ... father of anti-racist education in Britain, Chris Mullard

... Behind the arguments lies the persistent underachievement of ethnic minority children in British schools.

The favoured explanation in the 1970s was that black children had a poor self-image because schools despised ... their culture. This led to multi-racial education, ... highlight[ing] ethnic minority customs

Increasingly, this approach was criticised for evading the realities of political and economic power: White people ran Britain, while blacks got inferior housing, menial

jobs and low incomes. At its worst, multi-racial education could be racist, reinforcing stereotypes of blacks as people with distinct aspirations, based on exotic customs and noisy music. ...

“Racism”, says Professor Mullard, “will not go away if you hold a samosa party or play a bit of reggae.” Racial disadvantage is not created by individual and personal prejudices but by “routine practices, customs and procedures”, or “*institutional racism*”.

... institutional racism operate[s] ... through procedures that *seem* to treat people equally. [As] when letters to parents are written only in English. ...

... Geography lessons ... emphasise Third World countries as impoverished recipients of aid, without considering how the West is dependent on their raw materialsThe emancipation of slaves may be attributed to ... Lincoln or Wilberforce, without highlighting black people’s role....

... since racism is created by whites, [‘anti-racist education’] is more essential in all-white than in racially-mixed schools. ...

[The other criticisms of Manchester’s anti-racist policies are] first, the policies were imposed from above, without substantial input from ethnic minorities, ... second ... that the policies have concentrated on the personal shortcomings of whites, an approach that derives from *racism awareness training*.

[Barry] Troyna and [Jenny] Williams [‘committed anti-racist sociologists’] criticised ... Manchester ... for a “behavioural” model of racism concerned more with changing individual attitudes ... than with changing institutions.

“Racism awareness”, says Mullard, “leaves you all dressed up with nowhere to go, because unless you change institutions, you change nothing.” – *The Independent*, London.

Whites Bullied, Browbeaten and Blackmailed: ‘That’s Not What We Want!’

Nothing will satisfy these ‘anti-racists’ other than, by magic, eliminating all racial differences in achievement. Since that’s not possible, your prof mullards and jenny williamses will have lifetime careers in *kvetching*. Since there isn’t much ‘old-fashioned’ racism left – i.e., racism you can *see* – we will invent an invisible, ‘institutional’, racism.

Instances abound of whites doing ‘as ordered’. But *now* that’s *not* what we want, because your old policy was ‘racist’. When the ‘favoured explanation’ fails, what do they say? It’s ‘racist, reinforcing stereotypes of blacks as people with distinct aspirations’. Did they say this *before* ‘multi-racial education’ started? On the contrary; they insisted on it, because their ‘culture’ was ‘despised and ignored’; blacks – *and* whites! – must be ‘proud’ of black ‘culture’. But now, after 15 years of ‘consultancies’ and sinecures, with the well running dry, they need a new cow to milk!

Racism is ‘embodied in the curriculum’, because of the emphasis on ‘Third World countries as impoverished recipients of aid’. No one is denying that African countries *are* ‘impoverished recipients of aid’. Are they suggesting this should be *de-emphasized*?

Well, at least mention ‘how the West is dependent on their raw materials’. But this is apologetic nonsense. The question is whether Africa can cope, not whether they have natural resources. Moreover, when such resources *are* exploited, it is due to Western technology, without which Nigeria’s oil wells and Ghana’s bauxite mines would neither exist nor operate. To assume such talk is racist – and must stop! – is just another example of black psychological bullying.

‘Racism Awareness Training’

For even more outrageous psychological warfare, look at this ‘second criticism’: policies deal with ‘personal shortcomings of whites’ and are based on ‘racism awareness training’. Whites are being trained to become ‘aware of their racism’ as if they were bed-wetters! If this isn’t straight out of George Orwell’s *1984* I don’t know what is.

But alas! this Maoist re-education is no longer ‘in’; indeed, it may even be racist, ‘reinforcing stereotypes of blacks as people with distinct aspirations’. No matter how whites pander, they just can’t win. You say blacks don’t have their own culture? That’s racist, because it’s ‘putting them down’. So, ‘Black is beautiful’: they have their own distinct culture and aspirations; to assume they are like whites is racist!

Okay. So we celebrate black culture, samosa parties and all. Aha! Now you’re ‘reinforcing stereotypes of blacks as people with distinct aspirations’ – and *that’s* racist! Assume blacks are the same and you’re a racist; ‘go over’ to the ‘new’ view – they are ‘distinct’ – and you’re still a racist! Whites accept this brainwashing, browbeating and psychological intimidation like sheep, all because of their misguided guilt.

‘You’ve Done Nothing!’

From Professor Mullard: ‘Unless you change [those darned] institutions, you change nothing’. Did you hear that? All of this ‘racist awareness training’ for nothing! All the samosa parties, all the reggae, all the money spent on ‘uplifting’ blacks, and here is dear professor saying not merely that it’s not everything – but that it’s *nothing*.

Why? Because blacks don’t get the same school results, the same incomes, the same housing standards (*etc.*) as whites. And until you’ve done *that*, Mr. White Man, you’ve done nothing; for – of course – everything is your fault, ‘since racism is created by whites’. And don’t you dare *hint* that blacks are even a teensie bit responsible. No sir! Try that trick and you’re really in trouble. (Reminds one of [Mugabe](#).)

All this, whites meekly accept: ‘Kick them and still they [wag their tails](#)’. If you wanted an example of genuine black entrepreneurial accomplishment you couldn’t do better than this

anti-racism scam with its extraordinary manipulation of that inexhaustible resource – white [guilt!](#)

WHITE PANDERING

African Libraries: An Oxymoron?

An item on the *BBC's* "Network Africa" (3 June 1988) mentioned a 'book famine'. An American had given them a book on industrial psychology, a Nigerian said, but since they had no foreign exchange they couldn't get any more. If they did get a few, they'd be stolen from the library or have pages torn out. To have it photocopied, meant sending it three hundred miles away because all their copiers were out of order.

Then came someone named Ben Turok and a more pandering white would be hard to find. Were they asking people to donate books? Hilton File, the host, asked. Not at all! People think they can just send second hand books by overseas authors that were not appropriate to Africa. (Did he expect them to have a lot of books in America by African authors?) No, we are asking them to send money! They were arranging for books to be sent chosen by the Africans and written by Africans – which for some unexplained reason were published overseas and not in Africa.

No one asked why Africans can't produce their own teaching material. I did – in Africa. All you need is a typewriter and a gestetner machine. But of course Africans (a) don't write very much, (b) can't keep their gestetner machines, let alone photocopiers, working, and (c) don't produce gestetner stencils or ink. The problem is not lack of money; gestetner machines cost much less than photocopiers (that never work). The real problem is that [Africa doesn't work](#).

Zambia, Lesotho, Nigeria, Zimbabwe

Turok mentioned that at the university in Zambia, there were no journals less than five or six years old; they had once had one of the best libraries in Africa, but it was now ruined, with students tearing out pieces of books (etc.). Of course he was totally apologetic about this. 'It is very easy to condemn this, but when students don't have books, this is what they must do.' So of course we must 'help' them by sending them another library to wreck! Not a hint of criticism; it's all whites' fault and so we must do something about it – quick! Send your money, not your lousy 'foreign' books!

At the National University of Lesotho no periodicals had been bound for more than ten years. At the University of Ibadan, in Nigeria, books were restacked – at most – twice a year, so that any book removed from the shelves ceased to exist – *qua* usable book – for at least several months. In *Business Day* ("Zimbabwe's troubled university loses its head", 3 August 1991, p.8): "Two years ago students were told to replace books on the shelves themselves because the staff could not keep up. ... You queue for hours [to] photocopy,

only to be told the machine can do only four or five pages, and back you go to the end of the queue”’. (I might add that when I was there in early 1986 and had to photocopy, everything seemed fine.)

Whites Who Invite Blacks To Steal From Them

I spoke (in the early 90s) with an elderly Israeli woman who was getting ‘fed up’ with the blacks. She took her maid to the hospital, paid the bills, and then paid her sister to work in her absence. To show her gratitude the maid stole everything she could lay her hands on and disappeared! Is it surprising? You had already shown her that you were a tender-hearted white of whom she could easily take advantage.

A woman on a radio talk show related how she had hired a maid, paid her R400 per month (a lot in 1989), plus a room, all meals, clothing, three weeks leave a year etc. The maid’s boyfriend stayed with her along with several children; she fed them all. Next thing, the boyfriend’s brother came, then a friend of his, then someone’s sister and more children – etc. etc. etc.. And she fed them all. ‘Our grocery bill for the blacks was several hundred rand a month. Fortunately, we were able to afford it!’, she said. Then all of a sudden the blacks disappear, along with the ‘madam’s’ things.

No one could think this was normal, and yet she went right ahead. Someone that stupid deserves what she gets.

INTIMIDATION

Black Principal Slaps Student’s Hands and Has His House Burned Down

In May 1988, in Bloemfontein, I spoke with a (white) NCO in the South African Defence Forces. He gives training courses to black school teachers. At one school, students suddenly started running amok. It had somehow been communicated to them that they were supposed to boycott – and that was that. Why don’t you try to stop them? he asked the principal. ‘If I tried, my house would be burned down.’

Another principal disciplined an eight year old by slapping her hands with a ruler. The girl merely stared at him. When he left school that day, she was at the gate, staring at him again. Later that evening, at a nearby store, he saw the girl standing there and all she did was to point her finger at him. He turned around, went home, told his wife and children to get in their car and with nothing else, left. That night his house was burned down.

Gestapo Tactics

An editorial in the (black) *City Press* (“Protest was voice of the voteless majority”: 12 June 1988, p.6 – Friday edition) concerning a recent ‘stayaway’:

... The days of looking for scapegoats in the form of agitators and intimidators is over. ... Those workers who stayed at home, despite a stern warning of no-work-no-pay ..., did so out of commitment and solidarity. ...

But there was intimidation, as the following, from the left-wing *Weekly Mail*, makes clear (“A Baby’s Dawn Cries Save Dad”, by Carmel Rickard, 10-16 June 1988, p.10):

A DURBAN worker could owe his life to a scream by his hungry baby – it yelled in the nick of time this week during a “vigilante visit” to check why the house lights were on at six on a stayaway morning.

The ... father was woken ... by its crying. He stumbled out of bed to make a bottle and change a nappy. A knock on the door revealed an unknown man come to see why the lights were on when “no one was supposed to be going to work”.

An ugly situation was developing, but at the right moment, the almost-forgotten baby screamed and provided the excuse – the relieved father announced they were up to feed the child.

Satisfied, the visitor left.

Clearly, anyone going to work put himself at risk. Though in fact he was *not* going to work he was too scared to speak until the baby cried. The ‘visitor’ was treated like Gestapo: with pure, unadulterated fear. ‘Satisfied’ with his ‘excuse’, ‘the visitor left’.

For ‘Disobeying’, Women Paraded Naked

I had a conversation (September 1989) with a black woman who was supposed to work for me on a Wednesday and only showed up two days later. Wednesday, she says – a (white) election day – was a ‘stayaway’: if the ‘comrades’ saw you coming from town you would be beaten. Was it true that women were made to walk naked down the street? Yes, she said; they could also cut off your ear, and say ‘Give this to your master; you don’t listen to me!’.

These people, she said, wanted freedom in town (‘white’ Johannesburg), but in the townships they beat anyone who ‘disobeyed’. In other words, they want to be treated (by whites) as whites treat each other – under the rule of law – but quickly forget about these ‘freedoms’ where they hold sway.

So why is everyone saying blacks want black rule? Well, she said, they would like to ‘share’ it. But once these thugs get a taste of power they will want it all. She laughed; ‘of course’. Then why does everyone keep saying that blacks want a black government? It was the same fear, she said, that makes them afraid to violate the stayaway.

I asked if she’d ever had such a conversation with any white man before. She laughed again. ‘No, no.’ Nor would she have it with blacks. The media reports millions of blacks protesting (white) elections because they couldn’t vote, when the reality – as the media must know – is that they are simply terrorized.

Mob Psychology and ‘Double-Talking’

Regarding this phenomenon of mob psychology – believing something simply because you think everyone else believes and don’t want to ‘stand out’ – I am reminded of a social science experiment (in Chicago) in which a professional ‘double-talker’ (someone skilled in talking complete nonsense but making it [appear sensible](#)) gave such a ‘talk’ with an impressive title to group of PhD’s, to which the strongest criticism was that ‘it dwelled upon the obvious’!

INSIGHT INTO THE NATURE OF RACISM: BEING ‘BORN THE WRONG COLOUR’

Colour As a Bad Trait vs. Colour As an *Indication* of Bad Traits

In *The Star*, a piece by Jon Qwelane (30 May 1988, p.9: “Republic Day – a time to renounce apartheid”):

Twenty-seven years ago tomorrow, a former British colony on the tip of Africa became a republic and thousands of white South Africans celebrated late into the night in the streets of Pretoria.

But as they danced, millions more South Africans ... watched in silence, the millions ... relegated to the political, social and economic sidelines by the simple chance of being born the “wrong” colour.

How are we to understand this last statement? That it is their *colour itself* which whites don’t like? Well, except for your *bona-fide* racists, who simply hate blacks *as such*, I don’t think this is true. The most common attitude is that blacks *behave* differently – and *that* is why they must be denied political power (etc.).

You can argue about whether this is true and whether it would justify apartheid, but the point is, most whites are *not* saying that blacks should be treated differently because they were ‘born the “wrong” colour’. Putting it another way, black colour is not the *action-making-characteristic* – that which makes whites treat them as they do – but rather an *action-indicating-characteristic*: being black is *evidence* that they are likely to *behave* in certain ways. And it is this expectation, not their colour as such, that makes whites treat them differently.

In the *Sunday Star* (5 June 1988, p.11: “Glorification of the trek serves only to perpetuate racism”) Qwelane says that the Boers did not bring the ‘light of civilization’ (Christianity) to the blacks; that was done by David Livingstone and Robert Moffat and the London Missionary Society. The Boer trekkers

left the Cape embittered by the abolition of slavery, and they would not accept that they were *equal to everyone and superior to none*.

... one of the basics of civilised human behavior is to accept that you are equal, not superior, to others. ...

... Commemorating Blood River [a 19th century battle in which the Boers defeated the blacks] ... is commemorating the myth of racial superiority – which is the root of all South Africa's ills. [Emphasis in original.]

The Ambiguity of 'Equal To Everyone and Superior To None'

A Fatal Confusion

What does it mean to say that the Boers 'wouldn't accept they were equal to everyone and superior to none'? That they believed that as a *group* they were superior to blacks or that *each and every one* of them was superior to each and every black? If the former, the belief was basically true and is not racist; if the latter, it was almost certainly false and would constitute racism.

And what would it mean, correspondingly, to *be* 'equal to others'? That everyone in the world is of equal ability, that no one is superior, in any respect, to anyone else? I don't think so. The only sensible meaning here is that we should not regard ourselves as superior *just because* of our colour (or religion or sex or whatever), but should judge each individual on his merits. To assume that you are 'better' just because you are white and he is black *is* racist, and if that's what he means by the 'myth of racial superiority' he is right to call it racist. But that individuals should be judged on merit does not preclude one *group* being, in some respects, superior to another.

So when Qwelane rants against the 'myth of racial superiority' this is fundamentally **ambiguous**. Judging someone inferior just because he is black is racist, whereas saying that on average blacks are less capable is not. Clearly, this distinction is of enormous importance and failure to grasp it is the cause of endless confusion.

Example: All Jews – and Only Jews – Have a 'Spark' Which Makes Them More Valuable

Observant Jews believe that the souls of all Jews – and only Jews – have a 'spark' which gives each and every one of them a value which no one but Jews have. It is one thing to say that Jews are somehow 'special' because as a group, and on average, they have characteristics which account not only for their survival through thousands of years of persecution but as well for their pre-eminence when they enter mainstream life; it is something quite different to say this man is more valuable than that man solely because he is a Jew. That would indeed be a failure to consider individuals on their merits and is like saying that this man is better than that man just because he's white. You're not saying he is *probably* better but that he *must* be, which is not only irrational but is the very model of true racism.

One must add, however, that these beliefs are not motivated by hatred of any individuals or groups but are more ‘theoretical’, based on their understanding of the Torah, and have little if any impact on their behaviour, either individually or as a group. Nor are they specifically racial, as demonstrated by Israel’s rescue of the *falasha*, the black Jews of Ethiopia.

More Ambiguity: ‘Whatever Whites Can Do, Blacks Can Do’

Would I agree with the statement that ‘Whatever whites can do, blacks can do’? That would depend on exactly what is meant. In one sense it is more or less true, while in another it probably isn’t.

If it is about individuals, meaning that whatever some white can do there is almost certainly some black who could do it, it is probably true. White men get PhD’s in physics from MIT and there are almost certainly – if proportionately fewer – blacks who could do so as well.

Suppose, however, someone says: ‘The white man invented the electric light bulb, the airplane, television, automobiles and computers; are you saying blacks could have done this?’. Here I would say No: I do not think the black man could ever do such things. But am I not then denying that the black man can do whatever anything the white man can?

White Men vs. the White Man

Notice that we have subtly, but quite naturally, shifted from talking about black *vs.* white *men* to the black *vs.* the white *man*. The white man invented the light bulb; and even though it was ‘done’ by one man – Thomas Alva Edison – there is another sense in which it was done not by him alone but by white technological culture. He did indeed invent it; but this was possible only because he lived in a society with the requisite educational and technological infrastructure. If Edison had at birth been transplanted to a Nigerian village from which he never travelled more than a few miles, he might have been the cleverest person in the village, but he most assuredly would not have invented the light bulb.

So when we say the white man invented this or that we are speaking not merely of individuals but of the white man as a group along with his culture – which of course he created, just as blacks create their culture. In this sense I do *not* think it is true that ‘Whatever whites can do blacks can do’, for in this sense there is a difference between them – an average difference – which manifests itself in the culture and its accomplishments. It means that the ‘critical mass’ of intelligence, creativity, inquisitiveness, cooperativeness (etc.) which resulted in the technological developments of Western society, probably does not exist amongst blacks, making it unlikely that black cultures would ever develop science and technology. (See discussion of [abstract](#) thinking.)

Importance of Distinction Between Talking About Individuals vs. Talking About Groups

So, talking about individuals, ‘Blacks can do whatever whites can’ is almost axiomatically true; talking about them as groups, it almost certainly is not.

When a black (or a woman) does something rare for them, the fact that so much is made of it indicates how we confuse individual vs. group judgments. That one of them should (e.g.) excel at chess wouldn’t mean that much on two counts: first, that individual blacks (or women) can be good at chess should be obvious to anyone, almost *a priori*; second, it doesn’t prove anything about blacks (or women) as a *group*, because until there are a *lot* of such individuals, it doesn’t contradict the view that chess is something at which, as a group, they are weak.

Example: South Africa’s First Black Ophthalmologist

On the *BBC*’s “Network Africa” (10 June 1988), an item about the first black eye surgeon in South Africa.

Had he suffered from apartheid? ‘Of course’ (of course!).’ Lecturers would say that ‘The black mind is not made for mathematics’ (see [here](#) and [here](#)); he would only see black patients, who would prefer to see a white doctor. That, he said, shows the effects of 300 years of this system.

If a lecturer had said that *no* African could do mathematics, that might be racist; if he merely said that fewer could, that would not be. ‘But doesn’t it show that blacks are given a chance, the very fact you have succeeded?’ Yes, but he’d had to be five times as good as his white colleagues to succeed.

But of course the main reason [blacks prefer white doctors](#) is that – generally speaking – blacks *are* less competent, less honest, less reliable. This man will have to contend with these presumptions and may suffer unfairly. But whose fault is that? Surely not those who are simply acting on such presumptions. His attitude should be: ‘Right; I’ve got a handicap because I’m black and people are going to be skeptical. That’s not my fault, but neither is it theirs. It’s the fault of all those blacks who give blacks a bad name. I will simply have to work harder to prove myself’.

‘The Colour Of People’s Skin Means Nothing’: Bad-Making- vs. Bad-Indicating-Traits

A story in *The Sunday Times* (12 June 1988, p.3, “Aussie Yasmin told to quit flat”) tells of a coloured model who was evicted because the area is still officially ‘white’. The chairman of the board of trustee’s – a Mr. Visser – makes a typically ambiguous remark: “As far as I’m concerned the colour of people’s skin means nothing”.

If he means that colour is not a *bad-making*-trait – i.e., a bad thing about someone – he would be right. If he means that colour is simply irrelevant, that’s another matter; for a person’s colour may be evidence of certain *other* – and undesirable – traits, i.e., *bad-making*-traits. In other words, while being black is not itself an undesirable trait, it may be an indication of *other* traits which *are*.

The problem is that people rarely distinguish between the two, and hence, if they (correctly) reject the former – counting a person’s colour as itself an undesirable trait – they are likely to (incorrectly) reject the latter along with it, and hence will automatically consider taking colour to be evidence of *other* (undesirable) traits to also be racist; which it is not.

Black Law Prof Commits Very Mistake of Which We Speak

Illustrating the importance of this distinction *and* the likelihood of its not being fully grasped, I quote from Stephen L Carter, a black law professor at Yale University ([Reflections of an Affirmative Action Baby](#), 1991; p.228):

... [no] instances in which race might be relevant, either to the government or to individuals, [should] be used as an indicator of merit – no one [should be] more valued than anyone else because of skin color.

The second part of this statement (‘no one [should be] ...’) is most easily understood to mean that skin colour should not, in and of itself, count against someone; and yet it is being equated with colour being an ‘indicator’. But the two ideas could not be more distinct: devaluing someone (just) ‘because of skin color’ is almost the essence of genuine racism, while taking race as an ‘indicator’ need only mean being guided by reasonable and justified presumptions – which is not, *per se*, in the least racist.

Racism and Apologism: ‘Skin Color Is Irrelevant’

I have said that [apologism](#) is the mirror image of racism. I have also characterized (genuine) racism as the view that being black in and of itself makes a person less valuable. Correspondingly, therefore, (genuine) apologism would consist of thinking that being black (or white) in and of itself makes someone *more* valuable.

Ronald Kessler writes for Newsmax.com. Though a harsh critic of Barack Obama, he is a typical *skin-color-is-irrelevant* conservative, like [Dennis Prager](#). For Prager, that ‘there are no differences between the races’ is a religious mantra, repeated endlessly and always contrasted with his view that there *are* differences between the sexes; the no-race-differences refrain, I suspect, is to cover his rear for his sex-differences stance, a kind of *PC-credit* along the lines of *carbon-credits*. In spite of this, both are (relatively) honest about race.

In a recent [column](#), Kessler makes this astute observation:

When the media glorify Obama because he is black, white voters rightfully resent the implication that *because Obama is black*, he should be thought of as being somehow more worthy.

Bingo! Just as a *bona fide* racist says that a black person should be *devalued* by virtue of being black, the American media is saying that Obama is *better* by virtue of being black. And that kind of apologism is *just* as racist as its mirror-image: that blacks-are-inferior/whites-are-superior by virtue of their colour.

AN AMERICAN PHILOSOPHER TACKLES RACE

Preferential Treatment, aka 'Affirmative Action'

I have been reading an essay by an American philosopher, Richard Wasserstrom, entitled "Preferential Treatment, Colorblindness, and the Evils of Racism and Racial Discrimination" (*Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association*, Supplement to vol. 61, no. 1, Sept 1987, pp.27-42).

He sets out to defend 'preferential treatment' – policies 'that make ... race ... a relevant ... consideration' in hiring [p.27]. It is better to be white because there is a '*system of black racial disadvantage and oppression*' (p.28; emphasis in original). Even if whites were not concerned to maintain the *status quo*, it will 'perpetuate itself' unless blacks occupy more 'positions of power and authority'. He claims that 'blacks will .. both be more inclined to care about provision of these social goods to other blacks, and will be more able ... to provide them... beneficial[ly]' (p.29).

Do Blacks Treat Blacks Better Than Whites Do?

He claims that having such black 'role models' would undermine the 'system' and that blacks in these positions will treat blacks better than whites will. I would challenge all of this. To begin with, experience indicates that black bureaucrats tend to treat blacks worse than whites will, and that they will *not* be 'more inclined to [provide] social goods to other blacks'. On the contrary, their need to feel superior means making blacks – the alleged beneficiaries of this 'good will' – feel inferior.

As to things running well, there is abundant evidence to the contrary. Remember what [American blacks](#) say: 'If you want to die, go to a black doctor. ... to jail, a black lawyer'. In South Africa, Nomavenda Mathiane, a [militant](#) black writer, reports being 'appalled at the manner in which black officials deal with [black] customers', many of whom, she says, 'travel all the way into town rather than face the long queues at [black-run] banks' (*Sunday Times*: "Let's learn to do it well", 19 December 1993, p.17).

Stark Confirmation From *The New York Times*

A piece from the ultra-liberal, anti-white *New York Times* discusses the difficulties affluent blacks have in hiring nannies ("[Nanny Hunt Can Be a 'Slap in the Face' for Blacks](#)", by Jodi Kantor, 26 December 2006; all emphases added):

... interviews with dozens of nannies and agencies ... in Atlanta, Chicago, New York and Houston turned up many nannies — often of African-American or Caribbean descent ... — who avoid working for families of those backgrounds. Their reasons included accusations of low pay and extra work, *fears that employers would look down at them*, and suspicion that *any neighborhood inhabited by blacks had to be unsafe...* . *"Very rarely will an African-American woman work for an African-American boss,"* said Pat Cascio, the owner of Morningside Nannies in Houston and the president of the International Nanny Association.... . Many of the African-American nannies who make up 40 percent of her work force fear that people of their own color *will be "uppity and demanding,"* said Ms. Cascio, who is white. After interviews, she said, those nannies "will call us and say, 'Why didn't you tell me'" the family is black?

Note the detailed congruence with my ideas: (1) that blacks are more likely to mistreat blacks than whites are, and hence (2) that most blacks would prefer to work for whites, and (3) that blacks frequently have a need to make themselves feel superior by making others feel inferior – by 'looking down' on them, being 'uppity and demanding' (etc.). (For examples from South Africa see [here](#) and more specifically [here](#).) Not to mention their openly expressed 'suspicion' that *'any neighborhood inhabited by blacks had to be unsafe'*. (Compare views of [South African](#) and [D.C.](#) teenagers.)

Thus, Wassertrom's blithe assumption of black good will exhibits a colossal and arrogant ignorance of everyday black life, in Africa *and* in America.

'Role Models'

The other reason for more blacks in higher positions is to

bring [blacks] ... into relationships of greater equality of power, authority, and status with ... white[s] When relationships between blacks and whites are those of ... pervasive inequality ..., [the] ideology ... of racial dominance and subservience is ... securely preserved [p.29].

In other words, people will say: 'Look – important jobs are held by whites, because they are superior'. With more blacks there, they can say: 'See, blacks are just as good; they also have positions of [power\[E1\]](#)'. But if blacks were only put in these positions to 'help' them, would *that* counteract their feelings of inferiority? More likely it will do precisely the opposite, since they will ask why blacks *need* this kind of 'help'. Answer: because they are inferior.

Why *Would* People Rather Be Born White?

'[I]t seems ... difficult to deny that race does ... matter when it comes to all ... sorts of things ...' (p.30).

... suppose a person want[s] to ... assure ... being ... satisfied ... with his ... career; relatively politically powerful rather than powerless; ... secure from ... insensitive ... or unfair treatment [by] ... the police, the courts, the medical establishment, and the housing market ...; and able ... to pursue one's goals and develop one's talents [to his] satisf[action] ... suppose, finally, a choice of one's race at the moment of birth My conjecture is that persons would opt to be born white rather than black [p.28].

Less able to develop their talents? Athletically, musically? Certainly not. If a black is a whiz at mathematics, it will be found out (and, much made of it). Politically powerless? When blacks are mayors of some of the largest cities, many with minority black populations, and when one of them (Tom Bradley) come within a hair's breadth of being elected governor of California? When they have a powerful gerrymandered black caucus in Congress? And, finally, when Barack Obama (November 2008) has been elected president, while whites studiously ignore -- because the man is black -- clear indications that he hates America and whites? This is *racial disadvantage*? Of [blacks](#)?

'Insensitive treatment [from] police, courts and medical establishment'? I would wager that black cops treat blacks worse than white cops do. As just one example: In the film [Boys 'N the Hood](#) (1991), directed by a militant black, a black cop is shown exhibiting venomous hatred towards black 'hoods' – an indication of how even militant blacks see things.

It is true that most people – including blacks – treat blacks less well than they treat whites. Given a choice between hiring a black or a white, most people – black or white – will prefer the white. Black or white tenant? Most will prefer white. Having white or black patients (or doctor)? White. Black or white school? Black or white neighborhood? Black or white [employer](#)? Black or white [taxi passenger](#)? White, all around. All of this does put blacks at a 'disadvantage', but is this really due to racial prejudice?

Is It Racist To Prefer White Over Black?

If experience shows that a white secretary is much less likely to be trouble, why take chances? You'll hire the white – and so will blacks. So most of us would rather be born white – and whites are indeed treated better. But, again, why is *this* so? I say it is because of blacks' behaviour: they are less reliable, less honest, less capable (etc.). If this is so and is not the result of discrimination, then it is simply incorrect to say that racial disparities are due to discrimination. In fact, it's the other way round: 'discrimination' (i.e., distinguishing one group from another) is the result of racial disparities.

Individual blacks will suffer as a result. But the fault lies not with those ‘discriminating’ but blacks in aggregate, their ‘leaders’ and especially liberals like Wasserstrom who beget the myths of egalitarianism.

The Reverend James D Manning: The Blunt Truth

Regarding specifically the issue of hiring blacks, I urge the reader to watch this extraordinary [video](#). This man ‘takes no prisoners’ when it comes to stating the blunt truth about his fellow blacks. Watching it makes me feel like a milque-toast moderate. If there is exaggeration here, it is a welcome, if miniscule, antidote to the unending torrent of lies, subterfuge and self-hating self-deceit to which we have been increasingly subjected for the last half century.

Blacks’ Status-Seeking and Mistreatment of Other Blacks

Note, by the way, the connection between blacks’ [status-consciousness](#) and their poor treatment of other blacks. This inordinate concern with status reflects their sense of inferiority which they think will be assuaged by ‘elevating’ themselves, since by belittling someone else, they will at least be superior to *that* person. The resulting [mistreatment](#) is illustrated throughout this book.

Brazil: A ‘Test Case’

In 1991 I visited Brazil. Blacks, roughly a third of the 150 million population, were consistently at the ‘bottom of the pile’; at a university of more than 10,000, I saw only a handful. And yet there was almost no racial tension: neither whites nor blacks blamed ‘white oppression and racism’. In short, there seemed to be little if any racial humbug. [By the early 2000s this had changed – and with a vengeance.]

I recall an episode on a bus in Rio. At one stop several no-nonsense cops got on and started asking for IDs – but only of blacks. Two white women were sitting behind me, one of whom spoke English. I asked her about this and she said that it was always like this and that no one thought anything of it.

I have claimed that blacks prefer white rule, despite the fact that, whenever they get the chance, they elect blacks. My theory would predict that, *absent* the influence of liberal ideology, blacks would indeed vote for whites.

In 1992 I met a Brazilian who mentioned something quite astounding (later confirmed by another Brazilian). He said that in the northern state of Bahia, which is 80% black, the 500-member state legislature had exactly eleven blacks – seven of whom publicly said that they were elected because they *behaved like whites*. Maybe, I said, most blacks failed to vote, but he assured me this was not the case. No, he said; they vote for whites because they think they will manage better.

And so here we have a ‘test case’ for my hypothesis that in the absence of egalitarian ideology, blacks will vote for whites. Brazil, as I had previously discovered, lacks this ideology. And sure enough, blacks there apparently *do* elect whites!

The ‘Myth’ of Black Inferiority

On the question of meritorious blacks being tarred by affirmative action, Shelby Steele, a black American writer, had this to say (*Harper’s Magazine*, February 1989):

... this myth [of black inferiority] is sadly reinforced ... by affirmative action programs, under which blacks ... [gain entry to] college with lower ... scores ... than whites. ...
 ... The families of these students ... have pounded into [the students] the fact that blacks are *not* inferior. And ... more than anything, it is this pounding that finally leaves a mark. If I am not inferior, *why the need to say so?* [In other words, *thou protesteth too loudly*; “The Recoloring of Campus Life: Student racism, academic pluralism, and the end of a dream”, p.50.]

In all likelihood, those doing this ‘pounding’ have never thought through the difference between saying ‘all blacks are inferior’ and ‘on average they are, but many are superior – and you may be one of those’. Indeed, Steele himself, though quite honest about race, is unable to confront this possibility; he refers here no less than nine times to the ‘myth’ of inferiority.

Surveys reveal that in 1989 a surprising 24% of American blacks (compared to only 14% of whites) said the reason blacks had ‘worse jobs, housing and income’ was that they had ‘less inborn ability to learn’ – and if that many admit it, a lot more must actually believe it (*Black Americans’ Views of Racial Inequality: The Dream Deferred*, by Lee Sigelman and Susan Welch [New York: Cambridge University Press], 1991, p. 91).

Consider the experience of Tom K, a Ugandan academic I met in Lesotho. The black editors of a Kenyan newspaper, he told me, had simply refused to believe he could draw cartoons or write crossword puzzles; they were not merely skeptical-yet-willing-to-give-him-a-try, but simply said that *no* black man could do these things.

Black Entrepreneur Learns the Hard Way

On a visit to America in 1991, I spent an afternoon with my black fireman friend, [Don](#). I pressed him on the point that basing judgments on reasonable presumptions is neither racist nor discriminatory, but he wouldn’t buy it.

An hour later, attempting to dissuade a black university student of her socialist inclinations, Don starts talking about his vending machine business (dispensing U.S. postage stamps). ‘Let me tell you something about capitalism’, he begins. ‘A few years ago I took one of my machines down to Joe Blow’s Market [in the black ghetto in Buffalo, NY]. A week later I go back and what do I find? The machine’s gutted; no stamps, no nothin’. Okay. Then I go to Jim Slim’s Snack Bar and leave a machine there. A week later what do I find? Nothin’ left.’ He proceeds to enumerate several such misadventures, with uniform results. ‘Whenever I

ask the store owners what happened, they always say, “I dunno know nuttin’ about it, man!”“

‘Well’, Don says, ‘I simply won’t do business with these people anymore. I’m in business to make money, not to lose it!’ ‘Wait a minute, Don’, I interject. ‘When I said it was not racist or discriminatory to prefer a white over a black based on probabilities, you argued up and down that it was. Now here you are saying the very same thing.’ He laughed. ‘Man, this wasn’t a probability; this was a certainty!’ We all laughed, and he admitted that he had just been arguing for the sake of arguing. And in light of the [Jesse Jackson incident](#), I could now say: ‘If it’s good enough for Jesse Jackson it’s good enough for me!’

Encounter With American Blacks

There were six blacks present, including two university students. They all looked at my book and found it extremely interesting, several wanting to buy copies. They disagreed about some things, but none were offended or insulted. Don’s (black) girlfriend insisted that blacks would buy it in large numbers.

Why so much interest? Well, almost no one, black or white, left or right, ever says anything but rubbish about race. Here was an honest book that talks about things no one else will. Of course they’ll find it fascinating; blacks are as interested in truth as anyone else.

I might also mention the remarkable warmth with which they related to me. Here I was saying the white man was cleverer, and though some were visibly taken aback at hearing someone actually say this, they were friendly to the point of repeatedly shaking my hand. For the first time they were having a frank conversation with a white man about race, and they clearly found it exhilarating.

From a *Newsweek* cover story (6 May 1991, p.26): “How long has it been since you had an honest conversation about race with someone of a different race?” (then-US. Senator) Bill Bradley asked. “If the answer is never, you’re part of the problem”. Nine years later, however, as a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, this same man proceeded to pander to blacks on a level rarely seen even in America, making it palpably obvious that he would be quite incapable of having an honest conversation about race with anyone, black or white. His debate with Al Gore at the Apollo theatre in Harlem could only be described as a contest to see who could most fervidly kiss the most black ass.

Reprise: Skin Colour As an Undesirable Trait vs. As an *Indication of Undesirable*^[E2] Traits

WASSERSTROM discusses racial segregation in the American South.

.... [T]he deep immorality [here is] ... the idea that blacks were fundamentally lesser and degraded persons ... to be controlled and regulated by whites so that whites would not be contaminated [by them]. ... [T]he primary reason why separate *could* never be equal ... [were] these ideas of black racial taint, contamination, and

inferiority Whether ... bathrooms, restaurants, swimming pools, golf courses, public transportation, schools, or the housing or the job market, the problem is not ... how the facilities ... might not have been equal (although it never was equal), but rather ... how the ideology that ... gave meaning to these practices ... could ever be thought ... morally defensible ... concerning the claims of all persons, as persons, to fundamentally equal membership and standing ... [pp.34-35].

Calling blacks ‘fundamentally lesser and degraded persons’ presumably means they are less intelligent, less honest, etc.. But does denying them ‘equal standing’ mean that *every* black is ‘lesser and degraded’ or that on average they are? Whatever Wasserstrom thinks – surprisingly, he never addresses it here – the answer may be found by asking what it means, correspondingly, to *affirm* ‘the claims of all persons to equal membership and standing’. That everyone is intellectually and morally the same? Such an absurdity is beyond even the most ardent egalitarian. It can only mean that everyone should be judged on his merits and not by ‘virtue of their race’ (p.35). As Mr. Visser [says](#): “the colour of people’s skin means nothing”; i.e., in and of itself it doesn’t make one a good person or a bad person, not even a teensie weensie [bit](#).

But again, this does not that colour can’t be the basis for reasonable and justified presumptions, because saying that colour does not make a person good or bad does not preclude one group’s being superior to another. In other words, while colour does not itself make one good or bad, to any degree, it can be an indication of things – such as honesty and trustworthiness – which do contribute to one’s goodness or badness.

In short, asserting average differences between blacks and whites is not racist and does not mean that blacks are ‘lesser and degraded’. The more I think about it the more it seems that this idea of blacks being ‘lesser and degraded persons’ is meant to refer to each and every black ‘person’, and not blacks as a group. (Indeed, the notion of a *group* being ‘degraded’ makes little sense.) The idea that each and every black is ‘tainted’ and ‘inferior’ is certainly racist and something which I think few if any normal people [honestly believe](#). (It is clear, by the way, from [another article](#), that by ‘taint’ Wasserstrom means physical contamination; he specifically uses the word ‘dirty’ and refers to fears that blacks will ‘contaminate bathrooms’ [p.11].)

Personal Hygiene in Africa

My own experience has been that African women are quite fastidious in their personal hygiene, and I have never met one that had any offensive body odour; in the worst slums they somehow manage to bathe. They do, of course, have their own natural bodily scents which (I believe) are peculiar to blacks – as other races presumably do as well. Whether this is offensive to those of other races (as I know it is to some whites) is presumably a matter ‘racial preference’.

Deodorants Aside

As an aside: Can one imagine a more bizarre idea than what is taken for granted by millions of Americans, to wit, that the natural bodily odour of human beings should, under normal circumstances, be offensive to most other members of their own species? If, *per impossible*, this were the case, human beings would never have reproduced sufficiently to maintain their numbers – nor, for that matter, would they have come into existence in the first place. Yet to question the routine use of deodorants, antiperspirants and mouthwashes, is to be met, by the typical American, with unfeigned incredulity.

Questions for Wasserstrom: Are Racial Differences *Possible*? If So, Can One *Honestly Believe* They Exist? If So, How Can Such Beliefs Be Racist and Hence Bad?

I would like to ask Wasserstrom whether the view that whites are, on average, more intelligent and honest is part of this ‘racial ideology’, asserting ‘racial taint’ and ‘inferiority’. If it is, I would ask if it is *possible* that such differences exist. If it is not, I would ask him why – in other words, why this is a *necessary* and *a priori* truth. I don’t think he could give any satisfactory answer. If he admits that such differences *could* exist (though they do not), I would want to know whether one could *honestly believe* they exist. If not, I would want to know why not; to which, again, I don’t think there’s any good answer. But if it is possible for someone to honestly believe there are such differences, and if this is a matter about which honourable people can honourably disagree, then how can a person’s believing they exist be a manifestation of this evil ‘racial ideology’? (See [Appendix A.](#))

On ‘Meritocracy’

In [The Closing of the American Mind](#) (1987), Allan Bloom mistakenly equates meritocracy with egalitarianism (pp.88-91). That aside, it is important to distinguish such *individual*-egalitarianism (‘meritocracy’) from *group*-egalitarianism. The former is not a claim about what *is* the case but about how we ought to behave – that we should treat individuals ‘on their merits’. In this sense I am an egalitarian, both in theory and practice. But it is *group*-egalitarianism which is normally meant by the term and which forms a major underpinning of liberal ideology. It is typically ‘philosophical’ in making the very general – and ostensibly empirical – claim that all groups are essentially the same and hence (e.g.) must have equal political rights. On closer inspection, however, it is anything but empirical, being resistant to any challenge, factual or otherwise. It is all of this which I reject.

More Examples of Good-Making vs. Good-Indicating-Characteristics

Apropos the distinction between making something good vs. merely being an indication that it is good: the sound a car door makes when closing doesn’t make the car good or bad, but it may be an indication of other things which do – solidity of construction (etc.). That an apple is expensive may be *a* reason for not buying it; but if it is very delicious it might, everything

considered, still be worth buying. However, that it is expensive, though outweighed by other considerations for buying it, is still *a* reason for *not* buying it. This is shown by the fact that if you could have bought the same apple for less money it would have been a better buy yet. (This, by the way, is a ‘thought-experiment’.)

But now consider this. That an apple is grown in southern California may be a good indication that it is not a good apple (and hence not worth buying), because ‘hard’ fruits grown in warm climates are typically mushy (as opposed to crunchy and crispy). Crunchiness and crispness *are* things which make an apple good – they are part of what *constitute* its goodness. But the climate in which it was grown, while it may be an indication of whether it is good (i.e., whether it is crisp and crunchy) – as well as a cause – is not itself something by virtue of which it is good or bad.

Thought-Experiments

This is shown by the following **thought-experiment**. Suppose you taste an apple from southern California and to your surprise it is delicious – crunchy and crisp. You would say, ‘Well, I am very surprised, because in spite of being grown in a warm climate this is an excellent apple’. Put in terms of a ‘good buy’, we would say: ‘In spite of being grown in a warm climate this is a good apple and hence worth buying’. It would, however, be absurd to add ‘It is worth buying, but it would have been even a better buy had it been from a colder climate’. That is absurd in precisely the way that ‘It was a good buy but it would have been even a better buy if it had been cheaper’ is not absurd, because the cost of something does make it a better (or worse) buy, whereas its place of origin, while it may be an *indication* of whether it is worth buying (because it is an indication of things which constitute its goodness), is not itself something that ‘contributes’ to its being a good buy.

Similarly, it would be absurd to say, ‘This black man is a good employee, but he would have been better yet if [all else remaining the same] he was white’, in precisely the way that it would *not* be to say, ‘This man is a good employee, but he would have been better yet if [all else the same] he was computer literate’.

‘Real-Life’ Example

I make brownies for a living. A good brownie cake should be dense and chewy and flat on the top. If ‘roundish’, it is likely to be airy and ‘cakey’ (the opposite of dense and chewy) – and hence not a good brownie. Because they are fattening, I try to judge them by appearance.

Recently, I had occasion to discard several cakes that looked too ‘fat’ – which I later discovered were in fact quite acceptable. A friend (a medical doctor) related this to his girlfriend by saying, ‘This man is mad! He threw away several perfectly good brownie cakes because he didn’t like their looks!’. I tried to enlighten him. I was not being aesthetically over-fastidious. I was not saying that the brownie cakes’ (‘fat’) appearance was that *by virtue of which* (I thought) they were not good, but merely that it was an *indication* that they

had *other* qualities (airiness and lightness as opposed to denseness and chewiness), which would indeed have made them unacceptable.

Philosopher's 'Solution': Race Differences Do Not Exist Because Race Itself Does Not Exist!

The last five pages of Wasserstrom's essay deal with 'colour-blindness' and 'racial identity'.

[The essence] of a 'nonracist society' ... is the recognition that [race] is only a matter of appearance and ... a wholly unchosen set of ... superficial characteristics[:] ... skin hue [and] hair texture Given this ..., [a] person's race ... should be [as] irrelevant ...[as] eyecolor [and] height ... [p.37].

Clearly, he would not countenance differences in terms of intelligence or moral character. In fact, the subject of race is so explosive that the only way of dealing with it is to deny its existence altogether! If we really considered race to be unimportant, he says,

There would be no more reason [e.g.] ... to be interested in the race of those [one] might marry than there is ... in whether [they] are tall or short, or brown- or blue-eyed. ... The idea of race as irrelevant appearance, no matter how benign ..., cannot ... coexist with the ... concept of racial intermarriage. For, just as we have no concepts ... of interheight or intereye-color marriages, I see no obvious way to make sense of ... a wholly descriptive, ideologically benign concept ... [of] interracial ones [pp.39-40].

Conclusion?

... [any] conception of a nonracist society which anticipates the preservation of *any* concepts of racial identity and racial difference ... [is inadequate]. [In] a genuinely nonracist society, [any and all] concepts of racial identity will make little if any sense. ... [T]he disappearance ... of all racial concepts will itself be one important indication of that ideal's genuine realization [i.e., of 'the full disappearance of the concepts of racial identity']; [p.41.]

So this is where we end up, after this tortuous journey through the minefield of race in America: 'the concepts of racial identity' will 'make little if any sense', because in a 'nonracist society' 'all racial concepts' would '*disappear*'. It's not merely that we wouldn't be interested in race but that we *couldn't* be because *we wouldn't even know what it was!* Wasserstrom has no inkling of how this profoundly ludicrous conclusion illustrates his hyper-anxiety about race. The only solution to the race problem is simply to deny the existence of race – since if there are no races there cannot possibly be any differences between them! A truly philosophical solution! People like Wasserstrom typically have no hands-on knowledge of Africa, have never had an upfront relationship with American blacks, and yet are completely cocksure of their truly cockamamie ideas.

A Passing Thought For The Simple-Minded

Note, finally, that if there were broad human experience relating eye-colour to certain undesirable traits, eye-colour would be seen as relevant and the notion of intereye-colour marriage almost certainly would exist.

MORE 'ANGER': FEMINISM

'Gender': A Euphemism To Shield Us From ... What?

'Gender' was originally a grammatical term for classifying nouns and only since the rise of feminist ideology has it been drafted as a substitute for 'sex'. One must ask why this was thought necessary. Aside from the pleasure these heterophobes get from 'pushing men around' by telling them what they can and cannot say, one must wonder whether they are so [anti-heterosexual](#) that they felt the need for a euphemism to shield us from something so distasteful that it needs to (somehow) be hidden from view, to wit, sex itself.

Racism, Sexism and Homophobia: The Three Great Shibboleths Of Our Time

Feminism, like anti-racism and the homosexual movement, are all based on '*anger*'. Once you accept the legitimacy of women's 'anger' at men (as with blacks against whites and homosexuals against straights – and, one must now add, Muslims against the West) and you have established a *claim against* them based on the *wrongs* committed *by* them. From that, all the shouting, screaming, 'demands' – and *threats* – follow like night follows day.

Real Sexual Harassment

Examples of feminist sexual harassment – *real* harassment – abound, but here are some typical ones ("Radio Boss Makes Waves Against Sexists: Broadcasters told to mind language", *The Star*, 15 June 1988, p.11):

WELLINGTON – ... Radio New Zealand has banned 151 "sexist" words including manhole, snowman, bridesmaid and masterpiece. ... Under the approving eye of militant women's association ... a dictionary of the forbidden sexist words ... has been issued to employees of the state-owned network. ...

Among the words banned are girl and boy because females over the age of 16 are women Also banned are chairman and spokesman as well as their female alternatives, chairwoman and spokeswoman which must be replaced by the "correct nonsexist terminology – spokesperson".

... actress becomes actor, adulteress becomes adulterer, and instead of airman, broadcasters must use flyer, pilot or aviator. For manhole ...: access hole, utility hole ... or service access. Anchorman[:] ... presenter [or] anchorperson, and even a businessman must be referred to ... as a businessperson, owner, investor, financier or

executive. Churchman is out, in favour of church member and clergyman must become priest or vicar.

Dancing girl is banned and becomes dancer and Dear Sir is replaced by Dear Madam or Sir [and get that order right!]. ... the correct equivalent of Mr. is Ms.

Broadcasters have been instructed to say “any listener can have their say”, instead of “any listener can have his say ...”.

Other banned words include barmaid, fatherland, fireman, fisherman, foreman, gamesmanship, girl Friday, hen party, heroine, landlord, maiden voyage, man over board, master of ceremonies, mother nature, one-man show, paperboy and stewardess. ... – *The Times*.

It is evidently the aim of feminism to do away not merely with terms ‘favouring’ men (‘fireman’, ‘spokesman’ etc.), but any which *distinguish* between the sexes – such as ‘actor’/‘actress’. Just as the wasserstroms of this world wish to do away with [‘racial identity’](#), so feminism is intent on abolishing sexual identity. But without the existence of (two) sexes, there would – of course – be no life on earth. Sexual identity and sexual drive are – obviously – the most important facts about life in the universe; because without sexual drive there would be no life and without sexual identity, i.e., two – different – sexes, there could be no sexual drive.

Perceiving Someone ‘As a Woman’ Is ‘Discriminatory’

Another example of the evils of feminism (in the *Weekly Mail*, 14-20 July 1989, p.14, “The hidden office war: sexual harassment”, by Brian Gold):

Feminists point out that focusing on gender rather than on competence is a subtle form of “harassment” – *the mere perception of an employee, colleague or employer as a woman rather than as a person is “discriminatory”* [emphasis added].

In other words, unless we turn ourselves into (psychological) eunuchs, unaware that women are of the opposite sex (excuse me: ‘gender’), thus denying one of the most essential features of our existence, we will be cast out as pariahs. (See, e.g., [Gender Sanity](#).)

I was advised by a fellow academic – a pacifist Quaker – that if I wished to see a textbook of mine published it must ‘be revised to conform to current standards of gender usage. The rule is ... that no gender specific words ... should be used when the specific gender is not meant, unless the genders are reasonably balanced throughout the text (beginning, for [males], with the feminine gender)’.

Hobbling Speech

It is true that language exhibits a male bias, but this is to be expected since it reflects the reality that males are the dominant sex. I believe this dominance is necessary and inevitable and that it would be folly to try to fundamentally alter it, but in any case, since language is the intrinsic instrument for those most human of activities – thought and communication –

anything making us self-conscious of our speech will hobble it and is hence pernicious. To quote Michael Levin: '[Legislated] linguistic change ... makes people self-conscious about their own language ... Language is the vehicle of thought, ... speakers must be unconscious of choosing their words, if they are to express their thoughts. When we become entangled in decisions about how to talk, we lose contact with the reality our talk is supposed to be about' ([Feminism and Freedom](#), p.252.)

To insist that one must 'conform' to such 'current gender usage' on pain of being an (unpublished) outcast strikes me as an outrageous infringement on freedom of speech, something normally guarded with passionate zeal in America. And yet when it comes to the dreaded 'sexism', (white) males just cave in. As Auberon Waugh says ("Whither the newly empowered American female?", *The Spectator*, 27 February 1993, p.8): "The most terrifying aspect of [militant feminism] is surely the way men have surrendered at every point, exhibiting [extreme] cowardice ...".

Emasculation: Title IX and TV

Since 1972 a federal law in America known as Title IX has required universities to spend equal funds on men's and women's sports. Since there simply isn't the same interest amongst women, this means closing down many men's sports (wrestling, e.g.) in order to 'equalize' expenditures. Other feminist policies with more profound consequences include 'sexual equality' in the police, fire departments and the military. Almost no one dares challenge these unfair, irrational and *emasculating* policies. Most depressing of all is the spectacle on TV and film of women beating the crap out of men – with their fists, karate, guns, you name it. Interestingly, in the real world (or, for that matter, in any imaginary one) one thing you absolutely *never* see is women competing against men in sports. (Indeed, that reality is one of the basic premises underlying Title IX). In short, not only is this Hollywood depiction of female 'dominance' absurdly unrealistic but, given that, what can the explanation for it be other than an ever-increasing attempt at the [emasculating of white males](#)?

'Channeling'

On the issue of 'channeling' boys and girls differently ('encouraging' playing with tanks vs. dolls, etc.): Even if this were true – *and* that it was the 'reason' for the resulting differences – one must still ask, Why *do* we encourage boys and girls in these different directions? Is it just a conspiracy to preserve male dominance? And even if *that* were true, how have men been able to get away with it so easily and for so long?

Steven Goldberg writes ("The Universality of Patriarchy", [Gender Sanity](#), p.140):

Explanations ... that see the differentiated conditioning and socialization of males and females as being of primary causal importance fail because *they do not explain, but merely beg the question*. The question becomes, "Why do all societies socialize

males towards greater dominance behavior?" [Emphasis in original; see Goldberg's [The Inevitability of Patriarchy](#) (1973), reissued as [Why Men Rule](#) (1993)].

Why a World Without Male Aggressiveness 'Won't Work'

In order for reproduction to occur, sexual intercourse is required. That generally requires an erection which in turn normally requires sexual arousal. Sexual arousal requires sexual interest. And however unpalatable to some, the same is not true for women. (Which is just one reason why there is really no such thing as female-male rape.) All of which implies predation and aggression, which, in turn, is facilitated by superior physical strength. (It *cannot* be a coincidence that men are generally stronger than women). In short, male dominance is rooted, at least partly, in the very biomechanics of our sexuality.

It is obvious why two nonaggressive 'sexes' wouldn't work – nothing would ever 'happen' – and only slightly less so why two aggressive ones wouldn't, since a pursuer requires something which is pursued; a dog cannot, for purely logical reasons, chase a cat unless the cat runs away; and it is equally impossible for both to chase each other. And from aggressiveness, dominance follows. While this allows for individual variation, these variations cannot be the norm.

Some might say that if this is true then we must try to change it. To which I would reply first, that we tamper with the fundamentals of nature at our peril; and second, that if I am right we simply cannot, at least not in the long haul, change nature in these ways. In their book [Brain Sex](#) (1989), Ann Moir and David Jessel make the arresting claim that sexual differences are not a matter of averages-with-exceptions (as I have been assuming), but are universal: if you find a top-level female mathematician it is because, either in the womb or as an infant, she was subjected to an excess of male hormones. For 'normal' females, there are not 'fewer'; there are none.

FEMINISM AND THE DECLINE OF THE WEST

Equality Of Opportunity Means Women In the Workforce Is the Norm

I recently asked a friend what his attitude was towards feminism (since he was generally supportive of liberal 'causes'). "Well", he said, "I am certainly for equality of opportunity for women." "So", I replied, "that certainly includes equality of opportunity in the workforce, right?" Of course! – that went without saying. And ideological considerations aside, a fundamental sense of fairness seems to force one to the conclusion that women should be free to work when and where they choose. The idea that they should (somehow) be forced or even encouraged to stay at home, seems too absurd to merit serious consideration.

Low Birthrates and The Menace of Islam

And yet, and yet It is only recently that there has been open acknowledgement that at the root of western decline is *low birth rates*. Two books that focus on this are [*The Death of the West: How Dying Populations and Immigrant Invasions Imperil Our Country and Civilization*](#), by Pat Buchanan (2001) and [*America Alone: The End of the World as We Know It*](#), by Mark Steyn (2008); both show how these demographic changes profoundly undermine the West's ability to resist the threat from Islam.

Working Women Have Fewer Children

Even if, contrary to fact, feminists were justified in their 'demands' and claims of 'injustices', certain facts are beyond dispute. First and foremost is this: *working women do not, will not and cannot, on average, have as many children as women who are not working*. This should not need to be argued, but to be on the safe side let me spell it out. Working women are unlikely to have children during their working lives; if they eventually do have children, it will only be after they've spent several years at university (where they now outnumber men) and then have worked for several years reaping the rewards thereof. Hence, their birthrate must be significantly lower than non-working women. To quote Jeff [Jacoby](#): 'As the number of women in the workforce has soared, many have delayed marriage and childbearing, or decided against them altogether'; and from [Jonathan Last](#): '... 22.5 percent of [white] women never reproduce. The percentage of childlessness ... rises in a straight line with educational attainment.'

Effects of Longer Generations

Note also that even if – again contrary to fact – working women were to have as many children as the non-working, the fact that they would have them at a later age would mean that the *length of generations* would be greater and, other things being equal, that translates into lower birthrates. This is not immediately obvious, and we may think that if women in two population groups have the same average number of children then the birthrates of these groups must be the same. But if in one, women start having children at age 16, while the other one they start at 32, the first group will in fact have *double* the rate of births as the second, since for every generation of the latter, the former will have two.

Feminism, All By Itself, Will Destroy the West

Thus, any society with large numbers of women in the workforce will, of necessity, have a much lower birthrate than otherwise. But equality of opportunity is feminist bedrock. It follows that any society in thrall to feminism must have a low birthrate. *Ergo*, it follows that – all other issues aside – feminism, in and of itself, guarantees the decline and eventual destruction of the West.

SOUTH AFRICAN OPINION AT THE TWILIGHT OF APARTHEID

From Conservative Afrikaner: 'Black rule inevitable'

In *The Citizen* (15 June 1988, p.10), this interesting article about the conservative Afrikaner Prof Carel Boshoff:

**Black rule inevitable – claim
Volkstaat Plan For Afrikaners Outlined
by Brian Stuart**

CAPE TOWN – A new Right-wing [Afrikaner] organization ... says that Black majority rule in South Africa is inevitable. ... [A] return to a policy of separate development is now “totally impracticable”

“Government policy is undeniably heading towards Black domination of the whole of RSA. Minority domination as at present conducted in the RSA is morally unjustifiable and in practice untenable. Citizenship of equal footing for one mixed population leads to ... one-man-one-vote in spite of all claims and statements to the contrary”

But how can white rule be ‘morally unjustifiable’ if it is in almost everyone’s interest? In confirmation of my views – and by coincidence in the same issue of the magazine where I express such [views](#) – a black journalist describes the horrific experience of four black men at the hands of a “people’s court” (“An eye for a burglary, a knee for a theft”, by Abbey Makoe), prompting one of the victims to ask (p.24):

“What kind of society is it going to be if blacks take over government?”

I was shocked [says the black author], but I realized that he was saying what many people with sober minds worry about, and yet seldom speak of.

‘African States Not Fit To Govern Themselves’

Paul Johnson has had the courage to state the obvious (*The Spectator*: “How to restore the good name of colonialism”, 9 January 1993, p.18):

for more than 30 years the international community has been treating symptoms, not causes. The basic cause is obvious but is never publicly admitted: *most African states are not fit to govern themselves*. ... This is what the civilised world must do: go to Africa and govern. ... [But that] will involve abandoning publicly all the humbug and hypocrisies and downright lying of a whole generation of anti-colonialist propaganda. [Emphases added.]

Unfortunately, to abandon this humbug would require *publicly* acknowledging white superiority. And that can’t happen as long as this is considered ‘[offensive to human decency](#)’.

Sam Mabe, Straight-Talking Black

From Sam Mabe (*Sowetan*, 29 June 1988, p. 9: "Let's act now").

... Liberation is not merely wresting power from the Afrikaners. It is also the ability to run and maintain all of the structures we will inherit from the present regime.

If we should be liberated, we will inherit unemployment, homelessness, crime, poverty and everything else that makes us angry

Liberation will not perform miracles It will not overnight give us the skills to run banks, to edit newspapers, to purify water ..., to run hospitals, to manufacture needles for sewing.

Good examples of precisely the mundane, humdrum things absent from most of black Africa. (Sadly, Sam Mabe was murdered in Soweto on 5 July 1990.)

From a Liberal

White Affluence Built On Black Poverty'

From John Kane-Berman, director of the South African Institute of Race Relations, in *The Sowetan* (23 June 1988, p.18: "This is an education that makes no sense: It prepares children for a future that doesn't exist"):

Getting rid of apartheid in education is necessary for three reasons. Firstly, most people want to get rid of it. Secondly, we can't afford to keep it. Thirdly, it makes no sense

Apartheid in education makes no sense because it is preparing children ... for a future that does not exist – an [apartheid] economy. ... [M]ost children are still ... learning prejudices and stereotypes that they will have to unlearn

If by 'prejudices and stereotypes' he means believing that all blacks are useless, he is right; but if he means believing that there are average, group differences, then that is neither a 'prejudice' nor need it be 'unlearned'. On the contrary, it is a truth which will have to be relearned, something most people took for granted a few decades ago, but which they have since 'convinced' themselves cannot be true.

Despite the common view to the contrary, South Africa is not a rich country. White affluence is built not on real national wealth but on black poverty.

Horse manure. Of course if the total wealth of South Africa were evenly distributed between whites and blacks, the *per capita* wealth would be much less than the (*per capita*) wealth of the whites at present, and presumably less than in countries he says are 'wealthier' than South Africa – like Poland, Algeria, Mexico, Panama and Yugoslavia (though he doesn't mention any black countries). But by African standards these *are* wealthy countries, in which services and locally manufactured goods are generally available, etc.

The wealth of South African whites would be unacceptable if they had deliberately *kept* blacks poor, or worse, had stolen their wealth. But the latter obviously isn't true, nor (I would say) is the former. If, instead, the reason for the disparity is a natural difference in ability, then there is nothing obviously reprehensible about it.

In what sense *is* 'white affluence built on black poverty'? Whites have created an industrial economy to which nothing in black Africa remotely bears comparison. They created and maintain the schools, the hospitals, the infrastructure (telephones, water, sewage, electricity, etc.); they created and maintain the mining industry – etc., etc., etc. To argue that it was blacks who 'really' created this wealth is like saying that riveters are the ones who 'really' built the space shuttle! If blacks created the wealth of South Africa, why don't they create it anywhere else?

Caving In: *The Slippery Slope* and *The Thin Wedge*

Kane-Berman demonstrates how the government is retreating on segregated education.

Firstly, attempts to prohibit and then to limit the number of students in white universities have ... been abandoned. Secondly, . . . until recently it was illegal for private schools to admit blacks but [many] ignored this and the Government now even subsidises multiracial private education. Thirdly, the quotas ... to limit the number of black students at white technikons have been lifted In short, apartheid in education is crumbling.

... [t]here is a definite process by which this occurs. At first the Government resists integration. Then in response to pressure it tries to control it, first through a permit system and then through quotas, But in due course the quota system breaks down too, and the educational institutions are then told that they can decide on their admission criteria themselves.

Previously there was only the pressure against apartheid – black opposition to it, backed by a handful of whites. The fact that this pressure is now supplemented by four new ones – the erosion of the Group Areas Act [restricting residential areas to specific races], the desegregation of private schools, the Government's own commitment to educational equality, and the wish of a number of white Government schools to desegregate – means that school apartheid is more vulnerable than ever. Proclaiming states of emergency until the cows come home is unlikely to change this. ...

A good account of an insidious *slippery slope*. And given all of that, it explains – and justifies – instinctive white resistance to the *thin wedge* of allowing even one black into their schools.

Personal Encounter

I met Kane-Berman in 1998. He related a conversation he'd had with Helen Suzman's late husband, in which the latter had pulled him aside and said, somewhat conspiratorially,

‘Don’t you think this question of racial differences is really at the heart of things?’ Kane-Berman said he had not disagreed; it was, he said to me, ‘an important issue and must be discussed’.

I asked him whether he had, since 1994, travelled elsewhere in Africa. No, and he had no desire to! Is that because he knew what a mess these countries were in? Precisely, he said. But if you are aware that blacks make a mess of things, why have you been so relentless all these years in bringing an end to white rule? Apartheid was ‘brutal’, was all he really had to say, to which one could respond by asking: Was it so brutal that the only alternative was to recreate in South Africa the very disaster he now so studiously avoids elsewhere in Africa?’

IS IT UNFAIR FOR WHITES TO BENEFIT DISPROPORTIONATELY FROM THE WEALTH THEY HAVE CREATED?

Patrons vs. Administrators; Neighbourhoods vs. Schools and Hospitals

To begin with, note that white schools and hospitals (e.g.) can withstand more black clientele than they can administrators. There is also a difference between schools and hospitals as compared to neighbourhoods. The former could absorb a sizable number of blacks and still remain viable so long as they remained white-run; but when neighbourhoods become black they are black – end of story.

What will happen when Witwatersrand University (‘Wits’) becomes mostly black? Will the radicals ‘tolerate’ white administrators and faculty? Already [early 1990s] they are clamouring for more ‘senior’ positions which will not only mean bad administration but poor quality faculty, who typically [won’t accept criticism](#) and will do no research etc. In short, Wits will become like other black universities: good at little besides issuing worthless degrees – though I would hasten to add that in terms of interest and natural ability my students in Nigeria were amongst the best I ever had and my years teaching in Africa were probably the most rewarding.

Is It Unfair?

So is it unfair for whites to have better schools and hospitals than blacks? Well, is it reasonable to expect whites to provide everyone with the same facilities *if that means drastically reduced standards for themselves*? Remember, these problems only arise because it is whites who must provide education and health care for blacks, because blacks cannot provide it for themselves. Your bleeding heart will blame all this on apartheid, but the reality is clear from the rest of Africa, where these services are almost nonexistent. (For articles of mine on South Africa under black rule, see [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#).)

It will also be said that the high standards of white health care and education are only possible because of cheap black labour. Yet many places with the best education and health care – Switzerland, Scandinavia, Japan – have few if any blacks.

But even if (in South Africa) there were a modicum of truth to this claim, what is the upshot? If this division of labour is natural and if blacks are better off than they would otherwise be, what is unfair about it? True, blacks provide labour; but they benefit: they are 'taken care of' and are better off than on their own. As long as individual blacks are able to rise to the level of their natural ability – which is not incompatible with white rule – I don't see the injustice of it.

The Problem in a Nutshell

What do we do when we have two groups with vastly different ability and character, one able to cope and the other not? What arrangements will be fair, equitable – and workable? I am saying that there is nothing obviously unfair if the more able group provides for itself better than for the less able group. But if everyone insists on pretending that these differences do not exist, the resulting disparities can only be attributed to 'discrimination'; and then you will have the situation existing today: white guilt and black manipulation thereof, which benefits absolutely no one.

From several recent conversations (in 1989) it seems that universities here have decided they must become black – student-, administration- and faculty-wise. For whites to think they are doing this for the sake of blacks illustrates their profound ignorance. In fact, more than anyone, blacks don't want these universities to become black. After all, why do you think they're so anxious to go there in the first place? The answer (of course) is because they're white!

Paternalism

A letter in *The Star* ("Minimum Wage For Farm Workers Will Destroy Jobs", 16 June 1988, p.17).

... Has anybody considered the "perks" which blacks receive on a farm, which outweigh, by far, the monthly wage and [which] enable [him] to save, which is beyond the capacity of ... the urban labourer ...

Half of my own labour force have at one time worked on the mines ... yet they choose to work on the farm for a fraction of [that] wage

...Why? They have comparative freedom. Their perks include the running of a small herd of cattle each, run together with my own cattle so that their cattle are served by my selected bulls, and enjoy the same licks that my cattle have They have all the firewood that they care to burn, gathered with my tractor and trailer. They receive two issues of clothing a year, four litres of milk per family daily, which is worth a considerable sum of money in town [about R150 (\$60) per month {at 1988 exchange rate}].

If these things were to be taken away from them and money given to them instead, I and other farmers would be left with a dissatisfied workforce.

I forgot to mention free housing, free water and lighting, no worries, no debts, and a happy uninvolved people, who could leave here any day they wished.

J G Speedy
Vryburg

Very interesting details. But still, why should this white farmer be so much wealthier than his black labourers who, though well-off by Third World standards, are poor compared to him? Well, who created this wealth they share – unequally, though not necessarily unfairly? And who sustains it? Whites, of course. Not only are those who stay ‘happy and uninvolved’, but they are *taken care of*. To the extent such **paternalism** is the natural order of things, there is much to be said for it – as long as those who wish to are given the chance to rise above it.

Blacks’ Ability To Maintain Whites’ Legacy

Apropos the ability of blacks to maintain, let alone create, large and complex institutions, note this passage from an article (by a black) bemoaning the terrible conditions in (black) Baragwanath Hospital (*Sowetan*, 23 December 1988, p.6: “Hospitals: Outlook still bad”):

The only private clinic in the country manned by blacks, Lesedi, situated next to Baragwanath Hospital, is according to management a great achievement, but workers say it is a typical Third World health centre, with a shortage of simple equipment such as linen.

I remember asking a [black nurse](#) whether there were any black-run health care facilities in South Africa that ‘worked’ and she said, proudly, yes, there was – and mentioned this clinic. And yet the reality behind this ‘great achievement’ is quite different and is just what you would expect: ‘a typical Third World health centre’ *with no sheets*.

HENDRIK VERWOERD OPPOSED ‘RACIAL DOMINATION’

Verwoerd Accepted Pivotal Liberal Assumption – That the Idea of Racial Superiority Is Wicked

To my surprise, I find that the phenomenon of ‘anti-domination’ attitudes amongst Afrikaners ([above](#)) is not new. The following was written by Hendrik Verwoerd, the architect of apartheid, in 1963:

The essential condition (to a stable and prosperous country) is that *racial domination will have to be removed. As long as domination of one race by another exists there will be resistance and unrest*. Consequently the solution should be sought by means of a policy which is calculated to *eliminate domination in every form and in every respect*. [Emphases added; reference [here](#).]

His assumptions are first, that blacks feel oppressed by whites and hence do not want to be ruled by them – hence ‘resistance and unrest’; and second, that they do want to be ruled by blacks, which implies that they think they *can* rule themselves. Both of which I think are false – that they can and that they think they can. To the extent there is ‘resistance and unrest’ it is largely a creation of liberal thinking, by which I don’t mean that it’s a figment of whites’ imagination, but that it has largely been brought about by liberalism’s self-fulfilling prophecy of insisting it is warranted (because of ‘oppression’) and by blacks learning to take advantage of the [guilt-mentality](#) that lies behind it and so to *act* angry and resentful. (For evidence that some American blacks were consciously aware of this idea at least as far back as 1969, see [here](#).)

‘Bantustans’ Based On Profound Philosophical Error

The crucial assumption, however, is that the very idea of racial superiority is somehow bad and hence cannot be considered in formulating policy. How else do you explain this assertion that blacks feel hatred towards whites and hence don’t want to live under white rule? Whites are forced to think this, because to think otherwise would be to admit that blacks are inferior, and that was taboo – even for Verwoerd in 1963.

And that is a grave philosophical mistake, with disastrous consequences, of which this unworkable *cul-de-sac* of ‘separate development’ (‘Bantustans’) is just one example. There is nothing whatever racist, and hence nothing morally bad, about the idea of one race being, in certain respects, superior to another – and consequently ‘dominant’; and the dogma that there *is* is one of the most self-destructive myths ever invented.

(These quotes of Verwoerd’s are to be found in “Perceptions of Racial Inequality in South Africa”, by Hendrik W van der Merwe, in *Race and Ethnicity*, Hendrik W van der Merwe and Robert A Shirire, eds., [David Philip: Cape Town and London, 1980, p.88]).

PUTTING CART OF REWARD BEFORE HORSE OF INCENTIVE

Paying Blacks More *So That* They Will Be More Productive

I talked with Eric [Leistner](#) about black trade unions and said I thought they were a disaster for South Africa. Well, he said, they certainly have caused black wages to skyrocket. The ‘philosophy’ was that blacks were unproductive because they were paid so little; pay them more and they would work better. Unfortunately it had not turned out so: their productivity remains just as low, but now they’re getting much higher wages, striking at the drop of a hat, and contributing greatly to inflation. It was assumed, *a priori*, that blacks were unproductive because their wages were low, whereas in reality, just the opposite was true, and rather than increasing productivity, paying them more *decreased* it.

An industrial sales rep also told me that since black wages have gone up productivity has gone down; he said he keeps hearing this from people in industry, and I have since heard

this from at least four independent sources: one man in construction, one making steel products, one in a large meat business and one an internationally successful inventor with a large marketing business. Why should paying higher wages lead to a *decrease* in productivity? Well, by increasing someone's wages when he doesn't deserve it you are showing him you are weak and foolish; from which he infers – correctly – that he can get away doing even less.

It has also struck me that this idea of paying people more so that they will be more productive has got human psychology ass-backwards and is putting the cart (of reward) in front of the horse (of incentive). We may tell a slow worker that if he works better he will be rewarded; but we don't *first* 'reward' him in the hope that he'll then work harder! Common sense tells us this will usually produce just the opposite, and only when our behaviour is ruled by white guilt do we ignore such obvious truths. I remember in Papua New Guinea the (white) heads of the my department continually excusing surly and rude behaviour by (black) 'secretaries' because they were 'paid so little' and were always trying to get their salaries raised – which only made things worse.

How Blacks Respond To Discipline

This sales rep described two occasions on which blacks working for him were becoming extremely insolent; he eventually got so annoyed that he actually hit them. From then on, he said, they were not only much more respectful but displayed genuine affection for him, and (he said) liked him precisely *because* he had used a 'strong hand'.

I recall a young Papua New Guinea businessman remarking how much the people there had liked the Germans (when they'd been in New Guinea) because they were stern disciplinarians. 'If you didn't do what you were told, you were simply beaten.' That, he said, was what people there needed, respected – *and* admired.

In his book [A Very Strange Society](#) (1967), Allen Drury visits a 'model prison farm':

Everywhere the emphasis ... appeared to be on rehabilitation. ... prisoners were being trained as domestics, gardeners, construction workers, farmhands. Discipline was firm but relaxed, the officers in charge having that peculiar combination of formality, informality, official reserve yet intimately personalized humor that is the mark of the experienced hand at managing the Natives. There is a certain instinctive ease that such men acquire when they spend their lives dealing with a level of mentality which, despite its vehement defenders elsewhere, is still extremely primitive over vast areas of the continent. The laughter they evoked from the prisoners ... appeared to be quite genuine, the response they were able to get in human terms seemed perfectly sincere: *they liked their charges and their charges appeared to like them* [pp.109-110; emphasis added].

I interpret this to mean that these men needed discipline and liked their warders precisely because they gave it to them – in a ‘firm but relaxed’ way. I’m sure they realized that these white men were helping them, and in a way that few blacks would. The insight Drury has here *vis a vis* black-white relations is of a sort which most whites would not *allow* themselves to have, and it is precisely what has been at the core of my experience: that the black man likes, admires and respects the white man. And why shouldn’t he? Generally speaking the white man treats him much better than his fellow blacks do and he isn’t fool enough not to realize this.

CARGO CULTS

Profound Insight from Black Author

I copy here portions of an article which I had read in Kenya some years ago. It is from a magazine called *South* (May 1983, pp.45-48), which was typically anti-South African; this article is signed ‘Chinweizu’ (a black). It is very much worth reading. (Except where noted, all emphases are added.)

**Decolonising The Economy:
The Spirits Of The Cargo Cults Linger On To Haunt
Modern Development Structures**

... Most [independent African] countries are well into the third decade of post-colonial development effort, but have little to show for it Yet, in industrialised countries ... the fundamental transformation ... into an industrial nation-state was accomplished in approximately 30 years. ...

A fresh look is called for, *free of ideological dogmatism and blind spots*, at the nature and failings of Third World development efforts. ...

... it is useful to begin ... by looking at the *cargo cults* [emphasis in original] which arose in Melanesia in the days of European colonial rule.

The cargo cults believed that the gods and their spirit agents were packing manufactured goods into crates, labelling them with Melanesian names and addresses, and loading them in the holds of ships and planes. When the cargo ... arrived, cult members would be freed forever from the need to work To induce the spirit agents to bring the cargo, devotees had to perform *rituals* involving military parades, flag ceremonies and *meticulous observation of the rules of club organisation*.

In preparation for the expected cargo, airstrips, wharves, and immense warehouses were built. Eventually, the failure of the cargo to arrive would be blamed on the malice of Europeans, who, it was held, had intercepted the shipments, altered the addresses, and diverted the cargo elsewhere.

These cults arose among people who had marginal contact with industrial civilisation, who saw how the few European colonisers in their midst obtained manufactured goods – but who were unable to see, let alone understand, the nature

of the manufacturing and commerce which created and brought these goods to their shores.

Fixing upon some aspects of the behaviour of Europeans, they interpreted them as rituals for obtaining material goods from the gods.

The elites of the Third World may laugh at the naiveté of the cargo cult votaries. *But what has so far passed for development efforts in the Third World bears much resemblance to cargo cult ritualism.* True, Third World elites are far more knowledgeable about industrial civilisation. ... But they still display confusion about the fundamentals of industrial culture, and about how to organise an industrial economy. ... they have invented a *cult of development* whose rituals they enact with much the same devotion and futility as Melanesian cargo cult members devote to theirs.

In present-day counterparts of cargo cults, the great and expected cargo ship ... is a *mysterious process called development*; the industrial countries of the North are the gods and spirit agents; *the magico-religious rites are those of development planning, infrastructure building and foreign investment.* Third World governments have ... drawn up development plans, ... [built] highways, airports, telecommunications systems, warehouses, assembly plants, turnkey factories and industrial parks. ... [plus] universities, think tanks, research agencies and state-owned economic corporations.

... men of business make much of company letterheads, business suits, briefcases, elaborate business cards, and of boardroom titles. ... the men of labour make much of trade unions, strikes and cooperatives. ...

When the first spurt of national infrastructure building failed to produce the desired cargo of development, additional rituals were invented. A ritual of *North-South dialogue* was started to persuade the guardian spirits of development to bring aid, to transfer technology, and to grant better terms of trade. When this ritual also failed, Third World spokesmen resorted to blaming the West for holding up Third World development. Like the Melanesian cargo cult votaries, they accuse 'selfish' Westerners of blocking aid to the Third World, of putting up protectionist barriers against their efforts, and of *avariciously refusing to negotiate away their trading advantage.* They accuse the North of inhumanity, of lack of altruism; and they sourly turn to the building of more infrastructure – international infrastructure, this time – which they hope will solve *the riddle of development.* ...

The failures of Melanesian cargo cults and Third World development result from a superficial understanding of industrial culture. *They have grasped some of its forms, but not its essence.* Predictably, superficial understanding has led to ineffectual recipes. But whereas the failure of the cargo cults is perfectly understandable, given their total lack of acquaintance with industrial production, the failure of Third World elites is not. ...

The development of a national industrial culture contrasts profoundly with *cargo cult maldevelopment* in objectives, priorities and approaches... . In ['genuinely'] developing countries ... productivity holds preeminence over consumption

By contrast, in maldeveloping countries, most of what is consumed is imported. In fact, cargo cult maldevelopment is characterised by the development of consumerism without the prior development of the industrial culture which could produce consumer goods. ...

... Leaders of maldevelopment ... demand the fruits of development but insist on avoiding its costs in social and personal *discipline, investment, talent, effort* It is as if, as the saying goes, *they want to go to paradise but do not want to die*.

... Third World maldevelopers ... see the advanced industrial countries not as pace-setters whose challenge must be met, but as *fairy godfathers* from whom the cargo of industrial products are to be begged or *demande*d, godfathers who are to be damned as demons should they *fail to hand over the goods*.

The practice of referring to Third World countries as developing countries is misleading. There are very few developing countries in the Third World; most are actually maldeveloping. In fact, developing countries are so few among them that it would be more correct to refer to the Third World as the *maldeveloping world*. ...

But circumstances have arisen which threaten the *cargo cult maldevelopment racket*. ...

The International Monetary Fund ... is averse to giving good credit ratings to Third World regimes unless they obey IMF dictates on how to run their economies. But to comply with these conditions would mean reductions in consumption of imports So ... these regimes demand that the terms be revised to their advantage and salvation. Hence their clamour for a *New International Economic Order*. ...

But none of this lobbying and mediating has moved North-South negotiations forward. ... The Third World, in growing desperation, tries to keep alive these elegant, well publicised but futile begging sessions which masquerade as negotiations. ... [The North refuses] to be *guilt-tripped* into public admissions of past exploitation

But the true causes of chronic Third World poverty are rather different from what this cargo cult morality play would have us believe. The prime obstacles to development are [the Third World] elites' *lack of the autonomous will to industrial development* which motivated the capitalist pioneers in the West ...

... Should [Third World elites] realise that the crisis of maldevelopment is indeed terminal, ... [they might] abandon maldevelopment altogether and to go for development. ...

But for all that to happen, the elites must accept that *Third World industrial productivity is the only sure fount of prosperity and power*. ... It must accept that the enterprise of development is one of *inventive hard work*, not of waiting for miracles

of heavenly cargoes, or for the miracles of foreign aid, technology transfers and capital imports.

This is where the failures of the Third World intelligentsia could be a severe handicap. [They] ... need to appreciate ... that *the plunder of the Third World by the West is only one of the factors responsible for Third World poverty* and Western prosperity;

... It is foolish to expect ['dependency relations'] to be dismantled by negotiations, or by the manipulations of whatever strands of guilt some Westerners feel about their history, or by self-righteously denouncing western self-interest.

... The Third World intelligentsia needs to make it clear that development will depend on the will to development, and on strategies which acknowledge northern resistance and hostility, rather than benevolence and charity. The North cannot be expected voluntarily to sacrifice its interests for the benefit of the South.

What Would African 'Development' Look Like?

Surely one of the most insightful pieces ever written about Africa, though I would disagree with his assumption that Africa *can* develop – at least in any way resembling the West. This is not to say that Africa couldn't become self-sufficient, though the model would have to be pre-1976 China, with its labour-intensive agriculture and producing things like alarm clocks and bicycles (exported to Africa!).

That the West itself may not be able to continue living as it does, is another matter. Suffice it to say that if the earth is to be saved from the fruits of Western technology, it will be through the application of the same intelligence that created that technology in the first place. Left to its own devices, Africa would never have threatened the planet, not because of any 'concern' for the environment, but from a lack of those very abilities which distinguish blacks from whites. The white man's brain is, therefore, most certainly a double-edged sword.

Developing Euphemisms

The term 'developing country' is, by the way, a euphemism. They were originally called 'undeveloped'; but that implied too much of a difference with 'developed' countries. So they became 'under-developed': they are (of course!) developed, but just a bit less so. But that still wasn't very nice – 'Who are we to say that they are less developed!' And so, putting the best possible face on things without crossing into the realm of pure fantasy, they suddenly become 'developing' countries, leaving it nice and vague: without having to saying how far they have gotten, they are at least on the right track! This 'progress', achieved by verbal sleight-of-hand, helps no one, since contrary to progressing from undeveloped to underdeveloped to developing, Africa has in reality gone in precisely the opposite direction of 'maldevelopment'.

Cargo Cult Thinking in America

In America, blacks are calling for the re-segregation of schools because “Black males are failing at epidemic rates ... are at the top of all the negative categories – expulsions, suspensions, failures – and at the bottom of all the positive!” They want schools that are all-black, all-male and all-male taught. (From *The Star*: “US blacks bid for own schools”, 27 October 1990, p.6 – reprinted from the *Daily Mail* [London].)

While this idea might have merit, the same could not be said for their absurd attempts to rewrite history (“A fringe history of the world”, by John Leo, *U.S. News & World Report*, 12 November 1990, pp.25-26):

“Since Africa is widely believed to be the birthplace of the human race, it follows that Africa was the birthplace of mathematics and science.”

A ridiculous *non sequitur*, inadvertently indicating, however, that blacks recognize the importance of math and science – *and* of their inability to cope with either.

The new Afrocentric history is not [merely] a collection of random claims to have invented this or that. It is built around a coherent and powerful central myth of stolen black glory and the unjust ascendancy of implacably hostile whites.

From Ali Mazrui (State University of New York at Binghamton):

“The decline of Western civilization might well be at hand. *It is in the interest of humanity that such a decline should take place*”. Leonard Jeffries (City University of New York) ‘dismisses whites as “the ice people”, whose endless savagery is due to lack of melanin, the all-important skin chemical that turns blacks into benign “sun people” and gives them intellectual advantages as well. ... [Asa G] Hilliard [III – of Georgia State University] makes clear that in the “colonial” Western approach to history and academic work, *honest science is never permitted*’ [emphases added].

Would anyone besides guilt-ridden, tail-wagging whites acquiesce to such abuse? Indeed, would it be hurled in the first place were it not clear it would be borne in tame silence?

An assistant superintendent of schools in Washington, D.C. was quoted as saying that it would take 10 years to thoroughly Africanize [our] schools. ... *The Washington Post* reports that “School officials want the change incorporated into every grade and every school, from social studies and physical education to *math and science*” [emphasis added].

In short, as with Melanesian cargo cults and Third World ‘development’, so with American blacks: the more they fail, the more desperate become the ‘explanations’ and ‘remedies’, the only constant being the absence of any suggestion – from these black elite – that blacks themselves could have anything to do with it. Ordinary blacks seem to have more sense

([here](#) and [here](#)), as does [Bill Cosby](#), who castigates blacks for blaming everything on white racism and refusing to take any responsibility for black shortcomings.

Note the similarity between Chinwizu's call for 'inventive hard work' and the observations of Shelby Steele, writing about blacks' increasing lack of success at white universities (*Harper's Magazine*, "The Recoloring of Campus Life", February 1989, pp.47-55):

Blacks can only know they are as good as others when they are, in fact, as good
Nothing under the sun will substitute for this, and no amount of concessions will bring it about.

RECALLING KENYA

'I Don't Want Stories, Excuses or Explanations!'

From 1979 to 1984 I taught Philosophy at the University of Nairobi, during which time the university was frequently closed due to student disturbances. After an attempted coup in August 1982, it shut down for thirteen months.

When we began our juice business (in June 1982) Peter was working for someone who supplied us with passion fruit. One day he asked if we would buy from him directly. Though illiterate and speaking little English, I liked him and trusted him and said I would.

I taught him things. I said, 'Peter, if you say you are going to bring fruit on Tuesday, *you must bring it!* I don't want stories, excuses or explanations. Do you understand?' He looked at me earnestly and said he did. 'And if you really are unable to bring the fruit, then you *must* – absolutely must – let us know so we can make other arrangements. Is that clear?' Again he nodded, sombrely.

In the two and a half years I ran the business there, Peter almost never failed us: come hell or high water he delivered. On those rare occasions when he couldn't we would get a phone call sounding like it was coming from the moon. It was Peter, terribly apologetic. Somehow, he had gotten to a phone – which in rural Kenya could be as rare as hen's teeth.

I say I taught him things because in Africa, taking one's word as a solemn oath and letting someone know if you can't keep it is [rarer than hen's teeth](#). And yet I had no difficulty in teaching him the importance of these ideas. Though our relationship was per force limited, it was nevertheless one of natural affection, respect and trust.

I Drive a Hard Bargain

Another friendship was also with a man who supplied us with passion fruit. He had a small farm in Kiambu, near Nairobi. One day he came to me in distress. He had taken his bus to some 'Asians' to be serviced and if he didn't pay immediately he would lose it. Could I lend him money? How much? He looked doubtful; 'twenty-five thousand shillings', at the time amounting to \$2,500, almost five years wages for an unskilled worker. There was no

question of his getting it from a bank; even less, from another African, though he had 'friends' with more money than I. The only person he could ask was this *mzungu*.

I liked and trusted him and lent him the money. He agreed to repay it in so many bags of passion fruit at the current price. I explained that this might mean having to supply us at a price lower than he might get elsewhere. Shortly thereafter he had further such problems and asked to lend the same amount again. I agreed, on the same terms.

He never let me down. He brought every bag of fruit, even when he had to be losing money on them. I grew to love this man and his family and if I were to return to Kenya I know that he would embrace me with tears in his eyes.

Defining a 'Liberal'

I recall hearing a conservative described as someone who dislikes blacks as a group but likes them as individuals, and a liberal as someone who likes them as a group but dislikes them as individuals. And then I came across [*Black in Selma*](#), by J L Chestnut, Jr.. and Julia Cass (1990). Chestnut, a militant black lawyer from Selma, discusses several relationships of genuine mutual regard he has had with Southerners whose views of blacks, by contemporary standards, would be considered outrageously racist, and reflects (pp.181-82) that

White Southerners have always had warm feelings – even a kind of love – for black individuals, while having a morbid fear – even hatred – of blacks as a group.

What he never admits, however, is that, hatred aside, this is a perfectly reasonable attitude. Their unfeigned and heartfelt affection for individual blacks indicates that they relate to them on merit, and when they find those they like, they do not hesitate – which, I believe, reflects (*genuine*) nonracism. But at the same time, they realize that as a group, blacks are a menace, whose uncontrolled presence can devastate neighbourhoods and schools (etc.).

The 'liberal' attitude, on the other hand, has much less to recommend it. We're not talking here about disliking individual blacks for legitimate reasons (which of course your 'conservative' would also), but rather, disliking blacks *per se*, and consequently (e.g.) *not* forming friendships. Though irrational and genuinely racist, one must ask: with such an attitude, what possible basis could there be for '*liking*' blacks as a *group*? The answer is: none. Meaning that this 'pro-black' attitude is largely BS, based on the principle that talk is cheap.

EXPLORING JOHANNESBURG

My First Time in Soweto

I went to Soweto (an acronym for 'South West Township') in 1988 for the first time, giving a young woman a lift, and it was as bad as my worst expectations. Garbage and litter everywhere, acrid smoke so bad you could hardly see, people wandering around aimlessly. It seemed like not a foot of ground wasn't covered with rubbish.

Many will blame the ‘government’ for not collecting it, yet if people cared they would clean it [themselves](#); but that takes organization and cooperation, neither of which blacks possess in abundance. This girl kept talking about the Baragwanath Siamese twins (two black infants joined at the head and recently separated in Baragwanath Hospital). Blacks were very much aware of the significance of this remarkable surgery. She emphasized several times that their *brains* were together. She said it was much discussed, along with the observation of how incredibly clever the white man was. ‘Will blacks ever be able to something like this?’ No, never, was her unequivocal response. ‘They are too jealous; they hate each other.’

Walkabout: I See The Beginning Of the End

After walking about in the ‘inner suburbs’ of Johannesburg (near the city centre) in July 1988, I record some of my impressions. The area is very pleasant: nice buildings, trees, parks, playgrounds, little shopping areas, libraries, public swimming pools. In many ways like small towns, though part of a very large city. And very middle-class.

When I first went to Yeoville (one of these suburbs) I asked whether there were many blacks there. ‘Oh no’, they said; ‘this is a white area, not like [neighbouring] Hillbrow.’ But they were wrong; I saw several buildings which were all black.

More important is the way blacks have just ‘taken over’. In the parks and playgrounds whites are scarce, with blacks lounging about all over the place – plus rubbish; I saw blacks openly urinating in the street; black children clambering over the swings, slides, climbing apparatus, merry-go-rounds; white children are outnumbered 10 to one. And these are areas that are still predominantly white!

My thoughts on observing this were, first, annoyance. I had just seen the nightmare of Soweto, and my feeling was: it’s not enough they had to make a mess of that place; now they want to do the same here. One look at Soweto and it’s not hard to see why blacks want to live in white areas: by comparison, the least salubrious part of Johannesburg is a paradise.

How Easily Whites Capitulate: Irresoluteness and Weakness of Will

I am sure blacks are astonished at how easily whites cave in; only few years ago they weren’t even allowed into these parks. ‘Here are these wonderful things the white man built, and now he just lets us have them without a fight?’ People in the townships must react with incredulity: ‘What, the white man is just letting us take over? The black children are playing on the swings and the whites just go away? I don’t believe you!’ I remember, my first time in Hillbrow (on a visit in January 1986), someone noting that blacks often tried to sit in a little square (near where we were talking) and the police would chase them away. That was the beginning – ‘testing’.

This invasion stems partly from a court ruling (in the early 1980s) that blacks could not be evicted from white areas (under the Group Areas Act) unless alternative accommodation

was provided. It took several years for blacks to begin arriving in large numbers, partly because they simply could not believe whites would accept it. These were their areas, surely they will not just stand by and let us take them. And they are dumbfounded when this is precisely what happens.

Other factors were the removal of pass laws and influx control in [1986](#). It is difficult for outsiders to appreciate the impact this must have had. Put starkly: it is the difference between control and loss of control, which is all the difference in the world. The other day I saw a black casually urinating against the wall of a house. A drunken coloured woman recently walked into the entranceway of my building and proceeded to urinate on the tiled floor! In the playground I noticed a swinging teeter-totter with its very heavy wooden plank broken in half (and the one next to it with a broken chain), illustrating not only blacks' destructiveness but more important, the inability – and unwillingness – of whites to any longer exercise control.

Shiva Naipaul

In Shiva Naipaul's novel [A Hot Country](#) (p.104) there is this trenchant observation, attributed to 'a Lawrence novel':

'Ah the dark races (she read) ... the dark races belong to a bygone cycle of humanity. ... They can only follow as servants. ... *Let the white man once have a misgiving about his own leadership, and the dark races will at once attack him, to pull him down into the old gulfs* [my emphasis].'

This is basically what is happening in South Africa, and it is the white man's fatal irresoluteness and weakness of will, stemming from his (largely false) guilt, that is responsible for it.

THE PARADOX OF INTEGRATION

Too Many Blacks Means Destruction of the Very Things They Want

Lemming-Like Behaviour

It will be a terrible crime if these neighbourhoods are destroyed. The understandable desire of blacks to live in white areas and to go to white schools is a paradox, because if a lot of blacks satisfy this desire, they will cease to *be* white and hence cease to be what they wanted in the first place. By its very nature, such 'integration' is possible only in limited numbers; if not controlled it is inherently self-defeating. Just as in physics, where attempting to 'see' light alters the very thing we wish to observe, blacks' desire to live in white neighbourhoods and attend white schools, will destroy the very things they desire. (But good luck trying to explain this to blacks – as, lemming-like, they swarm white schools and neighbourhoods – since, a bit paradoxical itself, this reasoning is too [abstract](#) for most blacks to grasp.)

If You Allow One, How Do You Stop Others?

Sunday Times (3 July 1988, p.2, “Black family on a white tightrope”):

... Khaya [Ngqula] and his family ... are one of a number of black ... families living in “white” residential areas ... who could be removed by Ministerial edict. ...

“I’ve had no problems with any of the people here. We have more in common than the things that are different. We have a drink and a chat. We talk about sports ... all the normal things. ...”

A nearby council worker ... said: “I’ve nothing against them personally. But *if you allow one black family to move in, how can you stop others from doing the same?*”

[Emphasis added.]

I’m sure he has ‘nothing against them personally’. The crucial question is: if you allow one, how *can* you stop others, and hence stop the neighborhood from becoming too black? The connection is two-fold: *causal*, in that if some do, others are more likely to; and *logical* in that if it’s okay for this family it must be okay for that one, etc..

The position of most whites would be: if some blacks moving in meant the neighborhood becoming *too* black we’d be against it; if some could live here without this happening, we wouldn’t mind. This fear of black inundation is justifiable on two counts: that the end result would be undesirable, and that there is a real danger of this happening – and is not, *per se*, racist in any way, shape or form.

The ‘Thin Wedge’ Again

Whites’ Fears a Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

Though the Group Areas Act was repealed in 1991, it is still apparently legal for landlords to refuse someone because of race – though few would do so openly. A Malay-coloured friend says that whenever she inquires from an estate agent she is told that she can have a flat in such and such a building where they’re renting to blacks. But (she says) she wants to live in a white building!

One can sympathize with her; black buildings are generally noisy, dirty and dangerous. But (I said to her), while you may be a good tenant, the landlord doesn’t know that; all he knows is that blacks are often trouble and hence that there is a risk that you will be trouble. Even if he knew you’d be a good tenant, he may worry about the building eventually becoming all black – that you, in other words, will be the ‘thin wedge’. Others will say: ‘You’ve already rented to one black – why not to me?’. And once a few blacks move in, whites will start moving out, leaving the landlord with no one to rent to but blacks, thereby making such white fears something of a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Moreover, you have the same paradox. She wants to live in a white building, but if any and all blacks who want to can live there it will soon cease to be what she wants: a white building!

What's Needed Is Frankness

If there was frankness, whites could say to blacks: “You know as well as we do that if too many blacks live here it will be spoiled for everyone – *and*, that the reason you wish to live here is because it’s white. If whites know the neighbourhood won’t become too black, maybe they won’t leave and we can avoid destroying the neighbourhood – to everyone’s [benefit](#)”.

A black teenager in Washington, D.C. illustrates just such forthrightness when he expresses a desire to live in a ‘half-white, half-black neighborhood’: “I just figure an all-black neighborhood will be bad” ([Crossings: A White Man’s Journey into Black America](#), by Walt Harrington, 1992, p.174; emphasis added). He would no doubt regard what I have said as the merest truism.

THE PROS AND CONS OF APARTHEID

Whenever You Have Rules Separating Races, There Are Bound To Be Inequities

An Orthodox Jewish friend happened to look at this book. Though his political views were to the right of mine, he began reflecting on some of the injustices of apartheid. Twenty years ago, their maid, whom they liked very much, had been forced to go back to the homelands when her husband had been murdered, because while he had ‘rights’ to [live in the township](#), she didn’t. The unreasonableness of this had stuck in his mind.

I also spoke (in the early 1990s) to a young Afrikaner in the construction business. No bleeding heart, he called blacks ‘munts’ and said they smelled. And yet he recalled how maddening the apartheid bureaucracy could be. He could only hire from a group of ‘registered’ blacks who, realizing he was a ‘captive’ employer, made themselves very ‘difficult’. He was thankful those days were long gone.

Whenever you have such regulations, you are bound, even with the best will in the world, to have inequities, with individuals treated unfairly; but that doesn’t mean the system itself is iniquitous. To be sure, Afrikaner bureaucracy is often ham-fisted and no doubt there are many Afrikaners who hate blacks, giving them further reason to enforce the laws harshly. Nevertheless, the reason for Influx Control and Pass Laws was essentially to *exercise control over blacks*; and given the realities of South Africa – black behaviour, racial demographics, how blacks abuse authority – I don’t think the desire to exert such control was bad *per se*.

Apartheid Aimed At Keeping Blacks Out of White *And* Black Areas

The aim of these laws was at least twofold. First, to keep blacks out of white areas – which was neither unreasonable nor racist. But second, the Afrikaners also wanted to limit their numbers in *black* urban areas, like Soweto. I suspect this was based on an instinctive realization that for blacks to live in large urban agglomerations meant trouble, that blacks simply could not handle an urban environment, and that once they became disenchanted with their own environs, would look covetously towards the ‘nice’ white areas – which is precisely what has happened.

Indeed, blacks may well have been better off in rural areas. Certainly the American experience in which millions left the rural South for the urban industrial North – with the calamitous conditions in which many of them now live (illegitimacy and the near total breakdown of family life, rampant drug abuse and violent crime, *etc.*) – offers some support for this view. Two books, both by liberals, document this in concrete detail. [*The Promised Land: The Great Black Migration and How It Changed America*](#), by Nicholas Lemann (1991) and [*There Are No Children Here: The Story of Two Boys Growing Up in the Other America*](#), by Alex Kotlowitz (1991).

Grievous Error In Whites’ Thinking

Even if the apartheid regime was as bad as everyone says, many whites have made the error of confusing the idea that ‘*This* (white) government is bad’ with the very different idea that ‘White minority rule – *as such* – is bad’, and hence have ended up opposing white rule *per se* rather than *this white government* (and its policies). Most *apropos* here is the slogan of Jan Smuts’ United Party, voted out of power in 1948: “White leadership with justice”. However cruel and vicious the Nationalist government may have been, no one could have had any serious doubts – then or now – that in the long run almost any black government would be worse by several magnitudes.

Liberal Jewish Activist Advocates Apartheid

In Jim Sleeper’s [*The Closest of Strangers*](#) (1997), I learn that the ‘well-known [Jewish] activist for economic and racial justice’ (p.122), Saul Alinsky, ‘proposed that all-white communities agree to accept blacks up to but not exceeding 5 percent of each neighbourhood’s population. ... [The] proposal was a crude concession to white racism, Alinsky acknowledged; but, given whites’ bitter experiences with the dynamics of neighbourhood change, there was no other way, and it was better than nothing’ (p.147). (Sleeper’s reference is to [*Making the Second Ghetto*](#), 1983, p.209.)

Extraordinary that such a committed liberal should end up advocating apartheid, admitting that ‘there is no other way’. Of course by describing white reluctance as ‘crude racism’ he guarantees failure, for given that it’s ‘racist’, the black radicals and white liberals will know they can undermine it with impunity (and if it really is racist, rightfully so), while whites

asked to 'take in' blacks will think, 'We've been found "guilty" – so why should we do it?'. The only way such a scheme could succeed is if it were recognized – upfront, as by our [black D.C. teenager](#) – that white (*and* black) fears of blacks in their neighbourhood are fundamentally legitimate and not racist. (See also [here](#) and [here](#).)

BLACK DEFICIENCY IN ABSTRACT THINKING, AS SUPPORTED BY THE ENGLISH-ZULU DICTIONARY

'Why Do You Need a Dictionary?' Written vs. Oral Languages

My first inklings regarding African languages arose from a conversation with students in Nigeria about a coconut in a tree. How would you say where the coconut was – e.g., that it was about halfway up the tree? You couldn't say that; all you could say is that it was 'up!'. Right at the top? Nope; just 'up!'. In other words, no gradations.

A few years later in Nairobi, two women expressed surprise that I had an English dictionary. Isn't English your language? Yes, I said; it's my only language. Then why do you need a dictionary? They were puzzled that I needed an English dictionary and I was puzzled by their puzzlement. There are always times, I said, when you come across a word you're not sure about and so you look it up. But if English is your language, they said, how can there be words you don't know? *What?* I said. No one knows all the words of his language.

But we know all the words of Kikuyu; every Kikuyu does. *What?* (even more surprised). Eventually it dawned on me: being entirely oral, their language existed only in the minds of its speakers. But given blacks' lack of curiosity and the absence of any external input, the overall size of such a language will remain more or less constant – and, pretty much stagnant. And since such a language exists only in the minds of its speakers, they *must* know all its words, because if they don't know them, where else could they be? A written language, on the other hand, existing as it does partly in the written word, can grow beyond the capacity of anyone to know it in its entirety.

Important Consequences

But if the size of a language is limited, it follows that the number of *concepts* will also be limited and hence that both the language and the thinking will be impoverished. African languages were, of necessity, sufficient in their pre-colonial context, and are impoverished only in contrast to Western languages and in an Africa wanting to live like the West – which, for better or worse, they certainly do. While numerous dictionaries have been compiled *between* European and African languages there are few *intra*-African dictionaries, precisely because native speakers have no need for them. (I once had a Zulu-Zulu dictionary – more like a lexicon, really; it was a small format paperback 252 pages long.)

The Concept of Precision

My queries into Zulu began when I rang the African Language Dept at the University of Witwatersrand and spoke to a white guy. I asked him whether 'precision' existed in Zulu prior to European contact. "Oh" he said, "that's a very Eurocentric question!" and refused to answer. I rang again, spoke to another white, with the identical result.

So I called the University of South Africa (UNISA), the large correspondence university in Pretoria, and spoke to a young black man. What was the Zulu entry for 'precision'. 'To make like a straight line', he said. Was this part of indigenous Zulu? No; this was added.

As has been my experience in Africa, we got along like a house afire. I explained my interest in Zulu. He understood and found my questions of great interest.

The Nature of Abstract Entities

Before going any further, let us consider the nature of abstract entities. First, they are usually intangible and can't be perceived by the senses. The number seven is prime; this *primeness*, however, cannot be seen, felt or heard; it can only be perceived by the *mind*. Further, abstract entities are often things which *do not exist*. 'What would happen if everyone threw rubbish everywhere?' refers to something that *could* happen but hopefully will *not* happen. Nevertheless, we can think about it.

Everything we observe occurs *in* time and everything we see exists *in* space; yet we perceive neither with our senses, but only with the mind. Precision is also abstract; while we can see and touch things made with precision, precision itself can only be grasped by the mind.

Acquiring Abstract Concepts Requires Self-Consciousness

How do we acquire abstract concepts? Is it enough, e.g., to *make* things with precision to have the *concept* of it? Africans make excellent carvings, made with precision. So why isn't the word in their language? Well, to have the concept of precision we must not only *deal* with precision but must become *aware* that there *is* such a thing and then give it a name.

How, e.g., do we acquire such concepts as *belief* and *doubt*? We all *have* beliefs; even animals do. When a dog wags its tail on hearing his master's footsteps, it believes that he is coming. But it has no *concept* of belief because it has no awareness *that it has* this belief and so has no awareness of belief *per se*; in short, it has no *self*-consciousness.

A rat conditioned to expect food after pressing a bar but who then finds that sometimes it doesn't come, will begin *doubting* whether the bar will bring food; but it does not have the *concept* because it lacks the self-consciousness needed to become aware of the *state of mind* we call doubt.

The Concept of Promising In Zulu: *'I'll try'*

After discussing 'precision' (with the [black guy](#) at UNISA), he assured me it was otherwise for 'promise'. Hmm? How about 'obligation'? We looked it up. The Zulu entry means 'as if to bind one's feet'. No, he said; that was added. But if Zulu didn't contain the concept of obligation, how could it contain the concept of a promise, since a promise is simply the oral undertaking of an obligation? For him this was a 'light-bulb' experience. I was interested in this, I said, because Africans so often failed to keep promises, *and*, never apologized – as if it didn't warrant one.

Yes, he said; in fact, the Zulu word for promise – *isithembiso* – is not the correct word. When a black person 'promises' he means *'maybe I will and maybe I won't'*. But, I said, this makes nonsense of promising, whose very *raison d'être* is to bind one to a course of action. When one is not sure he can do something he will say, 'I will try, but I can't promise'. He said he'd heard whites say that and had never understood it till now. In other words, as a young Roumanian friend so aptly summed it up, when a black person 'promises' he means *'I'll try'*!

The problem here is clearly not linguistic. If it was, blacks would long since have learned the correct meaning; nor can it be a coincidence that the exact same 'problem' happens to occur in Nigeria, Kenya and Papua New Guinea. Much more likely is that they lack the very *concept* and hence *cannot* give the word its correct meaning. And that almost certainly reflects an intellectual incapacity.

FW de Klerk Addresses This Very Issue

In his decidedly milquetoast-quality book [The Last Trek](#) (1998), the last white president of South Africa, FW de Klerk, pointedly mentions the ANC's consistent failure to keep solemn commitments and agreements. Referring to a speech during the pre-1994 negotiations, he says:

... Mandela was coldly furious about my sharp attack on the ANC and its *failure to honour its agreements*, and insisted on a second turn to speak. His speech, labeled a tirade by the press, was one of the most vicious personal attacks on a political opponent that most of those present ... had ever heard. He accused me of being the head of an illegitimate, discredited minority regime and of being *incapable of upholding moral standards* ... [a]s he piled insult on insult [p.233; emphasis added].

Mandela Responds In Typical African Fashion: *BDO* and Arrogance

Note how this illustrates an apparent failure to understand the very *concept* of a commitment and its attendant obligations. Mandela acts as if he doesn't realize he's even *made* agreements and shows no indication of understanding their significance. He never, however, denies that such agreements were made nor does he claim they were (somehow)

kept; all of that's irrelevant. Nor – of course – does he admit not having kept them. Instead, he attacks, demonstrating that *the best defense is an offence* ([BDO](#)).

Mandela's intemperate outburst illustrates the arrogance of a black elite: I am an important person and am not to be criticized! If this is the attitude of [tin-pot academic tyrants](#) in backwater-African-universities, what can you expect from a man, said to be of royal lineage, about to become president of the most powerful country in Africa? Finally – and true to form (and as a corollary of the-BDO) – Mandela accuses De Klerk precisely of which he himself appears guilty, viz., 'being incapable of upholding moral standards'!

'Good-Cop-Bad-Cop': Black Psychological Shrewdness

The next day Mandela acts as if all this never happened. Instead, like children with their mercurial temperaments and short memories, Mandela

[began], once again, to adopt a reconciliatory tone. He played down his attack on me as something which had to be said, but was now over and done with. The following morning he and Ramaphosa made a special point of walking across the hall to shake my hand (p.224)

illustrating, I believe, not magnanimity but the absence of any genuine anger in the first place and instead, typically shrewd black psychological manipulation through *sham* anger. I suspect that this 'hot-and-cold' routine is (instinctively) meant to *wrong-foot* one's opponent, a bit like the good-cop-bad-cop technique, making the 'victim' pathetically grateful for any behaviour even remotely reasonable.

Making the Abstract Concrete

Note the huge significance of the Zulu definition of 'obligation' — *as if to bind one's feet*. An obligation binds you, but it does so *morally*, not physically. It is abstract: you can't see it, hear it, or touch it – which of course is precisely why there is no such word in Zulu. So what have the dictionary's authors done? They have taken an abstract concept and *made it concrete*: feet, rope and tying are all tangible and observable – and therefore things that (*all*) blacks will (*fully*) understand, precisely as they will *not* (*all*) understand what an obligation is. The fact that they *had* to define it in this way is, therefore, all by itself, compelling evidence for my thesis that Zulu thought lacks abstract concepts and, indirectly, for my claim that blacks are deficient in abstract thinking.

A woman working with severely retarded children, mentioned, without any prompting, that these children's thinking was extremely 'tangible': to understand something they had to see it and touch it – in other words, it had to be present to their senses – meaning that they were incapable of thinking of things which *did not exist*.

But if these children with IQs of 50 are less capable of abstract thought than those with IQs of (say) 70, it follows that the latter would be less capable than those with IQs of 100; etc.. And since the concepts of time and the future are amongst the most abstract, people of

lower IQ will have less grasp of the future than those with a higher IQ, and that there must be a significant correlation between IQ and the ability to understand time and the future. Hence, if blacks have a lower average IQ than whites, it would follow that they have less of an understanding of time and the future.

Blacks and Time

My thinking about this began in 1998. As I pulled into my garage (behind my apartment building), several Francophone Africans drove up and stopped right in front of my garage. 'Hey', I said, 'you can't park here!' *Perfectly friendly and respectful*, they asked 'Oh, are you leaving [*now*]?' 'No', I said, 'but' (stating what one would think was the utterly obvious) 'I might later.' 'Park over there' – and they did.

The point is, their thinking seemed to encompass only *the here and now*: if you're leaving [*now*], we understand; but otherwise, what's the problem? I had further such encounters and the key question was always 'Are you leaving [*now*]?'

Future, Time and Space All the Same Word in Zulu

The future doesn't exist; it *will* exist but doesn't exist *now*. People who have difficulty in thinking of things which do not exist, will *ipso facto* have difficulty thinking of the future.

It appears that the Zulu entry for future – *isikhati* – is the *same* word as the word for time, *as well as* the word for *space*. In other words, *none of these concepts exist in Zulu thought*, period. It also appears that there is no word for *the past* – meaning, the time preceding the present. This should not be surprising since the past no *longer* exists, just as the future does not *yet* exist. Hence, people who have difficulty in thinking of things which do not exist will have difficulty in thinking of the *past* as well as the future. This has an obvious bearing on things like *gratitude* and *loyalty* – both of which are noticeably uncommon in blacks.

The reader may wonder why it took me more than twenty years to notice these things. Briefly, I think it is because our assumptions about time are so bed-rock that we're not even aware of having them and so are equally unaware that anyone might *not* have them. Consequently this possibility is simply *not on our radar* – and so of course we don't see it even when it stares us in the face.

A Metaphysical Argument Regarding Time

Imagine the universe as an absolute void containing not a single particle of matter and in which, therefore, nothing ever happened and in which there was hence no change (since there was nothing *to* change). In such a universe (the reasoning goes) there would be no time, since time requires change.

Now consider traditional African society as it existed for millennia before any outside contact. It was essentially static: On a macro level, little if anything happened and there was

little if any change. A visitor returning after hundreds of years would hardly notice a difference: the habits, the customs, the food, the dress, the medicines, the language, the (absence of) technology, science and literature would be the same. In terms of human development there would be a void.

But if the absence of change means the absence of time passing, then to the extent that African society remained static it would be fair to say that in fact there was indeed neither past nor future. With no real history, and no reason to anticipate the future, such concepts would have had little if any purchase, and hence would have been unlikely to have arisen in their mental repertoire. As is still largely the case, there would only be the here and now.

Where Blacks *Do* Pay Attention To Time

Interestingly, there are areas where blacks do notice time. They see crops planted, growing and then harvested; they see children born, grow old and die; and, they plan for their funerals, because death is a certainty, while ill health is only a *risk*. (The Zulu entries for 'risk' mean 'danger' and 'a slippery surface'.) Furthermore, death is concrete and observable. In short, blacks tend to be aware of time when it is manifested in concrete, observable objects and events.

Math and Geometry: A Problem for South African *and* American Blacks

A quote from an article noting the problems South African blacks have with mathematics ("Finding New Languages for Maths and Science", *The Star* [Johannesburg]; 24-Jul-02, p.8):

[Xhosa] is a language where *polygon and plane have the same definition*; ... where concepts like triangle, quadrilateral, pentagon, hexagon *are defined by only one word*.

In other words, it is a language in which these concepts simply *do not exist*. In America blacks are said to have a 'tendency to approximate [space, numbers and time](#) instead of aiming for complete accuracy'. In other words, they are also poor at math. Notice the *identical triumvirate* of abstract concepts – space, numbers and time – none of which can be seen, heard or touched. Is it just a coincidence that *these* are the concepts with which blacks – *everywhere* – seem to have such difficulties?

The Zulu entry for 'number', by the way – *ningi* – means *numerous*, which is *not* the same as the concept of *number*. It is clear, therefore, that there is no concept of *number* in Zulu.

Maintenance

White rule in South Africa ended in 1994. It was about ten years later that power outages began, which have now (2007) reached crisis proportions. Part of the problem is the government's failure to build more power plants, in spite of being specifically warned about

this in 1999. More generally, it is the breakdown of existing power plants due to lack of maintenance. Maintenance is future-oriented, the Zulu entry for which is *ondla*, which means: '1. Nourish, rear; bring up; 2. Keep an eye on; watch (your crop)'.

In short, *there is no such thing as maintenance in Zulu thought*, and it would be hard to argue that the absence of this concept has nothing to do with the fact that throughout Africa, the phrase '*nothing works*' is only an exaggeration.

Motivation and Ambition

An article in *The New York Times* ("[Schools Plan to Pay Cash for Marks](#)", by Jennifer Medina, 19 June 2007) reveals that New York City is considering a plan (since implemented) aimed at getting blacks to do 'well on standardized tests and to show up for class', which could 'earn [them] as much as \$500 a year'. Adults would be rewarded for 'keeping a full-time job ... having health insurance ... and attending parent-teacher conferences'. Students would be paid for doing well on tests and sometimes just for taking them, as well as for regular attendance and for each book they read.

The clear implication is that blacks are not very motivated. Motivation involves thinking about the future and hence about things which do not exist. Given black deficiencies in this regard, it is not surprising that they would be thus lacking, and having to *prod* them is further evidence for this.

The Zulu entry for 'motivate' is *banga*, under which I find '1. Make, cause, produce something unpleasant; ... to cause trouble 2. Contend over a claim; ... fight over inheritance; ... 3. Make for, aim at, journey towards ...:'. But when I ask blacks what *banga* means, they have no idea, which tells me that whatever it means it does not mean motivation. Clearly this is a *substitute* definition – choosing the 'closest' Zulu word – as opposed to a *constructed* definition ('as if to bind one's feet').

In fact, no word in Zulu *could* refer to motivation for the simple reason that there *is* no such concept in Zulu; and if there is no such concept there *cannot* be a word for 'it' – precisely because in Zulu there *is* no 'it'. Hence the need to entice blacks into behaving *as if* they were motivated.

The entry for 'ambition' is *langazela*, which simply means 'desire' or 'longing'. Compare this to the *Encarta Dictionary*: 'desire for success: a strong feeling of wanting to be successful in life and achieve great things' [*in the future*], which is a good description of precisely what blacks tend to lack.

An Evolutionary Explanation

One explanation for this lack of abstract thinking, including the diminished understanding of time, is that blacks evolved in a climate where they were able to live day to day without

having to think ahead; they never developed the ability to think of things which didn't exist because there was no *need* to. Whites, on the other hand, evolved in circumstances where they *did* have to develop this ability – like thinking about what would happen *if* they didn't build stout houses and store enough fuel and food for the winter – since otherwise they simply would not have survived.

Moral Shamelessness

The [same New York Times article](#) mentions a Darwin Davis of 'the Urban League' as 'caution[ing] that the ... money being offered [remember, this is for *attending class*] was relatively paltry ... wondering ... how many tests students would need to pass to buy the latest video game'!

Instead of being shamed by the need for such a plan, he bitches that it's not enough! If he is unaware of how gross his remark is, he is morally obtuse. Even so, you would still expect him to know that most people *would* find it offensive. In fact, however, this is precisely [how blacks often do 'understand' morality](#) – as what others tell them or expect them to do. Yet for many blacks even this externally-based morality has failed to take hold – which makes sense, because this 'morality' is dependent on *enforcers*, and since these have disappeared, there is nothing left, neither internalized morality (the 'real thing') nor the external. One result is [moral opacity](#).

BLACK MUSICALITY AND RHYTHMICITY

What Would Be the Evolutionary Purpose of Black Rhythmicity?

I recall an argument with a black female academic in Lesotho who disputed the existence of African rhythmicity. What, she asked, would have been its evolutionary survival-value? Well, I said, while rhythmicity may not, in and of itself, have survival value, it is a *by-product* of *other* attributes, such as physical agility, which do. Blacks evolved in an environment where physical strength and agility had such value, but where they didn't have to think ahead, as the white man did. Hence, the whites developed abilities necessary for survival in his harsh environment – 'abstract intelligence' – while the blacks developed those of value in his – such as agility. And, people who have more 'hand to eye coordination' will tend to be more rhythmic. (See the Malaysian prime minister's explanation for differences between [Chinese and Malays](#), as well as J Philippe Rushton's [Race, Evolution, and Behavior](#) (1995), pp.228-231, including a reference to R Lynn, "The evolution of racial differences in intelligence" [1991], *Mankind Quarterly*, vol. 21, pp.89-91.)

An 'Artifact' Theory of Female Orgasm

Glenn Wilson, in his excellent book [The Great Sex Divide](#) (1992), mentions an analogous "'artifact' theory of female orgasm" (p.90). For simplicity's sake 'genetic blueprints for

males and females remain as similar as possible without incurring reproductive disadvantage'; hence, females 'share with males the basic neurological mechanisms that underlie a capacity which is biologically important only for males'. Just as African rhythmicity is an offshoot of something which has survival-value, so with female orgasm: given male orgasm (which has survival-value), it was 'easiest', from an evolutionary point of view, for females to have it as well, even if, for them, it had no such value. It would be as if someone used a common frame component for bicycles and tricycles; rather than remove the kickstand-bracket for the tricycles, it's easier to leave it on; and so you end up with a tricycle having a completely useless bracket – but for a perfectly good reason. (Wilson cites Donald Symons' [The Evolution of Human Sexuality](#), 1979.)

Evidence For Black Rhythmicity

I have frequently seen very young black children dancing to music, and when I asked their mothers if this was unusual, they said no, all children did it; yet I have never heard of a white child doing this.

Liberals will insist that these children must have been 'encouraged' (etc.). But in the case of Carol Njeri, the Kikuyu child who grew up in my house from birth (in 1981) until I left Kenya (in 1984), there was almost no music. Yet, sitting up at six months, and hearing music for virtually the first time, she responded in the most entrancing manner, moving her torso, her arms, her head, her forearms and – I swear (though I must be mistaken about this) – she seemed to be trying to snap her fingers! When she could stand, a Walkman on her ears and she was transfixed – and transformed! The dancing this produced was phenomenal. If there is any explanation for this other than instinct, I'd like to know what it is.

[Alan Drury](#) refers to

'... the beautiful voices [of the black prison choir] and the instinctive rhythm which, ... despite the indignant protests of a certain school of thought elsewhere, really is a distinct and definable racial characteristic ... (p.110).

Note that in spite of 'indignant protests', he felt free – in 1967 – to say this, as he probably would not have twenty years later. [Jared Taylor](#) remarks: 'After a lifetime of service to Africans, Dr. Albert Schweitzer said, in 1961, "They [Africans] have neither the intellectual, mental, or emotional abilities to ... share equally with white men in any of the functions of our civilization". ... Public expression of such sentiments by prominent men was common until a few decades ago' (p.239). Equally surprising views were held, among many others, by presidents Harry Truman and [Abraham Lincoln](#).

An Extraordinary Aspect of Black Musicality

Harmonizing Extemporaneously

A discussion (in 1997) with a white woman having experience teaching music to black children confirmed something I had long suspected. I myself am very musical; at the age of

four, I could play tunes on a piano and was able to sing in tune well before that. But one thing I could never do is extemporaneously *harmonize*. Yet I seem to have witnessed blacks doing precisely that on several occasions, and my conversation with this teacher confirmed this. (Note that to sing in harmony, one must sing a different note from the melody, usually lower in pitch, but not always the same number of notes lower, so that there is no general rule by which one can know what note will harmonize.) As musical as I am, I cannot imagine ‘just doing’ this; and yet apparently many blacks can.

If this is so, it would seem quite an amazing fact about black musicality, one which surely deserves attention. I remember that the mother of Carol [Njeri](#) was virtually tone deaf and could not begin to carry a tune. This is what one might expect, given that the ability to carry a tune (especially as a child) is correlated with higher than average IQ. And yet it appears that many blacks are supererogatory and can do something much more difficult! (Several acquaintances with a musical bent agree with this assessment of difficulty, so much so that some were frankly skeptical of my factual claims here.)

Black Acting Ability

[This same woman](#) and I also discussed why many blacks are so good on the stage. We noted four possible factors. (1) Blacks’ emotional volatility means that their emotions are nearer the surface, which presumably makes them easier to access, a trait useful in acting. This hair-trigger volatility also plays a role in black violence and their racial ‘anger’: an aptitude for acting, together with emotional volatility, helps explain how they are able to convince others (and themselves) that they are indeed [angry](#). (2) Blacks’ psychological astuteness would also be an asset, telling them when and where to make the ‘correct move’ and allowing them to ‘play to’ the psychological state of other actors and the audience. (3) Their rhythmicity – which makes them superior athletes, dancers and jazz musicians – is obviously conducive to the ability to vividly express oneself on stage. The same hand-to-eye coordination that tells them how to move on the basketball court, also tells them, instinctively, how to control their limbs, their facial expression and their voices (which, by the way, are generally deeper than whites, due to [higher levels of testosterone](#), and, is another clear asset); all of this, together with their exceptional psychological instincts, can produce outstanding dramatic ability. Finally, (4) there is black credulity. Being able to get yourself to believe that you *are* your character is clearly an advantage. Since blacks readily believe all kinds of childish nonsense – such as witchcraft and Afrocentrism – it stands to reason they will have an easier time ‘believing’ they are King Lear. When I asked a Scotsman who’s lived in Africa for over 30 years and who has two grown children by black women, why he thought blacks were such good actors, he responded instantly: ‘They’re natural born liars!’

Areas in which blacks excel are typically those involving instinctive-type behaviour. Their psychological astuteness is certainly instinctive; their ability on the basketball court, at

dancing and musical improvisation, are equally so. It's when it comes to conscious and analytical intelligence – such as mathematics or Western classical music – that blacks seem to be lacking.

Excellence Where Least Expected

I must add, however, that in 1998 I witnessed something which caused me to do some rethinking here. A group of dedicated British musicians pooled their resources to demonstrate that black musicality can indeed extend to Western music, and I myself I observed the result: a group of remarkably talented teen-aged blacks performing (e.g.) Bach's Double Violin Concerto. Having had considerable talent as a youngster and receiving a violin scholarship at university, I can attest to the fact that many of them had exceptional talent.

White Tutelage

Six months later I attended a larger concert by the same group, called *The Buskaid Soweto String Project*. Three things struck me. First, virtually everyone, from those teaching the youngsters to those running the organization and raising money (such as organized busking in London), were white – as was 99% of the large audience. Second, given blacks' superior agility and hand-to-eye coordination, it is perhaps not so surprising that they can be talented at a [difficult instrument](#) like the violin. And third, this performance demonstrates what blacks can achieve *under white tutelage*. It's not just that there are relatively few blacks with the requisite skills, but that they would be reluctant to pass on these 'white man's secrets' to other blacks. Nor can there be much doubt that if this project were 'taken over' by blacks it would quickly collapse. It runs – and probably can only be run – under white supervision. And blacks themselves [confirm](#) these very points.

NATURE-NURTURE AGAIN

'Environmental Effects' on Physical and Mental Abilities

In a conversation [in the early 1990s] with a typically liberal university student, [my suggestion](#) about blacks evolving in a different environment satisfied her need to see racial differences as 'environmental', because (on this view) the differences *are* the result of environment – geographical environment. And of course 'environment' in *that* sense can produce such differences; black skin, e.g., arose because it provided protection from the tropical sun. But such traits evolved over many thousands of years, and if there are differences in mental abilities which evolved in the same way, they would likewise have taken thousands of years and could only change over a similar period.

But when people say racial differences are 'environmental', they usually mean something much faster. If differences in academic achievement, e.g., are due to poor education, improving education should show results in a generation or two; whereas if they are due to

differences evolving over thousands of years, they would be ‘in’ blacks just as much as skin colour.

What Are People Who Deny Racial Differences Actually Denying?

What, after all, do people who deny ‘natural’ racial differences think they’re denying? That blacks were somehow, from the very beginning, ‘made’ differently? Unless we’re talking about some biblical-type story, the idea is absurd. If blacks are stronger and more agile than whites it is because they evolved so and that it had some survival-value. If whites have a more powerful brain, it means they evolved thus and there has to be some explanation for it. Aside from cataclysmic events – like a giant meteorite extinguishing the dinosaurs – what could this be except differences in geographical environment resulting in different evolutionary development?

From a Professor Schabort, leader of a neo-Nazi organization (*The Star*, 18 November 1988, p.15: “Rise and fall of the BBB”): “It is important to understand that ... differences [between blacks and whites] are genetic and not environmental, that they are unchangeable.” Meaning? That if Africans had evolved in the same geographical environment as whites, they would be the same as they are now? But if ‘Africans’ had evolved under the same conditions as whites did, they would *be* white(s), just as if ‘whites’ had evolved under the geographical conditions of Africa they would – of course – *be* African(s) (i.e., black[s]).

Racial vs. Sexual Differences

It is interesting to compare physical and intellectual differences between the races, on the one hand, and differences in physical abilities between the sexes. While the former are ‘environmental’ in the sense just discussed, this is not true of sexual differences. Given two sexes, differences between them *must* exist, and there seems to be no corresponding hypothetical to the effect that if women had evolved in the same conditions as men, they would be men. That makes little if any sense.

In short, while the races, and man himself, have clearly evolved, sexuality has not. Rather, it is a built-in feature of any creature like human beings: given that there is a human species, there must be sexes, period. And whatever the inevitability of their being different races (and differences between them), the inevitability of there being sexes (and differences between them) is of a different magnitude altogether.

Racism Ass-Backwards

Compare Schabort’s ideas with something from an article by Andrew Higgins (*The Star*, 4 January 1989, p.12: “Racial antagonism in China is nothing new”):

In the 19th century political theorist Kang Youwei called for an intermingling of the “gold’ and “silver” races – Chinese and Europeans – but recommended that blacks be

sent off to uninhabited areas of Scandinavia and North America until their skins became sufficiently pale.

Unless meant as a joke, he apparently thought their blackness was in and of itself ‘bad’ and not merely an indication of bad traits. But if blacks changed their colour without changing their behaviour, this would make them as a group no more (or less) desirable – except to *bona-fide* racists; while, conversely, if they were to change their behaviour without changing their colour, that would make all the difference in the world – again, except to genuine racists. (See [here](#) and [here](#).)

Black Children Improve With Good Education; *Ergo*, There Are No Racial Differences

A typical Jewish liberal, attempting to refute my views about black intelligence, said he could see himself it wasn’t true; the black kids coming into his store, going to good private (white) schools, were much brighter and more ‘eager’ than other blacks. Aside from the selection bias here, this is like saying that there are no natural sex differences in athletic ability because when women are given better training their performance improves. True enough; but that doesn’t mean natural differences aren’t *also* relevant, as shown by the fact that given equal training, men will, on the whole, [outperform women](#).

What this guy was ‘proving’ is that educational environment influences results. But as with athletic performance, there are multiple factors determining the outcome. Pointing out that one of these effects the result has no tendency to prove that the *others* do *not*. Hence, the fact that blacks (as a group) improve with good schooling in no way contradicts the claim that there *also* are natural differences in educability and that this is one of the reasons blacks do less well, just as *that* being so doesn’t prove that education isn’t also a factor.

‘If I’ve Heard It Once, I’ve Heard It a Hundred Times’

Ask a self-proclaimed liberal whether he’d mind his children’s school becoming black and he’ll answer, ‘No, not if they’re competent blacks’. The government? ‘No, as long as they know what they’re doing’. His neighbourhood? ‘Not at all; if they’re nice people, I don’t care whether they’re black, white or purple!’ – in other words, as long as they behave well. What this amounts to – practically speaking – is that he doesn’t care about the colour of someone’s skin *per se*; what counts is conduct.

This in effect is an expression of genuine nonracism. But the question of whether you’d mind your children in a black school is not a hypothetical matter about how you would feel if some (perhaps unlikely) conditions obtained, but rather, about such a school as it is likely to exist, staffed by your average black teachers. And that’s very different from asking whether you mind black skin *per se*. No, you don’t; but you do mind a school – or a government – being badly run, and that is what is liable to happen if it is run by blacks.

So the real import of asking whether you'd like to see this or that structure dominated by blacks, is: would you like to see it in black hands given the way – in this real world – it is likely to actually end up? An honest answer to that question is apt to be very different than the glib 'Not at all – as long as ...'.

BLACK YOUNGSTERS WHO SAY PRECISELY WHAT I'VE BEEN SAYING

“Go To a Black School with a Black Principal and You Will See the Difference”

Regarding my [observations](#) about the *Buskaid* project – that any white-run organization taken over by blacks is bound to fail, etc. – I quote from the leftist *Weekly Mail & Guardian* (“The black youths who want a white president”, by Cheche Selepe, 16 April 1999, p.12; all emphases added):

... Nicholas Ngoma (17) says whites are honest and straightforward. "I believe whites have more knowledge on almost everything than blacks. Look at countries governed by whites and contrast them with African countries. I believe that *African countries were better run under colonialism. ... whites are more brainy than us.*" ...

Referring to the Johannesburg Art Foundation where he is studying, Ngoma says: "I am here because of white people. I will also be attending tennis lessons at Ellis Park stadium, take extra English lessons at Barnato High and I am attending church. *And all these I do because of whites.* ... [Blacks] are selfish and self-centred." ... The person at the organisation most responsible for finding him a home and sending him to school is white.

"Look at the things that are produced by whites, such as cellphones and computers. We blacks always follow whites. Even the Bible is written by whites and we blacks just follow. You will never see a white person following our culture and traditions. I will not have any problem with a white president for South Africa."

From Bennet Mpehle (19): "I think whites are sort of strict. Our teachers are whites and students respect them. *Whites like order* and know how to rule and lead. *I will be very happy if we have a white president.* People tend to respect the white colour. Not to say blacks cannot lead, but *we take advantage of blacks.*

"Whites keep promises. Do you think this school will be like this if we had a black principal? We are just new in this building but see what the whites have done. We have new computer classes and extra classes being built, not because the whites have money but because they can fund-raise and have a vision. Go to a black school with a black principal and you will see the difference."

Matter-Of-Fact Openness *Re* Promise-Keeping, Black Disorder, White Leadership, *Etc.*

The remarkable and detailed congruence here with my own experience – blacks’ lack of promise-keeping, blacks and disorder, their dependence on white benevolence, leadership and supervision, etc. – is significant corroboration of my theses, especially their matter-of-fact frankness. To suggest that they have been ‘infected’ by racist propaganda is too implausible to warrant comment; as the author says, these youths were only recently in ‘the vanguard of the struggle’. And so once again, truths too ‘painful’ for whites to even contemplate, let alone voice, and for which they are vilified and hounded from public life, turn out to be commonplace facts for many blacks. *QED*

AS THE END OF APARTHEID LOOMS, WHITES JUMP ON THE BANDWAGON

White Contrition for ‘Racism’, Real or Imagined

The Citizen (“Row Over Netball Player’s Race Remarks”, 16 July 1988, p.11):

WINDHOEK – The chairman of the SWA Coloured Administration, Mr. Reggie Diergaardt, deplored the conduct of a White South African schools netball player who refused to be treated by a Coloured doctor ... and made racial remarks

The president of the South African Netball Union, Mrs. Lockie Louw, said the union disapproved of the girl’s conduct and asked [the team] to apologise. The team’s coach, Mrs. Anita Vorster, said [they] had decided to submit a written apology after [failing] to reach the doctor – Sapa.

White contrition here is surely a sign that racism (real or imagined) is not looked upon kindly in the South Africa of 1988. If the girl had said, ‘I am not going to be treated by this monkey!’, that would have been racist; had she said, ‘I’m sorry doctor, it has nothing to do with you personally, but I would prefer to be treated by a white doctor if possible’, it would not be. Between an unknown black doctor and an unknown white doctor, I would certainly choose the latter – and so would the vast majority of whites *and* blacks. What do American blacks say? ‘If you want to die, go to a [black doctor](#)’.

I recall, near the end of my first year in Nigeria, needing a urethral examination. Something routine in the West, I was loath to have it done in Nigeria, but too ‘polite’ to say so. Fortunately, the urologist (an Ibo) was an extremely nice man, and kept postponing it. Finally, hearing that I was going to London, he suggested I wait and have it done there. I didn’t argue.

Afrikaner Gnashing of Teeth and Grovelling

City Press ("NGK Gets Tough On Apartheid": 17 June 1988 [Sunday edition] p.3, by Elias Makuleke):

... the NKG [Dutch Reformed Church] is poised to become an effective and "fierce" government opponent More than 1500 delegates [at the University of Pretoria congress] sat stone-faced as speaker after speaker lashed at apartheid and its failure to create a just society "free of racial abuses".

... Dr H P Moller, a leading NKG theologian, told delegates apartheid had lent inferior connotation to colour. "To deny this or try and explain it is futile because there are so many practical daily examples which contradict it." ... the church had failed to convince blacks that separateness could be truly honest and unselfish. ...

It is remarkable that a South African church having close connections with the government, and until recently a staunch defender of apartheid, should be the venue for such gnashing of teeth. Many clearly didn't liked what they were hearing, but by now almost any defense of apartheid is considered 'incorrect'.

Lending 'inferior connotation to colour' means that black is inferior to white. Does that mean *every* black or just as a *group*? Some 'practical examples' might help. Denying blacks the vote reflects the belief that as a group they cannot handle democracy – is neither shameful nor is it 'racial abuse'. Not being allowed to hold certain jobs, even if qualified, would express the idea that each and every black is inferior – and would be racist.

The church may have failed to convince blacks that separateness could be 'honest and unselfish', but I have already given good, honest reasons for 'separateness', which are unselfish to the extent that they are in everyone's interest. There are good reasons for whites retaining political power, for controlling residential areas, schools and hospitals etc.

Two years later whites are grovelling before blacks by publicly 'admitting guilt for the sin of apartheid' and asking 'forgiveness', which Archbishop Tutu granted with alacrity (*The Weekly Mail*, 9-15 November 1990). In *The Star* (21 February 1991, p.1: "A Terrible Mistake") is a similar 'confession' by the (then) Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, Leon Wessels.

Separate Cannot Be Equal If Groups Are Not Equal

There is no point in pretending that separate facilities will be equal. They will be equal only if the groups are equal. But if they were equal there would be much less reason for separateness in the first place. Given that they are not equal, it is virtually certain that separate facilities will not be equally good.

Note, however, that if enough money were spent, whites could create hospitals for blacks, staffed by white doctors, administrators and matrons that could be as good as white

hospitals. Education, on the other hand, requires educability, so that even if whites provided equally good schools, there is no guarantee of equality of outcome; and there is considerable evidence it would never happen.

After all, if America, the wealthiest country in the world, with a large (if declining) white majority, cannot 'uplift' a 13% black minority, how can a 10% white minority in South Africa do this for a massive black majority? Put another way, if the 200 million whites of America cannot educate its 30 million blacks, how can we expect five million whites to educate the same number of blacks (30 million) in South Africa? It is a manifest impossibility. Meaning that if blacks can't do it themselves, it will [never happen](#).

HOW 'SENSITIVITY' PREVENTS WHITES FROM LEARNING ABOUT BLACKS

White 'Experts' Who've Never Talked To Blacks

I had a long talk [in the early 1990s] with Gavin Lewis, director of publications at the South Africa Foundation, a large organization funded by business, to promote a 'just South Africa', and left him parts this book. He sent me a note saying that he read parts of it 'with some interest, but have to admit that I do not find the underlying arguments on black-white relationships convincing'. This from someone who admits he's *never really talked to blacks about race*.

Recently two friends, knowing of my claim that blacks are not uptight about race, subsequently mentioned being amazed to hear blacks very matter-of-factly say that whites were smarter. When a young Afrikaner bank manager read my statement (in the *Preface*) that blacks were not 'sensitive', he said it struck him like a bolt-out-of-the-blue; he had never heard anyone suggest such a thing. Though he'd grown up in a rural area amidst blacks, he'd never talked with them about it. I asked if he thought the average rural Afrikaner shared this assumption and he said he was sure they did. More recently, Rian Malan, author of [My Traitor's Heart](#), admitted to me that I may be right about this – and that he himself was [altogether ignorant](#) in this regard.

In 1997 I met a young Afrikaner member of the South African Parliament (from Buthelezi's IFP party). While agreeing with my views about blacks, he found it impossible that blacks could accept their inferiority; they would, he said, blame any shortcomings on their lack of opportunity, and under no conceivable circumstances would they vote for whites. If my theories about black attitudes were correct, he said, that would be 'very good news', but he was sure it wasn't. Yet he admitted that he had never so much as broached the subject with any blacks because of the reaction it would provoke.

I replied that the 'good news' would not be simply my thesis being true (since if I was right it already was true), but rather these facts becoming widely known – by whites. There was

another MP present, who shared the other's views and who also admitted that, for the same reasons, he had never engaged a black in any such conversation. How these blacks must chortle at how easily whites can be bamboozled and led around by the nose!

Surprising Lack of Black Awareness that Race Is a 'Sensitive Issue'

A conversation in Papua New Guinea, illustrated not only the absence of racial sensitivity, but even more, unfamiliarity with the phenomenon itself. One of my best students there was a high school principal on one of the island provinces, and a more straightforward, down-to-earth person you'd be hard put to find. One day I said to her, *apropos* the recent dismissal (in 1987) of Al Campanis, vice president of the Los Angeles Dodgers, for remarks considered offensive to American blacks, 'You know, in America, this whole question of race is extremely sensitive; if you say, e.g., that whites are smarter than blacks you could be in big trouble'. She looked at me quickly, her eyes opening wide, and said, with unfeigned astonishment, 'Really??!!'. Though by then I was quite aware of the absence of such sensitivity amongst indigenous blacks, I had not really thought about the unawareness of its very existence. And yet here it was, from this intelligent, perceptive and relatively well-informed woman, illustrating the isolation of such places from Western culture and ideology.

BLACK AWARENESS OF WHITE SUPERIORITY

Actions Speak Louder Than Words

Throughout South Africa, blacks will go to almost any lengths to send their children to white-run schools, to go to a white doctor (or a white-run hospital), and to live in a white neighbourhood. Once again, actions speak louder than words, and I simply do not see how they can fail to be aware that the reason they prefer white to black is because they feel white is superior. Widespread use of harmful skin lighteners and the fact that in America one almost never sees a black woman with a natural ('afro') [hairdo](#), merely add to the [litany](#). Indeed, if anything, African blacks tend to go [overboard](#) in their assumptions of white superiority: if whites bottle-feed their babies, it must be better than breast-feeding; if whites use toothbrushes, these must be better than their traditional wooden sticks; etc..

If I am right in claiming that blacks are not nearly as uptight about racial differences as the vast majority of whites mistakenly assume they are, think how profoundly different race-relations would be if whites instead of labouring under this delusion, recognized, in an entirely mundane fashion, that they were simply wrong.

Encounter in New Orleans

On a visit to the U.S. in 1992, I began to voice my suspicion that American blacks were neither as uptight nor as 'angry' about race as most whites assumed; quite fortuitously, I had the opportunity to engage several in conversation. I met Raymond when he sat next to me on the streetcar in New Orleans. I had [Native Stranger](#) on my lap and he asked about it.

I'd only just begun to read it, I said, but knew how relieved the author was to get out of black Africa. I told him I lived in South Africa and that I used to teach at the University of New Orleans (where he was a student). I said I'd written a book about racism and he expressed interest, so I showed him my piece from [Frontline](#).

He found it very interesting and so the next day, at his suggestion, he, myself and his roommate, Gregory, met. 'Let me lay my cards on the table', I began. 'I think the white man is – on average – more intelligent than the black man. But the more immediate question is whether the idea of such superiority is somehow wicked. I say it is not and the fact that most whites think it is is one of the greatest obstacles to solving our racial problems, because that makes it impossible to discuss; and if we can't discuss it we can't deal with it – which I think is the situation in America right now.'

Basically they both agreed – emphatically – that (1) there was nothing wrong with saying whites were on average smarter, (2) it was probably true and everyone knew it, (3) it was mainly whites who were uptight about this, though (4) 'militant' blacks had picked up on this and were using it to psychologically blackmail whites – by getting 'angry' (etc.).

They were especially interested to know how such differences might have come about and what this meant in practical terms. I outlined my environmental/[evolutionary](#) ideas, which they thought plausible. Practically, it meant it was unlikely blacks would ever, on their own, develop science and technology. This caused no upset. I explained the ambiguity in the statement '[Whatever whites can do](#), blacks can do': applied to groups, it was probably not true, but applied to individuals it more or less was true, and that average differences between groups in no way limited an individual's prospects. They understood and agreed. Gregory volunteered that whatever they may say, blacks did think of whites as 'better'. They ended up buying a copy of this book and we parted on extremely cordial terms.

Confirmation from Elite and 'Angry' Blacks

As corroboration of this 'better'-remark, I quote from [Black Rage](#) (see also [here](#)), a book which, though seething with rancour and malice towards whites and though full of outrageous exaggerations, the *New York Times*, in a front cover blurb, deems 'One of the most important books on [blacks]':

The fact of the matter is that black people are inclined to regard the white man as superior. There are examples without number in the patois and the everyday behavior of millions of blacks which speak for the fact that they do indeed feel that the white man is intrinsically better [p.191].

More Examples

Along the same lines, this snippet from Shelby Steele (*The New Republic*, "The Race Not Run", 7 October 1996): 'I often hear other blacks say that black students will never get the SAT scores of whites or Asians'. In a debate with Steele, black militant and Ivy League

academic Cornel West, whose pronouncements are normally marked by platitudinous BS, said that “we have trouble believing that we are fundamentally as good as white people” (*San Jose Mercury News*, “Loretta Green”, 14 July 1999). John McWhorter, a black linguist at UC Berkeley, explains the intriguing finding that educated blacks are *more* likely than less educated ones to blame white racism for black failure by observing that “it offers a balm for something sitting at the heart of African-American consciousness: a sense that at the end of the day, *black people are inferior to whites*” (quoted by Roger Clegg, “Does Education Make Black People Crazy?”, *FrontPageMagazine.com*, 20 October 2003; my emphasis). In *The Washington Post* “The Stereotype Within: Why My Students Don’t Buy Black History Month”, by Marc Elrich, 13 February 1994, p. C-1), a befuddled white liberal hears his (black) eleven-year-old students unabashedly assert that “‘Everybody knows that black people are bad. That’s just the way we are’” – *and* that they’re ‘dumber than whites’.

It is clear, therefore, that American blacks, like African blacks, think they are inferior to whites. But while Africans accept this with equanimity, many (but by no means all) of their American cousins “protesteth (way) too much”.

How Blacks Are Impressed By White Ingenuity

As an example illustrating how deeply impressed blacks are by white intelligence, I remember, in 1989, when I first brought a recumbent bicycle to Johannesburg (a radically redesigned bike, with the rider sitting in what resembles an easy-chair with his feet in the pedals out in front of him), riding into the Indian part of town. After entering a long, narrow store, I see an Indian Muslim (the butcher from next door) standing near the entrance talking to someone and pointing to me. I went out to him, and there I saw a black woman, a streetsweeper in orange overalls, shouting and gesticulating wildly, all the while jabbing her finger at my bicycle. I asked him what she was saying, and he replied, ‘She is saying, over and over again: “White man’s brain made this bicycle! White man’s brain!”’, expressing instinctively her appreciation for the creative ingenuity which it represented. And then he said to me, ‘And you know, she’s right!’ Other such incidents have occurred involving this bike – which is spellbindingly fascinating to blacks.

“Heaven!!!”

In the early 1990s, riding this bike down a busy street, I passed a young white woman, wheelchair-bound, on a little pedestrian island, waiting for a chance to cross, and what does she see but this bearded white man, streaking by on a contraption which could have come from another planet. As I flew by she cried out with such emotion and poignancy I knew I would never forget it. “*Heaven!!!*” That’s all she said. And she also was right.

Further Conversations

UC Irvine

In the early 1990s, at the University of California, Irvine, an attractive black woman greeted me in a friendly way and we began to talk. The subject of white reluctance to admit black athletic supremacy arose. Yes, she said, they were afraid of the next point – intellectual differences.

Well, I said, couldn't there in fact be such differences? And once again, the crucial point was that she saw nothing bad about superiority *on average*; moreover, she said, it was probably true and most blacks knew this. What was bad was to go from this to saying *all* blacks were inferior and that therefore you were inferior.

Yes, I said, but this happens precisely because of a failure to apply the concept of averages. For many people there were only two possibilities: all groups were the same (because it is bad to say otherwise) or, all members of one group were inferior. When blacks realize the former is not true, they tend to jump to the latter, instead of the more sensible third option: while whites may, in general, be superior, many blacks are superior to many whites, and you may be one of those.

With all of this she agreed. We also discussed my idea of 'anger' as a gigantic con game: that blacks were not really uptight about race but realized whites were and that by *acting* 'angry' could gain immense psychological leverage. I mentioned my observation about African blacks not being at all racially sensitive, considering it obvious that whites were smarter (etc.). She said this could all well be so.

I told her I'd written a book which she might find interesting. 'If it's anything like the conversation we've had', she said, 'I'm sure I will!' And with that we parted. I subsequently spoke with her again, having sent her this book. She said it was 'very honest' and that 'blacks would be my best customers'. If conventional wisdom were correct, people like her and [Raymond](#) and Gregory should be very hard to find; yet they found me, so that I could not, consciously or otherwise, have 'selected' them. While not all such conversations ended in agreement, not one elicited 'anger' or 'offense'; on the contrary, there was usually great interest and pleasure shown in such frank discussions.

Travelocity

In February 2008 I was on the phone to Travelocity finalizing a trip to the U.S.. The woman was capable and friendly. I mentioned how impressed I have been with the American women (on the phone). I remarked that they are usually white – at least when it's a private business. I asked her her name and she said Jacinta. Oh, I said, are you Hispanic? No, she said, she was black. I expressed surprise since she had not the slightest trace of a black accent. Explanation? Her parents were both professionals.

You might be interested to know, I said, that I am traveling to the States to give a talk on “The Black Mind”. I told her that I had taught philosophy in African universities before ending up in South Africa. I could tell right away that she was not uptight about race. One of the things I was going to say in my talk, I said, was that blacks (here) had a limited capacity to think of the future, and she responded by saying “Well, I can tell you that that is true of American blacks as well!” I said that I’d also learned that there was no concept of *rape* in Zulu. She said she did not find that hard to believe. She agreed that blacks litter more than whites. Whites, I said, have learned to think about what would happen if everyone littered, which means thinking of things which hopefully will never happen. Blacks, I said, are weak at that kind of thinking; hence the rubbish.

She found all this extremely interesting and said she would like to read my talk, which I promised to send to her. All in all, just another example of how straightforward American blacks can be about race, completely contrary to Accepted Wisdom.

Johannesburg

Two notable conversations here in Johannesburg (1997). One was with a Zimbabwean who earns R5,700/month (nearly \$1,300) as a receptionist and who owns a car. While believing that ‘Africa should be for Africans’, she readily acknowledged differences in intellectual ability. ‘There is a saying that if you don’t have it in the head, you have it in the hands, and the black man has it in the hands’. (This woman, by the way, though having many black friends, came to me to borrow R50 – never repaid.)

The second was with an Sierra Leonian whose father had been a senior diplomat and whose brother is a professor of medicine in Sierra Leone. Louis has spent time in England and has a university degree from the States. He began with some fairly typical BS (that South Africa should not have poverty, e.g.), but very quickly agreed that since it was generally whites who created wealth, South Africa, with such a large black population, was bound to have poor people. He confirmed my ‘theory’ that real friendship amongst blacks is rare if not nonexistent. When I mentioned my conjecture that there were few large businesses, anywhere, run exclusively by blacks – that the accountant, at the very least, will inevitably be other than black – he pointed out that there were few black accountants to be had, mainly because blacks were not good with [numbers](#). Finally, he agreed wholeheartedly with my observation that African blacks were not uptight about racial differences, that they accepted white intellectual superiority without skipping a beat (as did he), and that it was whites who had made this an issue.

Some Exceptions To This Experience

On a subsequent trip to America, in spite of having several conversations that conformed to this pattern – including a Jamaican black who agreed ‘100%’ with my claim that black anger was a scam – I talked with three blacks who were quite adamant that whites were not smarter, that black deficiencies were the result of racism, discrimination or conspiracy (e.g.,

bringing drugs into the black community), and one of whom steadfastly refused – or was simply unable – to understand the concept of averages. (Whites are smarter? But look at this intelligent black man! Blacks are better athletes? How about Dan Marino, a famous [white] athlete? Etc..) None of them, however, said it was *bad* to say whites were smarter.

Are There Any Large Black Enterprises that Run Without White Help?

A well-known Afrikaner journalist mentioned [in 1998] that there had been several news items about large enterprises that had been handed on a platter to black businessmen and which quickly fell into rack and ruin; Pepsi Cola and a monopoly brewery for sorghum beer were two examples.

I asked him if he knew of any successful large businesses run entirely by blacks and he said yes, he did. The five Kuneni brothers, in a nearby province, owned and operated a Coca-Cola bottling franchise that was hugely successful. We both wondered who their accountant was. As luck would have it, a few weeks later I met someone who knew the Kuneni brothers. Did he happen to know anything about their accountant? Yes; in fact, he knew him personally – and he was indeed white! Obviously, he added, they needed someone they could trust!

Blacks' Interest In Racial 'Incorrectness'

Apropos blacks' interest in my book, I quote from the *Chicago Tribune Magazine* ("For Starters", by Jeff Lyon, p.10, exact date unknown, but approximately late 1994 to-early 1995), regarding [The Bell Curve](#), controversial for its explicit assertion of innate white intellectual superiority:

More intriguing than how many are buying is who's buying. Large numbers of African-Americans are snapping the book up, with many stores reporting 'an equal mix' of black and white buyers. At Super Crown ... two black customers in line ahead of me requested the book and were told by the clerk, also black, that it was out of stock. She then told me she was halfway through her own copy. Soooooo? "It's interesting", she deadpanned.

I also remember meeting a prominent black political figure in 1994 (later a government minister) who publicly expressed opinions implying that blacks were incapable of democracy. I spoke with him afterwards. Yes, he said, blacks are thus incapable – now – and most blacks knew this, discussed it amongst themselves and were dismayed at the prospect of black rule; he agreed that it was mainly whites who had made discussion of this impossible. He was anxious to read my book and bought a copy.

HOW WHITE GUILT AND APPEASEMENT *CREATE* THE SCAM OF BLACK 'ANGER'

Black Riots in the US: 1968

All of this confirms my belief that many Western blacks are happy to discuss these issues and that it is really whites who have a problem with it which they project onto blacks. Worse still, by insisting that black anger *must* exist and is justified, whites self-fulfillingly create the very 'anger' they dread and thereby the conditions responsible (e.g.) for the Rodney King riots in Los Angeles in April-May 1992. *Circa* 1968, from (then) U.S. Senator Fred Harris:

the deepest cause of the recent riots [1968] ... was white racism. ... the root cause of the black wrath that now threatens to destroy this nation is the unwillingness of [we] white Americans to accept Negroes as fellow human beings' [in a *Foreword* to [Black Rage](#)].

1992: The Rodney King Riots

For a penetrating analysis of the Los Angeles riots, I quote Dennis Prager ("Blacks, Liberals & The Los Angeles Riots", *Ultimate Issues*, April-June 1992, p.6):

This is my accusation against the liberal world: *You have stated, in essence, that America deserves to be burned.* That has been your reaction to Los Angeles and that was the way you portrayed America prior to it. We deserve to be burned, and the burners to be heard. [Emphases in original.]

From Otto Scott's *Compass*:

Long years of white liberal arguments that blacks have been – and still are – invariably innocent of accusations, because of the contemporary suffering and the suffering of their ancestors, has now convinced an articulate percentage of the black community that blacks should not be arrested or punished – no matter what they do [September 1, 1998, Vol. 9, Issue 97, p.3].

[Pres.] Johnson ... [n]ever seem[ed] to realize that ['a wave of black riots, racial denunciations, and violence'] in response to enlarged opportunities [after the civil rights legislation of the 60s] are not signs of progress, but the response of a violent minority to *perceived weakness* [December 1, 1998, Vol. 9, Issue 100, p.3; my emphasis].

Other than by myself, I do not recall having seen this latter point in print, obvious though it may be. (I am saddened to learn that Otto Scott died in 2006.)

The Power of Liberal Dishonesty

In spite of being politically incorrect on race and other ‘hot button’ issues, Dennis Prager has his ‘red lines’. On his syndicated radio show (*KRLA*, 13 Feb 2006), a caller mentioned that [Abraham Lincoln](#) had held some surprising views about race – to wit, that blacks were not the equals of whites socially, morally or intellectually, and that while opposed to slavery, he was not in favour (e.g.) of blacks having the right to vote or serving on juries and was against miscegenation.

Prager immediately took umbrage and you could almost hear his hackles rising. He asked the caller when these views had been expressed, since it was not uncommon, he said, to hold views in one’s youth that he might later reject. In fact, they were uttered during the Lincoln-Douglas debates in 1858, two years before Lincoln became president.

Becoming even more agitated, Prager said that to be an ‘egalitarian’, it was a *‘given that there are no differences based on skin colour’*. In short, it is was not open to discussion. This from a man whose very *raison d’être* is open, honest and rational debate. That he would go out of his way to express such a dishonest view is a testament to liberalism’s power to instill fear in the hearts of [otherwise honest men](#).

‘No Justice, No Peace!’

For an example of self-fulfilling hysteria from South Africa, two years before the end of white rule, consider this National Party advertisement preceding a (whites only) referendum on whether to ‘continue reform’ (*The Star*, 2 March 1992, p.13):

You won’t have to wait ... to find out how [blacks] will react. A “No” majority guarantees chaos

... rejection by white voters will turn even moderates into radicals. ... Anger could be directed at every white, ... whether you voted “Yes” or “No” – at you, your wife, your children, your parents and your friends.

... The government will have to respond. But repression and violence will simply breed more violence ...

In other words, *carte blanche* for murder and mayhem. In fact, whatever the outcome, whites lose. Resist – blacks ‘riot’. Capitulate – whites show what the mere threat of violence can achieve. Once they admit the legitimacy of such threats – as whites have surely done in creating the ‘anger’ which underpins it – and it’s a no-win situation. This psychology was beautifully illustrated (*re* the April 1993 retrial of the cops accused in the Rodney King case) by the black militant slogan *“No Justice, No Peace!”*. Acquit and you have ‘disturbances’; by convicting, whites demonstrate – and reinforce – the power of such ‘anger’.

American Black Turns Black 'Anger' On Its Head

Speaking of black 'anger' and the 'injustice' and 'oppression' on which it supposedly rests, this passage from [Native Stranger](#) (1993) completely turns things on their head. The author, Eddi Harris, is travelling down the Congo River and the boat's captain is 'preaching' about 'moving to Zaire to help his country grow' (pp.299-300; my emphases):

"The most advanced black man in the world is the American black man", he said.

"We need you. This is your home. This is where you belong."

I was shaking my head. I could never live in Africa, I told him. I had been here too long already.

"You prefer to live with the whites?" he said. He pointed his thumb at Justin. "His ancestors stole your ancestors from this place and took them to America as slaves. How can you live with them?"

Thinking quickly back on all I had seen and all I had felt, *I turned to Justin and thanked him.*

Far from being a springboard for paroxysms of 'rage', this black American, in the full flush of his African experience, sees slavery as something to be grateful for, resulting as it did in his living in a civilized country of opportunity, far, far away from the quagmire of black Africa. (See also [Out of America: A Black Man Confronts Africa](#), by Keith B Richburg, 1997.)

African Leader Ridicules 'Demands' for Atonement for Slavery

Apropos the demands from the American civil rights establishment for white 'atonement' for the sin of slavery (followed by endless 'reparations'), note these words from the president of Uganda, Yoweri Museveni:

I don't have time for that ... rubbish ... African chiefs were the ones waging war on each other and capturing their own people and selling them. If anyone should apologize it should be the African chiefs. ..." [Reuters, 22 March 1988.]

That this rebuke to the utter fecklessness of black American 'leaders' comes from an African further substantiates my claims concerning African ingenuousness about race. Can you imagine any important American – or South African – black saying such a thing?

Skeptic Becomes 'Much Less Skeptical'

Jared Taylor, author of [Paved With Good Intentions](#), spent a year going about and speaking to university students.

Once their more militant fellows have left the room, some blacks become downright cordial. "You've opened my mind to a new way of looking at things", one will say with a smile. ... Some blacks are genuinely pleased to meet a white man who is not afraid of straight talk about race (*American Renaissance*, "[Violating the IQ Taboo: A Report from the Field](#)").

Having reviewed this book and its thesis that black ‘anger’ is a con game, he says: ‘In 1993, I was very skeptical of Dr. Braun’s thesis. As I speak to more and more audiences, I find myself much less skeptical today.’ Indeed, in his book he foreshadows some of my claims about black anger:

‘... our society teaches blacks to hate whites. ... [It] has done everything within its power to encourage [this] [p.108]. ... Blacks have heard this so frequently they cannot help but absorb it [p.42].

In [The End of Racism](#) (1995), Dinesh D’Souza tries to ridicule the idea that black anger is a scam (p.390); yet he says (p.325) that ‘black rage is largely a response not to white racism but to black failure’. But if he is right, it is hard to believe blacks don’t, in their heart of hearts, know just what he knows, and hence hard to believe that they are not, in their heart of hearts, engaging ([as I say](#)) in a gigantic con game.

De Facto Support From Prominent Black American Intellectual

In a discussion of Ralph Ellison, who was getting flak because he was not enough of a ‘protest’ writer, Shelby Steele (*The New Republic*, 1 March 1999; all emphases added) writes about

... The all-important goal of protest writing is to *engage white American obligation* ... Protest writing negatively differentiates blacks from “normal” non-oppressed humanity, and then asserts that racial oppression is responsible for the difference. ... [T]his ... auto-dehumanization ... is what stirs white obligation, *which is the ultimate objective of all black protest writing*.

... A chief characteristic of black protest writing, therefore, is the concealment of black culture and black ingenuity so as not to diffuse white obligation. ...

Since the 1960s, black leadership has also concealed [blacks’] ... resourcefulness ... , as well as the full range of our new freedom, so as to highlight the black victimization that stimulates the sense of white obligation. ...

Real anger doesn’t spring from a strategy, but is a natural response to injustice. But black anger, as Steele says, is a *manoeuvre* to get the goodies from whitey. *Ergo*, it is *not* genuine, but is instead, as I have said, a scam.

White Breast-Beating; Black Credulity, Theatrics, Testosterone and Hair-Trigger Volatility

Unlike Steele, however, I do not think this ‘anger’ originates with blacks. Like [Dennis Prager](#), I believe that it has largely been created by whites and their self-flagellating guilt, telling blacks that they *ought* to be angry. How else does one explain that throughout black Africa, where this baleful influence is absent, such ‘anger’ is virtually unknown?

Black ‘anger’ is nevertheless real. With their child-like credulity and penchant for theatrics, blacks are easily carried away by their own rhetoric. Add their hair-trigger volatility and testosterone, plus white encouragement, and what begins as childish nonsense can end up in mayhem and destruction. While this anger may be a contrivance for their ‘leaders’, it is not *advertised* as such; all your ordinary black knows is that he’s supposed to be angry – and for many that’s more than enough.

A Knock-Down-Drag-Out Argument Proving Black ‘Anger’ Is a Scam

I think I can now present a irrefutable argument that black ‘anger’ is a scam. This ‘anger’ is directed at the alleged cause of black failure, viz., white racism: if blacks are angry, whites must have done something to cause it. But this book is replete with examples indicating that blacks believe they are inferior and that whites are ‘better’. It doesn’t matter – here – whether these beliefs are true; it is enough that *they think* they are true. But if blacks believe they are inferior they cannot but recognize that *that* is one of the major reasons for their failure. It follows, therefore, as night follows day, that they do *not* believe that *racism* is the principal cause of their failure. Hence, they cannot believe that they have *reason* to be angry at whites. *Ergo*, their ‘anger’ is just what I say it is: a sham and a scam to gain psychological advantage. **QED.**

Window On Reality: While Whites Grovel, Blacks See Things Differently

When Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans in September 2005, it produced gut-wrenching apologies from whites and high-octane ‘anger’ from black elites. *ABC News*, therefore, must have been nonplussed when they interviewed black evacuees after President Bush, speaking on TV, tried to ‘make amends’ (“To ABC's Surprise, [Katrina Victims Praise Bush ...](#)”):

Reynolds [an *ABC* journalist] asked Connie London: "Did you harbor any anger toward the President because of the slow federal response?" She rejected the premise: "No, none whatsoever, because I feel like our city and our state government should have been there before the federal government was called in." She pointed out: "They had RTA buses, Greyhound buses, school buses, that was just sitting there going under water when they could have been evacuating people."

Not one of the six people interviewed on camera had a bad word for Bush -- despite Reynolds' best efforts. Reynolds goaded: "Was there anything that you found hard to believe that he said, that you thought, well, that's nice rhetoric, but, you know, the proof is in the pudding?" Brenda Marshall answered, "No, I didn't," prompting Reynolds to marvel to [*ABC*] anchor Ted Koppel: "Very little skepticism here."

Reynolds pressed another woman: "Did you feel that the President was sincere tonight?" She affirmed: "Yes, he was." Reynolds soon wondered who they held culpable for the levee breaks. Unlike the national media, London did not blame

supposed Bush-mandated budget cuts: "They've been allocated federal funds to fix the levee system, and it never got done. I fault the [black] mayor of our city [Nagin] personally. I really do."

And so, through this unwittingly honest broadcast, comes a rare public exposure to reality, further corroborating my claim that many ordinary black Americans are neither as 'sensitive' nor as 'angry' as they're supposed to be.

Black Theology and Black Power: Confirmation In Spades!

In the *National Review Online* ("[Context, You Say?](#) ...", 19 May 2008), Stanley Kurtz discusses the above titled book (1969) by James H Cone (black), 'founder' of black liberation theology (my emphases).

Cone understood his task as both "radical" and "prophetic". It was ... prophetic in its *determinedly angry and denunciatory tone*. ... Cone *demands and commends anger*, ... The black intellectual's goal, says Cone, is to "aid in the destruction of America as he knows it." Such destruction requires *both black anger and white guilt*.

But this of course is *exactly my theory!* The only reason blacks are *able* to so successfully use 'anger' as a weapon of psychological warfare is because of white racial guilt, as a result of which whites already *blame themselves* and hence accept that they have *done the black man wrong*, which in turn means that they have accepted the legitimacy of this 'anger'. The two go together hand in glove.

In short, this is explicit proof that black leaders, at least since the mid-20th century, were *consciously aware of and deliberately using 'anger' and white guilt as tools* with which to (in their own words) '*destroy*' whites – a fact which *I* have only 'discovered' nearly half a century later and of which the vast, *vast* majority of whites remain not only ignorant but *willfully* so and which, were it pointed out, would feverishly denounce as racist! How's that for pulling the wool over people's eyes? (It 'takes two to tango'?) All of which is a further testament to black psychological shrewdness. (See [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#).)

Blacks Were Aware of White Self-Hatred Long Before Whites!

Even more startlingly revelatory (from the same *NRO* piece) is this passage, showing the absolute centrality of *white self-hatred – and black awareness thereof* – and how at least for some blacks it lay at the very heart of the so-called Civil Rights Movement:

In the preface to his 1970 book, *A Black Theology of Liberation*, [Rev. Jeremiah] Wright wrote: "There will be no peace in America until whites begin to *hate their whiteness*, asking from the depths of their being: '*How can we become black?*'" [my emphases].

Perhaps Wright didn't know it, but he was, even then, *preaching to the converted!*

RACISM AND ANTISEMITISM

The Nature of Antisemitism

From *The Citizen*: “Chicago mayor fires ‘anti-semitic’ aide” (7 May 1988, p.15):

The aide, Mr. Steve Cokely [like the mayor, black], delivered a series of lectures ... in which he said Jews were part of an international conspiracy to rule the world and said Jewish doctors inject Black schoolchildren with infectious diseases.

Since antisemitism is a form of (racial) prejudice my ideas about racism should apply. Are his statements *per se* anti-semitic? [If I am right](#), no belief (or assertion) is in itself racist; i.e., deemed prejudiced solely by virtue of its content; and yet it seems clear that these statements *are* anti-semitic.

We can start by distinguishing between ‘belief’ understood as the proposition believed, i.e., the *content* of a belief, vs. the *act* of believing some proposition. A proposition itself can’t be anti-semitic because to call it anti-semitic is to condemn it and it makes no sense to condemn a proposition. The only thing that can be anti-semitic here is his believing (or asserting) it. He must be believing it in a morally disreputable way – e.g., believing it while knowing deep down that it’s not true

But how would we know this? How do we know he doesn’t *honestly* believe them? Because if he did, we couldn’t – correctly – accuse him of anti-semitism, since his (*honestly*) believing this would not be deserving of moral condemnation; and since (racial) prejudice *is* deserving of condemnation, we could conclude that his statements were not anti-semitic

In fact, however, we are confident they *are*, because they are on their face so preposterous that no *normal* person *could* honestly believe them. Assuming he is normal, we infer that he knows they are not true and that his belief it is malicious and dishonest: he knows they are not true but is motivated by racial hatred. And it is this [inner dishonesty](#) that constitutes the moral evil of racial prejudice. In sum, if he honestly believed these things he would not be guilty of anti-semitism; but this is so unlikely that it can be ruled out; *ergo*, he is an antisemite.

A Side Order of Logic

As a point of interest: It makes no sense to condemn a proposition because it is an *abstract entity* (i.e., something that exists neither in space nor time) and hence is *inanimate* and as such is not the [sort of thing](#) which can be sinful or wicked. All abstract entities (e.g., numbers, propositions, concepts) are inanimate (i.e., things which are not living and breathing), but not all inanimate things are abstract; a rock, e.g., is inanimate but is concrete.

The argument above was:

If a belief is anti-semitic, it is deserving of moral condemnation.

This man's (honestly held) beliefs are *not* deserving of moral condemnation.
Ergo, his beliefs are not anti-semitic.

The *form* of this argument, known as *modus tollens*, is:

If p, then q.
 Not q.
 ∴ Not p.

Any argument having this form, *anywhere*, at *any* time, about *any* subject, presented by anyone, *to* anyone, in *any language* (etc.) is valid. That is, *if* the premises are true the conclusion *must also* be true. This doesn't mean the premises *are* true – and hence doesn't mean the conclusion is true – but merely that *if* the premises are true *then* the conclusion must also be. In short, one can look till the end of time and he will never find an argument of this form with true premises and a false conclusion.

BLACK ARROGANCE AND WHITE SELF-ABNEGATION

'Paralyzing Fear' of 'Superior' Whites

Here is something from Siphon Maseko, 'secretary for political education' of the Azanian Students' Movement (from the *City Press*, 24 July 1988, p.7; all emphases added):

Universities And The Apartheid Umbrella *Student Movement Puts Its Case On Ceremonies*

... Our schools ... render their products [blacks] inferior ... to ensure they play a subservient role *They also instill a paralysing fear of whites, who are regarded as superior.*

[We] vigorously oppose ... the present education system ... which *arrogantly* espouses racism, sexism, social inequality based on wealth, values that come from over-rated and over-emphasised competitiveness, *undemocratic* and individualistic attitudes as expressed in elitism, *authoritarianism* and the *desire to be the most important person* Therefore, the idea [came] to boycott the graduation ceremonies ...

But despite these indisputable facts, certain students purposefully and ignorantly *challenge* these reasons. ...

... liberal campuses refuse to Africanise, ... but adamantly want to remain white. White values ... reign supreme.

... the liberal campuses ... perpetuate ... *bourgeois democratic rights*. ... black and white middle-classes are ... co-opted into the oppressive and exploitative system against the toiling and suffering of black masses. ...

Education must be nothing less than cooperation rather than competition among fellow students, espousing such values as *anti-sexism and anti-racism*. ...

Note this ‘paralysing fear of whites, who are regarded as superior’ – one more indication that blacks do indeed believe whites are ‘better’. His arrogance and authoritarianism, typical of African elite, is revealed by his indignation that some students dare ‘challenge’ him!

Why do blacks want to go to white universities? Because they think they’re better. Why do they think they’re better? Because they’re white. So what does he want to do? Make them black!

Attack Before You Are Attacked!

Notice his accusing whites of authoritarianism and the ‘desire to be the most important person’. I recall a black businessman on the radio claiming that blacks were less concerned with ‘status’ than whites. In other words, *accuse others of the very things of which you are guilty!* This relates to the strategy ‘[Attack before you are attacked](#)’: if you are the first to make an allegation, then when the accused responds by saying – even correctly – that the truth is just the opposite, this will sound hollow, since he will *appear* to be doing precisely what you are in *fact* doing. Another example of black psychological cunning.

Storm Trooper Tactics: Black ‘Anger’ In Action

There was recently a striking example of this black elite mentality, illustrating how blacks behave when they get a taste of power. From *The Citizen* (1 August 1989, pp 1,4):

Zach, Slabbert silenced
Wits Students Prevent Campus Debate
by Marguerite Moody and Sapa

ABOUT 100 singing, dancing and chanting [and foot stamping] students ... yesterday prevented a ... debate at the University of Witwatersrand

They chanted “We must arm” and sang songs in praise of the banned African National Congress’ military wing, ..., drowning out amplified requests for them to stop “in the interests of freedom of speech on campus”.

Dr De Beer, Dr Slabbert and Mr. Friedman [whites] sat passively on stage [during] the furore ... [and] the meeting was cancelled. Dr De Beer said it had been “a great pity so many people have wasted their time. Feelings run strong in these situations”. Dr Slabbert said the disruption ... was “*symptomatic of the absurdity of holding a general election for the minority.* ...

“It would be foolish ... to underestimate the depth of frustration and anger amongst [these students] ...”. South Africa could “expect this kind of turbulence” until everyone could “participate legally and peacefully in the political process in a nonracial democratic South Africa”. ... [All emphases added.]

Is such storm trooper intimidation surprising when whites are so ready to apologize for it? After all, it to be ‘expected’; the ‘depth of frustration and anger’ must not be

‘underestimated’; etc. etc.. It is just such ‘understanding’, that tells blacks that they are *right* to be angry, thereby fuelling this very ‘anger’!

Liberalism’s Firm Grip: White Weakness and Self-Doubt

I was told by a Professor who attended the Senate meeting where this incident was discussed, that while many were ‘very angry’, they were persuaded by the bleeding hearts that to discipline the students would cause ‘alienation’ (etc.). In fact, strong discipline is the only thing these students will respect, and it is precisely its absence which leads to such behaviour. Appeasement, pure and simple.

From an editorial in *The Citizen* (“Feelings Harden”: 26 July, 1988, p.6).

... [Whites] see reform being met by increased sanctions. ... Blacks staying away from work whenever the radicals insist ... – ... too scared of the consequences if they don’t. ... Black discontent despite the huge sums spent on Black housing and Black education – granted, to make up a terrible leeway in housing and to bring Black education ... in line with White education. ...

For the whites do not consider they are as beastly as they are made out to be. They don’t believe they treat Blacks viciously They don’t believe they deserve to be condemned, shunned, isolated or punished.

Most know that apartheid is bad, but they also know the government is dismantling it. They know that there are many inequalities, including economic inequality, but they also know that Blacks are advancing and nothing can stop their progress.

Even many on the Right know that they cannot keep Blacks in a political no-man’s-land, that they cannot run the country as a White fiefdom, which is why [they] want a White state of their own. ...

One more example of how firmly liberal ideas have taken root here. This is a right-wing paper, and yet it accepts all the usual dogmas: there are no differences between races, can be none, and (hence) this possibility needn’t be considered; blacks are systematically ill-treated; apartheid is evil and must be ‘dismantled’; and, of course, the masses of blacks are just itching to get their hands on the reins of power.

In South Africa, Blacks Burn Down Winnie Mandela’s House; In UK, Teacher Humiliated for *Not* ‘Reverencing’ Mandela

From *The Star* (“Mandela Home Attacked: Police Probe ‘Grudge’”, 29 July 1988, p.3, by Craig Kotze and Jovial Rantao):

... scores of black students yesterday stoned and set fire to one of the two Mandela homes in ... Soweto. ...

... [Learning] the house was unoccupied, a large group of students ... arrived at the home and stoned it, smashing the windows. Then they set it alight. ...

While these blacks care so little about Nelson Mandela they destroy his wife's house, the West 'reverences' him ("Denunciation Of U.K. Teacher 'Disgusting'", *The Citizen*, 29 July 1988, p.15):

LONDON. – A London teacher who refused to attend a school ceremony to celebrate the 70th anniversary of Nelson Mandela was shamed in front of her pupils and reduced to tears

The London *Daily Express* said children ... watched as 42-year-old Mrs. Diana Stuart was given a severe dressing down at assembly.

Mrs. Stuart ... was so shocked that she broke down ... "It was terrible. The teacher who had arranged the Nelson Mandela assembly shouted at me that she was personally insulted that I had not attended. I turned to a senior colleague for support but she said: 'No I agree'.

"I refused to attend the assembly because I regarded it as political. Surely I had the right to decide whether [to attend]"

The school has about 300 pupils aged between five and 11 – 30 percent of them White and 70 percent Asian and Afro-Caribbean.

The *Daily Express* said that four years ago parents of Black pupils at the school were allowed to check books to see if they were "racist". But when White parents sought the same privilege they claimed they were refused

A local opposition councillor ... said: "This woman suffered trial by denunciation. It is straight out of Nazi Germany or Stalin's Russia". ...

Under the headline "The tyrants of Islington", *The Sun* said in an editorial: "down the ages, fear and humiliation have been the weapons of Tyranny. The ordeal of Diana Stuart could have happened ... 50 years ago in Nazi Germany. Instead it happened in 1988, in London at the heart of a country which has long prided itself on its freedom and respect for the right of an individual." ...

"Nelson Mandela is a convicted terrorist who could be free tomorrow if he renounced violence.

"Yet were he an Amalgam of all the saints, Diana Stuart still had the God-given right to decide for herself whether or not she celebrated his birthday. If not, then freedom really is dead in Britain in 1988." – *Sapa*.

In England a woman is vilified because she refuses to honour Mandela, while back home, schoolchildren burn down his wife's house because of some petty quarrel! Note the 'antiracist' pandering – allowing only blacks to 'check school books to see if they were "racist"'. I'm sure these blacks were quite bewildered by this; 'but if you insist ... well then, sure; we're against racism as much as the next person'. I've no doubt that they were quite amazed at how whites kowtow to them – in the whites' own country – without them having to lift a finger!

2008: 11½-Year-Old Never Heard of Nelson Mandela

Recently I talked with the 11 ½ year old child of the woman who works for me. She attends a rural school and is above average black IQ. I asked her who Nelson Mandela was. She didn't have a clue. (She also failed to recognize his image.) A few minutes later I mentioned it again and she responded quizzically: 'Thabo Mbeki?' True, she was born three years after apartheid and was two years old when Mandela left office. But there is a TV in her home and as I say, she goes to school.

The upshot? Either they don't teach history in Primary School (though I've subsequently learned that they do), or it's done so perfunctorily that [no one learns anything](#), or, because of [black jealousy](#), they're not eager to talk about Mandela, or, finally, that they have such a poor grasp of [the past](#) that they're almost *unable* to teach it – or some combination thereof. In any case, it's not exactly promising.

PART IV: JOHANNESBURG

BLACK 'ANGER' OVER EDUCATION

The 'Hell' Of Black Education

Joe Thloloe prints a letter from a Standard 8 (13-year-old) black child (*Sowetan*, 5 May 1988, p.7):

“Dear Duduzele

I am worried about my school who gave us the problem firstly our teacher are not fit like primary school they like us the scholar who teach them self my teachers not mum a better than sir's I am worried about the teacher who teach my biology, afrikaan, maths ad sotho for standard 8 they like the people who take from streets and said learn the dog to speak.

Secondly the teachers are not fear for the pupils when we wrote exams when we fond the report we fond that we failed but when the school reopened we fond that those who get 14 percent passed but those who get 29 percent etc. failed they said those who failed more than 4 years they are the 'adens' or amahlosi' if they passed the school can be broken into many pieces. I said sis oDuduzele help us to passed the standard 8 whow can those who get 14 percent can passed

Thirdly our toilet are very old are bracket toilet a very dirty they do not clean as from 1984. Whow can we fond the beatiful toilet like other school but our parents did everything the school want we paid broken window and doors and we pay school fiers the money of school fies is R15,00 we need help?”

Thloloe's comments on 'this hell'? 'This letter is a desperate cry for help ... a cry we hear daily if we listen' Clearly, it sounds like [any school in black Africa](#): the teachers are bad – and corrupt (underhanded dealings regarding passes and failures), toilets not working, etc. etc.

A neighbour in Bloemfontein was a senior administrator in 'Bantu Education' where, in 1988, nearly 50% failed. He said he gets frequent requests from black schools asking for white principals, because black principals cannot instill discipline and often steal (etc.).

So why aren't there more white principals? Because his superiors – whites – won't allow it! Black principals are – of course! –just as good as whites, and so you have a situation where blacks want white principals while whites insist they must have blacks!

'Drinking and Dancing During Lessons'

More startling revelations about schools in Soweto (*The Star*, "It Is The Young Who Must Foot The Bill For Conflict", by Zenaide Vendeiro, 8.8.88, p.13; all emphases added):

... There has been a complete breakdown in discipline. ... pupils arrive late ... and leave at about 11 am. *They walk in and out of classrooms as they please and talk, play music, drink and dance during lessons.* ...

Demotivated and intimidated, many teachers no longer prepare lessons or make any attempt to keep to the syllabus. *Control of the schools has passed on to the pupils.* ... “... there is a general atmosphere of unease, anger [at whom?] and frustration, demotivation and despair”, says a principal. ...

Educationist Dr Ken Hartshorne ...: “Pupils and teachers at black schools are often present in the flesh, but not in spirit, because ... *the fundamental issues of separation, discrimination, isolation and white domination have not been addressed* ...”. ...

Just what do these bleeding hartshornes want? A completely black-run education system? Because as far as I can tell, the problem at present is precisely that it *is* (largely) run by blacks. (And in [America](#)? ‘Some students spent class time laughing, joking and tussling with one another.’ The similarities with African behaviour is uncanny!)

Magic Bullet: ‘Complete Desegregation’

In an adjacent article (*The Star*, 8.8.88, p.13: “Experts fear all-out black ‘school war’”, also by Zenaide Vendeiro; emphasis added), a Mr. Fanyana Mazibuko, ‘director of the University Preparation Programme’, says:

Piecemeal reforms ... will no longer work. Any movement short of *complete desegregation of education* ... will be ... rejected. ...

“... Pace College headmaster, Mr. Thamsanqa Kambule, agrees. “The government boasts about the money it is spending on black education. *That is meaningless.* None of the grievances has been addressed. ...” ...

He concludes with thinly veiled threats.

“... There are hundreds of thousands of children not receiving an education who are forming part of a revolutionary machinery.

“They have nothing to lose. All they can look forward to are unpromising [jobs with] no security. When they revolt, there will be hell to pay ...”, [Mr. Kambule] says. “... not a single person, black or white, will escape the consequences of what is happening in schools in Soweto today. Every child who becomes angry because he does not get a chance will resort to other means.”

He’s already excusing the ‘hell to come’ – they’re not criminals; they’re just ‘angry’ because they’ve not been ‘given a chance’ – and *that’s* why they will ‘resort to other means’! It is clear where *he* thinks this ‘anger’ should be directed, but how about the students who [say exactly what I say](#)? Any guess who *they’re* angry with?

'Magic Bullet' Means a White Presence

Not Enough Whites To 'Go Round'

'Complete desegregation' can only mean all schools having roughly 75% black students, teachers and administrators. Does anyone really think that a 10% white presence is somehow going to resurrect black schools? And since in practice 75% black means 100%, I see little hope in 'desegregation'; certainly [America's](#) experience leaves little room for optimism.

In any case, there simply are not enough whites to 'go round', so that if all blacks went to white schools there would no longer *be* any white schools. What blacks *should* want are black schools that are white-run, plus the opportunity for talented blacks to attend white schools.

On the same page (*The Star*, 8 August 1988, p.13: "I am basically a 'crisis manager' – de Beer", by Esmare van der Merwe; emphasis added):

... [Deputy Minister of Education Sam de Beer said] he was in constant contact [with his colleagues] about the deep-rooted causes of school unrest: *equal political participation and the total abolition of apartheid.*

The idea that masses of black schoolchildren could be so concerned about 'equal political participation' that *that* could be the cause of unrest is too preposterous to merit comment. His most revealing statement comes in the last paragraph: "*I experience tremendous goodwill from the black communities, especially parents who have the interest of their children at heart*" (my emphasis).

As I would expect, blacks are happy to see whites trying to improve black education. But how does de Beer square this with his assumptions about 'black aspirations' for 'equal participation and abolition of apartheid'? Does he think these parents think *blacks* would make such efforts? In fact, I'd be surprised if he wasn't subjected to the same requests for white teachers and principals as was my friend in [Bloemfontein](#).

Factors Militating Against Black Education

Blacks Helping Blacks?

I am reminded of a Kenyan police Inspector who was in charge of a fairly large station, to whom I'd given some 'handouts' from my logic class (at the University of Nairobi). When he found them interesting, I suggested giving seminars for his men. He was aghast. What! Teach *them* these things? [The white man's secrets?] Absolutely not! This was for big people, not the *wananchi* ['common people']. We are here ('*up!*') and they are there ('*down!*') and that's where they must stay! These were not inferences of mine; this is what the man said. Even though I'd been in Africa for more than five years, this still amazed me. (See [here](#).)

Blacks often regard truth as a commodity not to be casually dispensed. Why on earth should the ('superior') teacher willingly give these white man's secrets to the ('inferior') students? So that they may become his equal? Are you [mad](#)?

Insight Despite Herself

A conversation in 1996 with a white woman, an almost farcical bleeding heart liberal, teaching at an abandoned white school that was now black, elicited (without any prompting) that, generally speaking, these black kids lacked 'self-control', had no 'values' (they lied and stole indiscriminately), were insolent, had great difficulty with arithmetic, had no concern for their environment (throwing trash everywhere), and that their musicality (as evidenced by the choir) was [extraordinary](#); their parents, she said, clearly wanted them at this school because it was white-run. She also related an incident in which she was privately tutoring a group of children, but the mother of the only black child never paid. Finally, she approached the woman and was paid with a check ... which bounced! Was that typical or atypical? I asked. 'Typical', she said, resignedly.

In Truth, Blacks Want To Be Educated *By Whites*

In the *Sunday Star* ("Mr. Chips" Talks On People's Education', by Jon Qwelane: 14 August 1988, p.2):

... "The content [in black schools] must be determined by the people, The history ... taught [to] black students gives no space to project black history; there is no black image in it"

... "People's education wants to instill values in blacks, it wants to instill pride in themselves. *We underrate ourselves and place higher value on the white man because of the [inferior] ... education he gives us.* ... [All emphases added.]

The most common complaint about black education seems to be that it's *different* than whites'. Steven Friedman, e.g., [asserts](#) that blacks cannot 'take part ... in the economy if they don't enjoy the same ... schooling as whites'. As Erich Leistner [says](#), blacks think whites have a magic formula for 'education' which they keep secret, giving blacks a deliberately inferior product. The solution, therefore – from *blacks'* point of view – is presumably not an expressly black education but a white one, and the 'whiter' the better.

The Four No-Exit Options

There are roughly four possibilities *vis a vis* black education: (1) one which is formulated and delivered by whites to be the same as white education; (2) one which is formulated and delivered by whites to be specifically for blacks; (3) one which is formulated and delivered by blacks to be the same as whites'; and (4) one which is formulated and delivered by blacks specifically for blacks.

When you do the first, you're ignoring black culture and 'aspirations'; if you do the second, you're saying blacks are [different](#)! And the last two are doomed to failure simply because education provided by blacks is doomed. (*And if that is false, then let them go ahead and prove it by demonstrating otherwise!*) Surely a no-win situation.

Specific Confirmation of This Claim

James Coleman, author of the *Coleman Report* (1966), discussing its suppressed evidence regarding black teaching performance, refers to the (apparently well-founded)

conjecture that black children would be doing less well, on average, under black teachers than under white teachers. ... [One] implication [of which] would be that a major source of inequality of educational opportunity for black students was the fact that *they were being taught by black teachers* ["On the Self-Suppression of Academic Freedom", *Academic Questions*, Winter 1990-91, p.20; emphases added].

BLACK EDUCATION AND WEALTH CREATION

Blacks Can't Take Part in Economy Without 'White Standard of Schooling'

A column from a typical liberal, Steven Friedman, in the typically liberal *Weekly Mail* (2-8 September 1988, p.10: "Stagnant economy or political change"):

... the economy's biggest problem is [that] most South Africans are excluded ... because they happen to be black. Decades of white rule have ensured that most blacks are too poor to buy many of the goods we produce. Even more do not have the resources to create wealth themselves. So the economy relies on a fifth of the population to sustain its growth ...

... black[s] ... must ... become wealth creators and producers. ... they must be freed from the restrictions which prevent them taking part in the economy. ...

... Nor can they take part effectively in the economy if they don't enjoy the same standard of schooling as whites. ...

Why Don't Blacks Create Wealth Anywhere?

Notice the common mistake – that blacks are excluded 'because they happen to be black'. If apartheid's restrictions were the reason blacks are not wealth creators, why they do not create wealth *anywhere*, with or without such restrictions?

Wealth creation doesn't always *require* resources; often it *produces* them. The most important 'resource' needed is enterprise and imagination. All I needed, e.g., to start a juice business in Kenya with sales of over \$25,000 per month was a blender. His statement that if blacks are to take part in the economy they will have to live in white areas is another *non*

sequitur. The real question is why there aren't more industries in black areas *created and run by blacks* – again, anywhere?

The Catch-22 of Black Education

The problem is that almost any education blacks get will come from whites. At the same time, it is also true that any education that does not come 'from within' is unlikely to succeed. And so here I am saying that if blacks are to be educated it will be by whites, and in the next breath, that unless they can educate themselves such 'education' will not be successful!

Just ask yourself: Is it conceivable that while blacks cannot educate themselves (to anywhere near the level of whites), they nevertheless *can* be educated – to that level – by whites? It seems obvious that if they could be educated (to that level) by whites, then they could do it themselves; and that, conversely, if they cannot do it themselves, then it cannot be done by whites.

From which we are led to Verwoerd's notion of training blacks to be 'hewers of wood', not all that different from Booker T Washington's view that they should start by learning to be bricklayers and artisans – with the proviso that if they want to start their own schools (etc.) and refute this Verwoerdian hypothesis, they should be free to do so. Don't forget: the reason black education so rarely works has as much to do with [character](#) as ability – the black teacher's need to feel superior to his students and the concomitant reluctance to hand over the white man's 'secrets'.

EDUCATION AS WHITE MAN'S WITCHCRAFT

Whites' 'Secret Formula' for Education

On a visit to Johannesburg in July 1988 I again spoke with Erich Leistner (of the Africa Institute of South Africa). He told me that many blacks think that whites have a 'secret formula' for education (like Coca Cola's), which they refuse to share with blacks, and that *that* is why blacks are less educated! Leistner also mentioned how blacks insist on following whites' routines to the letter, whether it makes sense or not. 'If the whites have a study period at 2 o'clock, then so must we', no matter how inconvenient it might be. In other words, outward form and ritual – 'education' is white man's magic. In *The Citizen* ("Western Democracy is losing ground all over Africa", 30 December 1993, p.12): "It would seem Africans failed to obtain the correct [formula](#) for democracy", said an African diplomat in Kenya'.

In fact, magic is as good an explanation for black failure as 'discrimination'. In both cases nothing is allowed to count against the 'favoured explanation': no matter what, it is the fault of whites, either 'racism' or withholding 'magical secrets'. Indeed, they are remarkably

similar, for when all visible discrimination is removed, blame is then laid on invisible – ‘institutional’ – racism, just as, when witchcraft fails, it is due to ‘unseen forces’.

The Talisman Called a ‘Degree’

I was told (in 1993) that the ANC espouses a policy whereby everyone who enters university must get receive a degree. One has to ask what their conception of a ‘degree’ is. Part of the answer, I believe, is that they see it as a *talisman* which *by itself* gives you wealth and power. After all, they are told that a degree is the road to success, and like the [Cargo Cultists](#), they fatally misunderstand this. Do they not realize that such a policy would eventually make these ‘degrees’ as worthless as counterfeit money? Which makes one suspect a cargo cult mentality here. In Nigeria, e.g., if money becomes soiled, most people will not accept it, reflecting their failure to understand that this piece of paper merely *represents* value and had no value in and of itself.

A surgeon at the Wits Medical Faculty told me that the (black) Minister of Health has ordered that from 1998 the incoming classes of all South Africa’s medical schools must ‘reflect South Africa’s demographics’—i.e., 76% black – regardless of merit. This should not be altogether surprising, given that blacks often regard Western medicine as one more example white witchcraft. And since witchcraft is often based on the magical powers of some object, why shouldn’t this witchcraft come in the form of this piece of paper called a ‘Diploma’? What a the student ‘learns’ (whatever *that* is) is unimportant; what matters is that he acquires this piece of paper! And why should a black government allow whites a monopoly on these precious and powerful objects?

All of which reminds me of black attitudes towards titles: a ‘Ph.D.’ is a certification of knowledge, so that a person with a Ph.D. automatically knows more than someone without, and in an argument can simply say, ‘I have a Ph.D. and you don’t; therefore I am right and [you are wrong!](#)’. In his refreshingly contra-liberal book, [The Third World Calamity](#) (1981), Brian May notes this ‘veneration of the paper qualification’ (p.92), as well as the ‘emphasis on status’ (p.94).

BLACK EDUCATION IN AMERICA AND ITS PARALLELS WITH AFRICA

Differences in ‘Learning Styles’

An article from the *Buffalo News* (16 June 1988) talks about black education in America:

Some Stereotyping Can Assist Minority Education

Associated Press

ALBANY – Some racial stereotyping by educators is a risk New York State has to take to start cutting dropout rates among blacks and Hispanics, a member of the state Board of Regents said. “We have opened an area that I hope we will not withdraw

from because of fear”, Adelaide Sanford ... said during a ... symposium on differences in learning styles among racial groups.

[We] must learn to educate children in what is essentially a racist society, said Edmund Gordon, a [black] Yale University professor [A] controversial passage in a Regents handbook ... called for a new approach to teaching blacks because most had a different approach to learning than whites. ...

Gordon said policy makers have to deal with the fact that large segments of society are racist. “I [am] a racist myself ... I prefer black people to white people. ...” [He’s married to a white woman.] Critics ... resent the presumption that children have a certain learning style simply because they’re members of an ethnic group. “There is as much diversity of learning styles among blacks and Hispanics as there are among whites”, said Lucinda Grant-Griffen, a black audience member.

Louis Grumet, head of the state School Board Association, ... agrees that some blacks learn the way the guide describes but it’s dangerous to assume all do. ...

American Blacks ‘Approximate Space, Numbers and Time’

A related item from *The Star* (8 June 1988, p.10; all emphases added):

Schooling Of Blacks In U.S. Is Probed

by Cheetah Haysom

The Star’s Foreign News Service

Why do black American schoolchildren perform less well than their white fellows?

Are poverty and poor conditions the only reasons?

NEW YORK – A ... debate has been set off in the United States over the reemergence of a theory that black and white children learn differently because of their different cultural backgrounds. ...

The debate began when the Board of Regents ... issued a booklet on the causes of the high dropout rate among minority students. It suggested that poverty, poor nutrition and social problems could not account for ... low black school performance. ... [Black] students had a ... “*tendency to approximate space, numbers and time instead of aiming for complete accuracy*”. ...

... *to ignore the causes of black learning problems was to fail to deal with them.* ... black learning style was not worse, just different. ...

... Dr Janice Hale-Benson[:] ... black children are better at generating ideas orally than at writing them down. In black culture, “we value charismatic ... use of language rather than fluency and vocabulary breadth”. ... [B]ecause of their cultural environment, [they] acquired motor skills and hand-eye coordination faster than white children

... Dr Dorothy Strickland, a professor of education at Columbia University, ... said assigning attributes on the grounds of ethnic background was to ignore the individual.

The Nonsense of Calling America a ‘Racist Society’

It is nonsense for Gordon to call America a ‘racist society’. In some ways I also prefer blacks. I love the way they rear children, carrying them on their backs, breast-feeding them day or night, keeping the child with them 24 hours a day. While Western women look upon childrearing and breast-feeding as tremendous feats, African women go about it effortlessly. Does this make me a racist?

The Fallacy Of ‘Equal Diversity’

The fact that ‘there is as much diversity among blacks as whites’ is not incompatible with average, group differences *between* blacks and whites. Suppose, e.g., that the range of physical strength amongst women was the same as amongst men. Would that mean there couldn’t be average differences *between* them?

A well-known conservative black American talk show host, Ken Hamblin, argued (November 1998) that the difference in IQ between the races couldn’t be genetic because he knew too many smart blacks (and, he might have added, too many dumb whites). One could as well say that there are too many tall women and short men to think that the difference in height between them could have a biological basis!

Note, however, that in a typical case of such group differences – e.g., male vs. female athletic performance – and no matter what training is provided, the fastest women in the world are still not as fast as the fastest men; and it is unlikely they ever will be. In such cases it seems not merely a matter of probability and percentages, but of biological limitations, in spite of substantial overlaps with which such limitations are compatible. (In [Brain Sex](#), it is claimed that top female athletes are so because of the effects of abnormal pre-natal male hormones.)

In Ibadan I knew a Nigerian who possessed the greatest mechanical ‘knack’ of anyone I’ve ever met. He could look at a machine and within minutes know how it worked – and more often than not fix it. In this sort of case, average group differences are compatible with an individual from the weaker group having the most ability of anyone in either group, just as Margaret Thatcher’s being arguably the dominant political figure in the latter twentieth century in no way contradicts the fact that men dominate politics.

Also interesting: ‘to ignore the causes of black learning problems was to fail to deal with them’. In [Notes of a Hanging Judge](#) (1990), the black writer Stanley Crouch, quotes the black deputy mayor of New York, Haskell G Ward (*circa* 1981): ‘Until we take responsibility for our condition, we will never change [it] (p.102). From the militant black film-maker Spike Lee: “... you cannot hide the fact that millions of black kids are being born out of wedlock. ... whites aren’t killing black people. ... it’s black people killing black people all across the country. We won’t be able to turn anything around if we don’t address [this]”” ([Crossings](#), pp.210-211).

Grasping Gradations, My Ailing Back and Black Nursing Care

In 1978 I spent seven weeks in a Nigerian hospital for a bad back. Though without a semblance of infrastructure – water, sewage, electricity, sidewalks, paved roads, running trains, etc. – Nigeria had colour TV. At 3 o'clock prompt the set was turned on to a test pattern, accompanied by West African music.

The ward had two rows of 14 beds; I was three beds from the TV. In order for the people in the furthest beds to hear, the TV was (naturally!) set to full volume. Being in traction, I knew that the problem would be to get the volume turned down a *bit*.

I found a likely person and said, 'Would you please turn the volume of the TV down; don't turn it *all* the way down, just *some*. Not like *this* [twisting my hand] but like *this*. Do you understand?' Yes. 'Show me what you're going to do'

It didn't make any difference. The sound went down – all the way. *Why did you turn the TV off!* came shouts from everywhere. Back on it went – full blast. In theory and in practice, Africans have difficulty with matters of degree, and I observed endless times how concepts like precision, detail and exactitude seem [alien](#) to them.

The reader may wonder why I didn't just ask a nurse to lower the volume. And then my mind flashes back to some of the realities of Africa. In this hospital, where you literally couldn't get a bedpan to piss in, the reason was the nurses. Aside from simply not being available, often lounging around and gossiping, their overt hostility towards the patients – not to mention laziness and incompetence – was beyond belief. This was largely due to their need to feel 'superior' by making others 'inferior', and who better to abuse than the hapless patients. I have since observed identical behaviour in South Africa. (See [here](#), [here](#), [here](#), and [here](#)).

Nature-Nurture

Note also the statement that 'Black children, because of their cultural environment, acquired motor skills and hand-eye coordination faster than white[s]'. Why should *just these* effects of 'cultural environment' – agility and learning ability – have somehow remained inviolable, through slavery, racial domination, segregation, integration, etc., while almost everything else from their African culture has vanished?

Does no one ask: What makes a culture the way it is? Of course 'environment' plays a role; but to the extent that blacks' environment is different, this is mostly of their own making. And can't the natural traits of a people *influence* their culture? As Michael Levin observes: 'Using culture as the all-purpose explanation of human behavior ignores the fact that culture itself is just one more natural phenomenon, a product of what is innate in man responding to the environments in which man has found himself' ([Feminism and Freedom](#), pp.73-74).

Another High Status Academic Failing to Recognize Individual/Group Distinction

Finally, look at Dr [Dorothy Strickland](#), of Columbia University, who demonstrates an (*operational*) failure to distinguish between groups and individuals. Only someone ideologically driven could interpret ‘assigning attributes on the grounds of ethnic background’ to mean that *every* black is poor at math. Understood, as it should be, to mean *average* differences, then for an individual black child it means simply a (greater) probability that he will have difficulty with arithmetic and therefore a (greater) probability that he will benefit from a different approach, and consequently a (greater) probability that a classroom of blacks might benefit from such an approach.

Micro- vs. Macro-Judgements

We cannot ‘deal with’ such differences if we ignore them; and if they’re taboo we *will* ignore them. Making such group judgments does not mean ‘ignoring the individual’; each child can and should be dealt with on his or her merits (‘as an individual’), which involves *micro*-judgments. But educational policy also involves *macro*-judgments and macro-policies: judgments and policies regarding groups. (Indeed, policies normally deal with groups, not individuals.) Precisely because macro-judgments are about groups rather than individuals, there is no conflict between such macro-judgments and judging individuals on their merits.

SCHOOL SEGREGATION IN AMERICA

Why Should ‘Separate’ Be ‘Inherently Unequal’?

I heard on the VOA (*circa* 1990), that while Oklahoma City had done everything required to integrate their schools, they had again become (*de facto*) segregated, and the problem was that separate *ipso facto* meant they were unequal. In 1954, when the U.S. Supreme Court issued their epoch-making decision outlawing segregated schools (*Brown vs. Board of Education*), they considered the South’s claim to have provided separate but equal facilities. The heart of their decision was the now famous dictum that ‘*separate is inherently unequal*’.

But precisely why are racially separate schools inherently unequal – meaning, presumably, that white schools will be better? In the American South, whites, then having control, probably provided better schools for themselves. But that doesn’t mean separate is *inherently* – i.e., necessarily – unequal, but merely that in these circumstances it is likely to be. Suppose each group controlled their own schools and had equal funding? Is there any reason for thinking black schools would be inferior?

Well, given that blacks had been ‘disadvantaged’ and were therefore ‘behind’, some provision might be necessary to ‘bring them up’ (at least as far as possible). But once that’s been done, would there *then* be any reason for thinking separate must be unequal?

US Supreme Court Decision ‘Assumes Black Inferiority’

Obviously there is. Whites are capable of creating a reasonable educational system while blacks are not, and I really cannot think of any other way of interpreting ‘separate is inherently unequal’. If *de facto* residential segregation meant some schools were largely Chinese (or German or Korean, etc.), would anyone complain that these schools were ‘inherently inferior’? The idea is preposterous. It is only when those separated are [black](#) that this principle seems to operate.

In his book [Civil Rights: Rhetoric or Reality?](#) (1984), the black economist Thomas Sowell notes (p.70) that ‘The most casual knowledge of history shows that all-Jewish, all-Chinese, or all-German schools have not been inherently inferior’. From black US Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas (*Sunday Times* [South Africa], “Kansas school of racism”, by Simon Barber, 18 June, 1995, p.24):

Legally enforced segregation was evil and unconstitutional, [Judge Thomas] said, but the 1954 court had reached that conclusion for the wrong reasons. It had decided on the basis of “questionable social science” that unless white children were in the classroom, black children’s ability to learn must inevitably be impaired. That, Judge Thomas said, “rests on an assumption of black inferiority”.

In a related decision, “Justice Thomas ... took issue with the lower courts’ premise that a predominantly black district should be enabled to attract more white students”.

“It never ceases to amaze me that the courts are so willing to assume that anything that is predominantly black must be inferior”, Justice Thomas said. The theory that “segregation injures blacks because blacks, when left on their own, cannot achieve” is the result of “a jurisprudence based upon a theory of black inferiority”. ... (“Justices Say Lower Federal Courts Erred in Kansas City Schools Orders”, *New York Times*, 13 June 1995, p.1).

What is equally amazing is that this obvious implication is not commented upon until an honest black man like Clarence Thomas comes along. The profound problem, which even Justice Thomas seems unable to face, is that this assumption is so readily made precisely because it is so self-evidently true.

The ‘Stigma’ of Inferiority

Note that the observation that no one complains about all-Chinese schools (e.g.) would apply even if Orientals were kept separate because of racial prejudice, implying a ‘stigma’ of inferiority – which is what is presumed to make black-white segregation so ‘bad’. But for such a stigma to have long-term harmful effects on a group, two conditions must obtain: first, there must be an element of truth in it, since otherwise it dies of its own accord (e.g., [Chinese](#) and Irish in 19th-century America); and more important, everyone must [insist](#) that it isn’t and cannot be true, thereby generating the idea that there is something shameful

about such average group differences, differences which would otherwise cause those involved little concern.

The Problem Isn't Blacks *Per Se*, But Blacks *Too Many*

While many blacks would undoubtedly benefit from white schools, it is impossible to *control* their numbers, because that could only be based on the 'racist' premise that *too many* blacks is bad news. The result? White schools become black almost overnight. As in South Africa, most whites would not mind blacks in their schools; what they fear is their becoming *too black*. [*The Burden of Brown*](#) (1984) cites 40% as the 'tipping point'; for some [left-wing Jews](#) it is 5%. Over time, this 'point' will tend to get lower and lower as people anticipate the results and try to be the first to escape a sinking ship.

And so once again we see the consequences of our unwillingness to confront natural racial inequalities.

IS IT RACIST TO RESIST BLACKS IN YOUR NEIGHBOURHOODS AND SCHOOLS?

Residential Integration In America

From *The Citizen* (10 August 1988, p.6):

Mixed Housing Court Order Threatens City by Marlene Aig

YONKERS, New York – A dispute over a judge's order ... has split this community

The Yonkers dispute grows out of years of efforts by courts across the United States to force racial equality in public housing and schools. ... courts have ordered children to be bused to schools away from their own neighborhoods to even out the racial mix in classrooms.

... US District Court Judge Leonard Sand found in 1985 that [Yonkers] had intentionally segregated its schools ... by building low-income housing mainly on the west side of the city. The judge wants ... low-income housing ... built all over the city.

Last week, [he] found the city in contempt But ... *the city council voted 4-3 to reject a package of incentives to attract developers of 800 new low-income housing units.*

The racial divisions in Yonkers evolved through the city's shape – split by a parkway, with the older, more industrial section on the west and a more affluent area ... to the east. Some 6,800 units of low-income housing were built in the 1960s, mostly on the west side. Originally, they housed people of Irish, Italian and Slavic origins, but those groups prospered and moved to the east side.

Blacks and Hispanics from New York City's borough of the Bronx, on Yonker's southern border, took their place and now account for nearly 30 percent of the city's population. ...

Marvin Addison, 27, who lives in ... one of the city's worst housing projects, says: "Whites will violate the law ..., pay huge fines ... [and] may even go to jail to keep Blacks out of their neighbourhoods". ...

"We worked and saved all our lives so we could move out of the Bronx to this beautiful neighborhood – and for what?" asked John Loggio, 62 "So we won't be able to sell our house? It's value has lost 100,000 dollars". ...

"We hope [the city council] won't betray us again" resident Bernadette McLaughlin said "*We know we aren't guilty of anything. We've done nothing wrong.*" ... – Sapa-AP. [Emphasis added.]

No Matter How You Slice It, Blacks Are Seen as a Pestilence – by Whites *and* Blacks

First of all, how is being in a white neighbourhood supposed to keep black housing from becoming a blot? Are whites are so superior that their mere presence will forestall black blight? It's as if blacks are a plague which, if diluted by being spread out amongst the (healthy) white community, may be tolerable. You cannot spend time in America, reading about the endless difficulties with integration, without this idea of a black pestilence striking one, and as always, actions speak louder than words: when they are able to, blacks waste no time in fleeing black areas, and when their numbers in white areas approach a critical mass, whites do the same.

White Resistance

'We've Done Nothing Wrong'

Previous residents 'prospered and moved to the east side'; I'm sure there are blacks who prosper and move there and that few if any whites object. But that there are *good reasons* for not wanting *lots* of blacks is never mentioned. Instead it's because 'we won't be able to sell our house'. True enough; but why will they *want* to sell it? Because if there are a lot of blacks it won't be a nice place anymore. And though this is not the slightest bit racist, most Americans accept that it is.

Nevertheless, some aren't so easily duped: "We know we aren't guilty of anything. We've done nothing wrong". And they are confident enough to act, even in the face of tremendous pressure. What they are lacking is a *philosophical rationale* for their stance – which I hope this book may provide.

In Italy

In Italy, a man complains about African squatters in terms that have the ring of plain common sense ("The Indignity of Labor": *Time*, 13 September 1993, p.42):

“It’s easy just to call us racists, but try living here. These Africans have destroyed our town and our livelihood. I don’t say they should be kicked out, but they should act decently. They live surrounded by trash. [See [Sam Mabe](#).] Their settlement breeds rats. Everyone knows the women are whores. I’ve seen them dealing drugs on the street. *Is it racist to want that stopped?*” [Emphasis added.]

Rural South Africa: ‘Prisoners After Dark’

A poignant letter in *The Citizen* (“No Response To Queries On Infringements”, 16 August 1988, p.19):

... I voted for the present government in 1983, believing that their policy of ‘change’ would bring about a better life for my seven grandchildren. I trusted in the promise of the Prime Minister and his government when they told me that their proposed ‘change’ would not interfere with my way of life as a White South African. They ... even guaranteed in print and in Parliament that my “White-residential area” would be protected by law for all time.

But ... [w]ithin the short time of 5 years my White village and also all the surrounding White villages ... are fast becoming a haven for Blacks who have moved into every available servant’s quarters, and empty building. ...

... if we do not succeed in our efforts to keep our residential areas free from this type of invasion, *then we the Whites will become prisoners in our own homes after dark.* [All emphases added.]

W Knoesen

Graskop

One can only feel sympathy for these whites who, even in the rural areas, have become ‘prisoners after dark’. Few of them mind blacks, but do mind that it is no longer safe to walk at night.

Quasi-Military ‘Takeovers’

Re this plaintive cry, many blacks do see these as ‘take-overs’, almost military in nature. I remember in 1979 (in Nigeria) an elite [Kenyan](#) saying triumphantly “We’ve won Rhodesia and South Africa is next!”; many think in such terms with regards to specific buildings, neighbourhoods, schools.

The pattern goes like this: first, groups of young blacks are seen ‘hanging around’, accompanied by pan-handling and petty theft. Then they infiltrate the parks and playgrounds, which soon ‘belong’ to them. If there are any vacant grounds, these become soccer fields, with ‘hawkers’ selling bananas, chewing gum and candy. Then you see blacks just lounging around. The only people on the street (especially after dark) are blacks; all this in neighbourhoods where virtually all the residents are white.

How long such a situation can continue? I am thinking of Killarney, a wealthy area consisting of posh apartment buildings, occupied mostly by elderly whites (many Jewish), with parks and a very upmarket shopping centre. For economic reasons alone, it is hard to imagine it becoming a festering black slum. Yet what can the long-term prognosis be with blacks swarming about and whites afraid to put foot out of doors?

Then there is Melville, one of the 'in' entertainment areas since Hillbrow became black, consisting of single family homes on hilly terrain, a bit like San Francisco. It is one of the few 'street' scenes with white nightlife, one reason being the relative *absence* of blacks. Recently, however, a park has been 'occupied' by blacks, with their garbage, defecation and other unpleasanties, cheek to jowl with trendy restaurants, books stores, boutiques and art galleries, while whites pretend nothing is wrong!

MORE BLACK 'ANGER': THE BEST DEFENCE IS AN OFFENCE [BDO]

Blacks Destroy Property, Then Get 'Angry'

From *The Star* (8 August 1988, p.5; all emphases added):

**Caretakers threatened with violence
Tenants Blamed For Poor State Of Flats**
by Sheanaaz Bulbulia and Janet Heard

Black tenants were destructive and to blame for the bad condition of flats, [said] Mr. D Malan, head lessee of a number of Joubert Park blocks of flats [near central Johannesburg] ...

Mr. Cohen said: "The owners called me in because ... [of] tenants complaining ..." ... broken windows and leaking toilets had not been repaired ... [no] electricity in the ... foyer, broken door locks, no hot water and out-of-order lifts. ...

... "... Three years ago, the original owners were proud of the flats. Today, ... nonwhites have moved in ..., and they are destructive." Mr. Cohen said black tenants vandalised buildings, creating havoc and destruction. [They] were unaware of health and sanitation.

"Sanitary towels and newspaper pages are put down the toilet bowls, causing blockages. They don't know what toilet rolls are." ... tenants threw bottles at one another when they were drunk and broke windows.

"There is always war and friction going on. We never had broken windows ... with whites. "The caretakers cannot control tenants and are threatened with violence ...". The lifts did not work because children abused them "In one case ... the plug was so dangerous, I pulled the wire out. A tenant was so angry, he threatened to kill me. ... I am trying to maintain the building and have so far repaired windows, boilers, lights, globe-holders and plugs. We are putting up with all this nonsense." ...

... tenants ... agreed to pay the R45 service levy for maintenance ..., but a number were refusing to pay the levy until the repairs had been seen to. [And *then* they'll refuse to pay!] About R7,100 had recently been spent getting a [new] boiler but [he] complained that the flats were overcrowded with the result that there was [still] insufficient hot water.

“We ... are trying to uplift these people”, Mr. Cohen said. “I have no objection to ... [blacks]. I would like to see them Europeanised.” ...

Black Intelligence: *BDO*

Imagine, first they wreck the buildings and then complain that the landlords don't maintain them! – illustrating blacks' superior psychological intelligence and the philosophy that *the best defense is an offense* [*BDO*]. Rather than waiting till the landlord complains about the damages, you *first* shout at *him* for not fixing them! When accused of wrongdoing – especially if guilty – don't deny the charges; instead, attack, by accusing your accuser of wronging you!

This is a psychologically brilliant tactic and illustrates again that in these respects the black man puts the white man to shame. I remember an incident in Nigeria when a roadside mechanic replaced the brake blocks of my car. He said he would get them cheap – \$40. Out of curiosity I went to the dealer and got a quote – \$20. When he came to collect his money, I asked: ‘How much did you pay?’ \$40. ‘How much did you say they cost from the dealer?’ \$50. ‘Here’, I said, ‘look at this’, handing him the quote for \$20.

What did he say? ‘Oh, there must be some mistake’ or ‘I'm sorry, I'll give you the money back’? Not on your life! Caught red-handed, this man – I swear! – accused me of (somehow) cheating him! He didn't question the facts, but instinctively realised that rather than defend himself it was much better to take the strongest possible position and accuse *me* of wronging *him*, thereby putting me on the defensive and diverting attention from his own wrongdoing. I remember being quite nonplused – but impressed – by the uncanny brazenness of his performance. In fact, *BDO* behaviour is really just an example of black [‘anger’](#).

Black Psychological Insight

One day a close friend and I were engaged in that peculiarly male bantering consisting of trading mutual ‘insults’ (‘How can you say something so stupid! ...’). A young black woman who happened to be there was watching this and asked, “How long have you two known each other?” “About three months”, I said, to which she replied, “Wow, only three months, and yet you're so close!” While many whites (especially females) would perceive our behaviour as spiteful bickering, this woman immediately grasped that in fact it represented an unusual degree of familiarity and affection without which it would have been impossible. I remember at the time being struck by her almost preternatural discernment.

HOW WHITE GUILT FEEDS BLACK 'ANGER'

'I Feel Ashamed'

A letter to *The Star* ("Where Is South Africa's Churchill?" 8 August 1988, p.9):

... I feel ashamed of the privileges I enjoy because of my white skin, particularly the right to choose where ... to live. ...

... I am [occasionally] consulted by Sowetan mothers facing ejection from their homes, flowing from the rent boycott. They are often accompanied by their sons aged between 15 and 18. I explain to the mothers the awesome powers of the local authorities to eject them summarily. These young men do not take part in the discussion but remain in the background. They look at me with a measure of contempt and hatred. I am told ... they do not regard their parents as bound by laws in which [they] had no [say]. ... The[se] young men ... are potential Khmer Rouge recruits who will have no hesitation in creating the killing fields of South Africa.

Is there not one white leader of Churchillian stature who can speak for South Africa before it is too late?

Oaklands
Zimerman

M

Obviously, he's never considered whether might be *reasons* for this separation – such as those [just mentioned](#)? Does he think *blacks* would feel shame at such 'privileges'? If so, he should read about the treatment of blacks by [black 'elite'](#), making them wash clothes that aren't dirty, as well as the behaviour of [American](#) blacks. Most blacks don't know what such shame is and treat 'lower' blacks with a [contempt](#) few whites can imagine – which should make us very suspicious of black 'outrage' at white 'oppression'.

Furthermore, I can't believe so many young blacks really give a damn about whether their parents 'had a say' in making laws; indeed, I'd be surprised if they even knew what this meant. How many of *them* would give anyone a 'say' if they were in power? (A big fat zero, that's how many.) Is it surprising he sees 'contempt and hatred'? Isn't that what he thinks he deserves? Once blacks learn that whites think blacks have *reason* to hate them, many will be happy to oblige, instinctively realizing the psychological advantage of being the '*injured party*'.

Anti-Apartheid Film 'Shocks' Whites; Black Shrugs It Off

In *The Citizen* (30 July 1988, p.4: "Mixed reaction from Jo'burg cinema-goers"), an account of audience response to Richard Attenborough's anti-apartheid film *Cry Freedom*:

... A young black businessman ... said: "I am not politically inclined, but I enjoyed the film ...

"... it is only 50 percent accurate ... It is not a true reflection of the situation in this country. I believe things are changing".

Compare this with *The Star* (30 July 1988, p.2: “‘Cry’ shocks audiences”):

AS POLICE bullets ripped into the crowd of schoolchildren there were gasps of horror ... from a cinema audience witnessing the final climatic minutes of “Cry Freedom” They joined in singing “Nkosi Sikelel iAfrika”, which accompanies the film’s last frame ... a list of those who have died in detention. To the film’s last spoken word, “Amandla”, there was a thunderous “Awethu” in reply from the audience [‘Power is ours’.] ...

Afterward, as patrons left, many were in tears, others sombre. Some walked away heads bowed

Something which a black shrugs off, leaves whites ‘sombre’, ‘in tears’ and with ‘heads bowed’, illustrating their insatiable appetite for self-flagellating guilt ... , while the ‘virtually all white’ audience shouts ‘Power is ours’ (i.e., *yours!*). The joy with which they cheer their own demise is truly mind-boggling and literally shrieks out for an explanation.

First Inklings About White Racial Guilt

In 1981, after two years in Nairobi, I visited the U.S.. I was given the name of a Kenyan in Miami and we got together. She was – typically – not at all uptight about race and we had a completely upfront conversation.

Originally coming as a student, she’d been there for five years. She had a black American boyfriend and lived in a black neighbourhood. Having spent three years in West Africa and now two in East Africa I was beginning to formulate some ‘hypotheses’. It was dawning on me, I said to her, that whites felt guilty about race and that African leaders had learned to take advantage of this.

And I wondered whether something like this might not be true in America, where whites bent over backwards to ‘help’ blacks, blaming everything on slavery and discrimination etc. Did American blacks also know that this was rubbish? Did they perhaps even talk about it amongst themselves, *and* – given that, *unlike* Africans, they had cottoned on to white guilt – did they have a laugh over how easily whites could be hoodwinked and manipulated through this guilt? Yes, she said; American blacks viewed white attempts to ‘help’ them as a ‘racket’, and yes, they did have a laugh over it.

Racial Discord Rests on White Racial Guilt

Many of the racial difficulties in America (and South Africa), I began to realize, stem from this white guilt, which itself rests squarely on the assumption that the idea of racial differences is morally bad; and it does so in at least two ways.

To begin with, most whites, ‘in their heart of hearts’, think the white man is superior, but given their belief that this very idea is reprehensible, they feel guilty about it. Secondly, this guilt results from the white man’s blaming himself for the black man’s problems. But the reason he so readily accepts this blame is his unwillingness to consider any *other*

explanation – such as differences in character and ability; the only explanation, therefore, is that it is *his* fault. Hence the guilt. And the *reason* he is unwilling to consider this other explanation is because it is so [‘offensive to human decency’](#).

It is clear, therefore, that this assumption, whereby the possibility of racial differences is rejected *a priori*, is the linchpin on which white guilt rests, and I can think of no single idea the frank and open recognition of which would do more positive good and be more truly liberating than my claim that the idea of racial differences is *not* morally bad. As disastrous as the consequences of white guilt are, that is how beneficial would be the consequences of ridding ourselves of this philosophical albatross upon which this guilt rests.

RACIAL GUILT AND SELF-HATRED: A FATAL FLAW IN THE WHITE RACE

Campaign Against South Africa Led By White Nations

The campaign of sanctions against (white) South Africa was galvanized, orchestrated and implemented by whites nations – Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Scandinavia, the U.S. – and I do not think any other race would behave this way. Imagine, e.g., that an Indian dominated government in Fiji (where Indians constitute half the population and control the economy) were to come under attack for ‘oppressing’ the indigenous Melanesians. While India might not openly defend their compatriots, I can’t imagine them leading the call for sanctions *against* them. Nor China *vis a vis* the large Chinese minority in Malaysia. And yet that is precisely what whites all over the world have done to the whites of South Africa. This can only be explained in terms of racial guilt and self-hatred.

White Guilt Can Never Be Assuaged; Blacks Understand This and Use It To Advantage

White Guilt Is *False* Guilt

Where a person has wronged someone, his guilt can be alleviated by an apology, followed by forgiveness from the victim. In the case of white racial guilt, however, where there was usually little if any wrong done, or where it was done generations ago, and where, moreover, the ‘oppressor’ knows, in his heart of hearts, that he has nothing to feel guilty about – in other words, where the ‘guilt’ involves *self-deceit* – there can never be normal forgiveness since the ‘guilt’ isn’t based on any genuine wrong and there really isn’t any victim. Instead, the (*false*) ‘guilt’ is constantly being re-created and renewed by self-hatred.

Apologizing Only Makes Matters Worse; Chicken-or-Egg

To make matters worse, since ‘angry’ blacks know there is little if any basis for their ‘anger’, they are not about to ‘forgive’, especially since their ‘anger’ and the ‘guilt’ on which it feeds, is their ‘meal-ticket’. Therefore, any attempts at ‘reparations’ will only be seen as further

‘proof’ of the ‘wrong’ done and hence will lead to *more* ‘angry demands’, not less. (Indeed, we have already seen that blacks have deliberately *used* white self-hatred in an attempt to [‘destroy’](#) whites.)

So what you have is self-flagellation in a kind of symbiotic relationship with guilt. It’s a bit of a chicken-or-egg scenario: Do whites believe that they’ve done something wrong (and hence feel guilty) *because they hate themselves*, or do they hate themselves *because they think they’ve done something wrong*?

Self-Hatred the Preserve of Whites – With Jews In the Vanguard

But this self-hatred-cum-guilt is almost exclusively white: you won’t find it amongst Orientals, Indians, Latin Americans or blacks. In [Illiberal Education](#) (1991), Dinesh D’Souza paraphrases Kenneth Arrow, a Nobel prize-winning economist at Stanford, thus (p.88): ‘It is the white man, more than anyone else, who can be “played” with the tactic of the “guilt trip”. Only the white man can be intimidated by a catalog of his forefathers’ errors and crimes.’

Examples

‘It Is Right That Whites Should Be Castrated!’ [spoken by a Jew]

In 1967, at the beginning of the ‘black power’ movement in America, at a left-wing political conference in which whites (disproportionately Jewish) gave in to every black radical demand, no matter how outrageous (for which they were, understandably, showered with contempt), a delegate recalls a ‘Jewish leftist’ screaming “‘*After 400 years of slavery, it is right that whites should be castrated!*’” ([Second Thoughts About Race in America](#), 1991, p.15; emphasis added).

Similarly, (white) men not only capitulate to the most strident demands of feminists, they often spearhead them (and, as a result, are being emasculated). And just as this misbegotten ‘anti-racism’ couldn’t flourish without the leadership of whites, so feminism depends on the more than willing cooperation of ‘guilty’ men. And as a friend noted, the white man’s religion, Christianity, is also guilt-based: ‘original sin’ makes one ‘guilty’ before he so much as sets foot on earth! – in which respects it is, I believe, also unique.

Whites Are ‘The Cancer Of History’ [from another Jew]

Indeed, feminism is also largely white. Frankly, I think all of this represents a *fatal flaw* in the white race: the capacity for self-flagellating, unfounded guilt and the self-loathing that underlies it. Amongst what other race, e.g., will one find a leading intellectual saying, of her own race, that it “*is the cancer of history*”? (Susan Sontag [Jewish], quoted by David Horowitz in [Second Thoughts](#), 1991, p.134).

Robert Frost's Definition of a Liberal

No one could have put it more succinctly than the American poet [Robert Frost](#): '*A liberal is a man too broadminded to take his own side in a quarrel*'. In short, a liberal will always *take the side of his adversary*, even when the adversary literally wants to kill him. If he's a Jew, he'll take the side of the Arabs; if he's white, he'll take the side of blacks; if male, females; if heterosexual, homosexuals; if Christian, Muslims; *etc.*

And amongst whites, Jews seem worst afflicted. (See, e.g., [Why Be Jewish?](#) by Rabbi Meir Kahane.) No doubt this has something to do with their history of persecution and their subsequent readiness to identify with the 'underdog' – which may make it understandable, but no less deadly. That the two most fatuous liberals mentioned in this book, Lelyveld and Wasserstrom, are both Jewish, as are two of the leading lights of the South African Communist Party – Joe Slovo (deceased) and Ronnie Kasrils – not to mention such Jewish over-representation remarked on just above (*and*, as just one more example, in the Russian Revolution), cannot be mere coincidences. But where antisemites see a sinister conspiracy, I see a fatal weakness, accentuated amongst Jews. And though this calls for an explanation, conspiracy theories aren't it.

Jewish 'Cabals': A Refutation

A refutation of such antisemitic calumnies about Jewish *cabals* aimed at world domination is simple: If Jews are so *ethnocentric*, why is it that their rate of intermarriage is so great that they will soon disappear as an identifiable group? (See, e.g., Alan Dershowitz' [The Vanishing American Jew](#) [2000].) Not to mention their searing self-hatred and their malignant hatred of religion, *especially* Judaism. Does this sound like ethno-centrism to you?

Jewish Jew-Hatred: Israeli Soldiers Must "Feel the Pain of Their Enemies"

An article posted at the [Freeman Center For Strategic Studies](#) shows that this take-the-side-of-your-enemies poison reaches to the highest realms of Israeli society – *and* that it precedes the 1960s ("Israel's Government is Bad for the Jews", by Prof. Paul Eidelberg, 19 March 2007):

[In 1995, Israeli Prime Minister] Yitzhak Rabin – without any protest from his Chief of General Staff Ehud Barak – deleted the terms "Judaism" [and] "Zionism," ... from the IDF [Israeli Defence Force] Code of Ethics. This IDF Code, writes Dr. Amnon Goldberg,

preaches *havlaga* – "restraint" – and *tahar haneshek*, "purity of arms", terms coined by the Jewish Agency *in the 1930s* [NB] and advocating a passive policy in response to murderous Arab terror, stipulating that weapons be used solely as a means of self-defense and that "unnecessary" bloodshed be avoided at all costs, even at the expense of Israeli casualties, and that soldiers should always "*feel the pain of our enemies*" ... (*Jerusalem Post Magazine*, March 16, 2007). [Emphases added.]

“No army on earth,” says Goldberg, “ever held to such insanity.”

In short, the Israeli military advocates *sympathizing with the enemy!* Insanity, to be sure. And just another example of Jewish Jew-hatred.

Israelis ‘Morally Identify With Those Committed To Its Annihilation’

A powerful summation of this hatred is to be found in a piece by Louis Rene Beres, Professor of Political Science and International Law at Purdue University (“Cowardice And Desecration: The Deeper Jewish Meanings of ‘Disengagement’”, *Freemanlist Digest*, Vol 13, Issue 38, 16 Mar 05) (all emphases added):

The relentless moral cowardice of so many Jewish "intellectuals" consecrates [i.e., *blesses*] Israel’s relentless enemies. Writing several years ago about Israel’s Oslo Agreements, the Israeli novelist Aaron Mugged noted: "We have witnessed a phenomenon which probably has no parallel in history; *an emotional and moral identification by the majority of Israel’s intelligentsia with people openly committed to our annihilation*".

Yes, ‘Liberalism Is a Mental Disorder’

For years I have heard conservatives call liberalism a mental disease and have generally viewed this as hyperbole. Recently, however, it has occurred to me that people like Michael Savage, the talk show host, are right. For if the essence of liberalism is self-hatred – hatred of one’s race, of one’s sex, of one’s ‘sexual orientation’, of one’s religion, of one’s ethnicity, of one’s nation(ality), indeed, even of one’s species (*vis a vis* ‘animal rights’) – and if the essence of such self-hatred is *taking the enemy’s side and being against one’s own interests* – then what better measure of mental illness could there be *than acting in furtherance of one’s own destruction?* Think about it. If *suicidal* impulses makes an individual ‘sick’, then surely it makes a society, a people and a race just as sick – and just as certainly, doomed.

Feminism and the Homosexual Lobby: Truly A Sickness Unto Death

Notice how this self-destructive self-hatred, which lies at the heart of liberalism, fits seamlessly with feminism and the promotion of homosexuality. While [feminism](#) is inherently destructive because it leads to negative population growth, it has become increasingly – and openly – anti-family, anti-marriage and anti-child-bearing. When a friend, teaching at a junior college in Los Angeles, played a video about the dangers of women not having children, his female students were outraged. *They were going to have good jobs – and that was that!!* Reasoning with them, he assured me, was out of the question. This is bedrock feminism.

Moreover, it is clear that this assault on marriage and child-rearing is part and parcel of the agenda to legitimize homosexuality – and, preposterous as it might seem, to *de*-legitimize heterosexuality. Precisely because they are so aware of [the abhorrent nature of their own](#)

[behaviour](#), sodomists will savagely insist on precisely the opposite; hence, e.g., the campaign to institutionalize homosexual marriage.

Thus, two of the dominant 'liberation' movements of our time – feminism (with its pro-abortion zealotry) and the promotion of homosexuality – have identical goals and consequences: a suicidally reduced birth rate. Add to this their penchant for taking the side of an enemy sworn to their destruction (à la the [Jews of Israel](#)), and what you have are people whose goal seems to be the destruction of their own society: discouraging marriage and child-rearing is *anti-life*, as of course is abortion, as is the active encouragement of homosexuality.

Ergo, to the extent these ideas become dominant, they point in only one direction: *death*. A people who refuse to reproduce obviously *has no future*. Whites may bury their heads in the sand, but hispanic groups like *La Raza*, advocating the *reconquista* of the American southwest, [know better](#).

"Go back to Boston! Go back to Plymouth Rock, Pilgrims! Get out! We are the future. You are old and tired. Go on. We have beaten you. Leave like beaten rats. You old white people. It is your duty to die. *Through love of having children, we are going to take over.*" [My emphasis.]

Truly, a *sickness unto death*.

Explaining The Rise of the Homosexual Movement

It may seem that the rapid acceptance of homosexuality (since the 1960s) was somehow inevitable. Nevertheless, specific circumstances are relevant. The *New York Times* has an enormous influence on public opinion in America, far out of proportion to its circulation (in November 2008 only about one million). This is apparently due to the fact that what appears on the *Times*' front page largely determines the lead stories on network TV news – which, for the vast majority of Americans, is their only source of news. And who determines what is on that front page? Frequently, says Richard Berke, the *Times*' National Political Correspondent and himself a homosexual, 'literally three-quarters of the people deciding what's on the front page are [not-so-closeted homosexuals](#)'.

It is disturbing, to say the least, that such a relative handful of people, completely hidden from public view, could have such a profoundly insidious impact on the very survival of the Western world. And make no mistake about it, homosexual advocacy groups are often genuinely evil. The founder of one such group [admits](#) that he has

"helped to create a truly fascist organization ..." which consciously subscribed to "subversive modes, drawn largely from [Adolph Hitler's] voluminous *Mein Kampf*, which some of us studied as a working model. As ACT UP/D.C. grew, we struck intently and surgically into whatever institution we believed to stand in our way..."

THE GUILTY MIND SYNDROME (GMS)

Over the past several years an idea has been gestating in the back of my mind, which I have dubbed *The Guilty Mind Syndrome (GMS)*.

Examples

(1) In the early 1980s I heard an item on the *BBC* about a high-ranking Soviet defector who had said that many of the top Communist leaders lived in constant dread of an nuclear attack from America, almost, he said, as if they were looking over their shoulders expecting it at any moment.

(2) In 1973 homosexual activists stormed a meeting of the American Psychiatric Association (APA) ‘demanding’ that homosexuality be removed from their compendium of illnesses. Though successful in their intimidation, a small group resisted and formed a subgroup within the APA offering their services to any-one wishing to become straight, claiming a small but significant success rate. The ‘activists’ were incensed by this, insisting that such therapy, though strictly voluntary, must be prohibited and the group disbanded.

(3) In *The Mail & Guardian*, a leftwing weekly in South Africa, there are these paragraphs about Thabo Mbeki, President of South Africa (“Mbeki in bizarre Aids outburst”, by Drew Forrest and Barry Streek, week of 26 Oct – 1 November 2001, p.4; all emphases added):

... after referring to medical schools where black people were “reminded of their role as germ carriers”, [Mbeki] says: “Thus does it happen that others who consider themselves to be our leaders take to the streets carrying their placards, to demand that *because we are germ carriers, and human beings of a lower order that cannot subject its passions to reason, we must perforce adopt strange opinions, to save a depraved and diseased people from perishing from self-inflicted disease*”.

... “Convinced that we are but natural-born, promiscuous carriers of germs, unique in the world, they proclaim that our continent is doomed to an inevitable moral end because of our unconquerable devotion to the sin of lust”.

(4) In late 1999, during a visit to the US, my recently divorced brother had acquired a much younger girlfriend whom his teenage son Clark despised. Approaching the living room, through which he had to pass to exit, my brother says in a conspiratorial whisper, “*Is Clark there?*”. No, I said, but why are you whispering? Oh, he said, he was carrying a bag with some shoes for his girlfriend. And so? “*I don’t want him to see!*” Satisfied that the room was ‘clear’, he left.

(5) In Johannesburg, a lesbian couple were convicted of murdering a four year old child. The headline says it all: “SLAIN because he refused to call his mother’s lesbian lover ‘Daddy’” (*The Star*, 23 March 2006, p.1). (For a frighteningly similar example from the U.S., involving black lesbians, see [here](#).)

Examples Analyzed

(i) Let us assume that Soviet leaders did in fact expect to be attacked by America. The question is, How can one *explain* this, given that it was totally at odds with reality?

The defector had said that most of these leaders were guilty of terrible crimes, and let us assume that that is also true. I would claim that, with few exceptions, people who do wicked and evil things *know* that they are wicked and evil – *and* that they deserve to be punished.

These beliefs – that they were evil and deserved to be punished – were basically true. But they also believed things which were flagrantly false, specifically, that *American* leaders knew, as the Soviet leaders did, that these Soviets were criminals who deserved to be punished. In fact, nothing could have been further from the truth.

The Glaring Light Phenomenon (GLP)

So why *did* the Soviet leaders believe these things? First – and what is typical of someone who's aware that he's doing wrong – he assumes that his behaviour *and* its wrongness are glaringly apparent to everyone and anyone, like a flashing neon light, even when this is not remotely the case (*The Glaring Light Phenomenon [GLP]*). And secondly, they believed that American leaders not only knew this but would *act* upon it.

Note, therefore, that what these communists were assuming with regards to what the Americans believed – that they (the Soviet leaders) were evil and deserved to be punished – is *nothing more nor less than what these Soviets themselves believed*, viz., that they deserved to be and *would* be punished. And what could be less surprising and more natural than that they should think that *others would believe about them precisely what they believed about themselves*?

Hence, we get exactly what the defector said: the Soviet leadership living in dread of a nuclear attack from America. *GMS*.

(ii) Why did homosexual activists demand that psychiatrists offering to help homosexuals wishing to become straight be stopped? First, I would assert that they feel shame and revulsion about their lifestyle and assume that everyone else feels the same way. Anything, therefore, which could even remotely be interpreted as casting aspersions on their behaviour will immediately be seen as a neon light broadcasting their disgusting behaviour for all to see (*GLP*). 'What could these psychiatrists be saying *other* than that our lifestyle is filthy and disgusting?' (After all, that's what *we* think!) And that will not be tolerated! Once again, they are merely assuming that others feel towards them *precisely what they feel towards themselves*. *GMS*.

(iii) Thabo Mbeki's accusations against whites are remarkable on several counts. First, the idea of whites 'carrying placards' with such allegations is not only false but absurdly so.

Even in America, where whites are still a large majority, this is unimaginable; how much more so in South Africa where they are a small minority recently stripped of political power? How does one explain Mbeki making such a charge? Well, virtually everything Mbeki accuses whites of saying about blacks is true – and uncannily accurate: they are promiscuous; black men do have higher levels of testosterone and hence are more ‘lustful’; they are more impulsive and have less self-control; and they are ‘disease-carriers’ – besides AIDS and TB, the rate of other sexually transmitted diseases amongst blacks is astronomical; and whether or not Africa is ‘doomed’, it is clear that Mbeki, for one, thinks it is.

But why does he make these ‘bizarre’ charges? Well, once again, he is assuming, first, that blacks’ numerous moral malfeasances are glaringly obvious to everyone (*GLP*) and hence he is merely assuming that others believe about his group *what he himself believes*. And so he *expects* them to say such things because that’s what *he* thinks they *ought* to say. In other words, the *GMS*.

(Another example of the *GMS*, concerning blacks’ “nappy hair”, which the reader may wish to analyze in terms of this discussion, can be found [here](#).)

(iv) Though really doing nothing wrong, my brother nevertheless *felt* like a child-with-his-hand-in-the-cookie-jar. He therefore assumed that everyone somehow ‘knew’ what he was doing (*GLP*), and that his son Clark, like his namesake Clark Kent, would use his x-ray vision to see through the bag and know immediately who these shoes were for and would (of course!) ‘challenge’ him. Hence, his need to ‘sneak out’. Once again, a clear case of the *GMS*.

(v) When I saw the photographs of the lesbian couple I thought it was a mistake, because one of them was clearly a man. But no, this was the ‘male’ partner and, as I guessed, the one who beat the child to death. (Ditto with the black lesbians mentioned [above](#).)

Inner Turmoil

Why would the child’s refusing to call her ‘daddy’ provoke her so? First of all, and like most homosexuals, she feels (*genuine* and *warranted*) self-loathing. Combine this with the unrelenting drumbeat promoting homosexuality as healthy, normal, even desirable, and you get an *inner turmoil* resulting from the clash between the fantasies she *hears* and the reality she *knows*. And once again, she assumes that others regard her with the same disgust with which she regards herself; consequently she expects to be treated with the contempt which she feels towards herself, *and*, which she thinks she deserves.

Thus, extraordinary as it might seem, when this four year old boy refused to call her ‘daddy’ – which would have been an affirmation of her normality – she can only ‘see’ this as an accusation of what she herself believes and expects to hear: that she is *abnormal* and disgusting. And so she lashes out. *GMS*.

How “Liberation’ Has Made Things Worse for Homosexuals

I believe it is precisely this inner turmoil which causes the numerous pathologies so common amongst (male) homosexuals – promiscuity, drug abuse, pedophilia, *et. al.* – all of which are attempts to reaffirm their sexuality, something which is only necessary because of the self-loathing intrinsic to their lifestyle.

I would further conjecture that this self-loathing has been greatly exacerbated by homosexual ‘liberation’, as a result of which they are constantly having to confront the reality of their behaviour vs. the ‘normality’ they are *supposed* to believe in, making it much more difficult to ‘ignore’ this reality than before, when the ethos was pretty much: ‘you keep to yourselves and we’ll keep to ourselves’. They were, indeed, living ‘in the shadows’; but that, after all, is pretty much where this behaviour should be. Not in jail, certainly; but not ‘parading’ down main street either.

This murder underscores the very real consequences of [Sickness-Unto-Death](#) Political Correctness: this little boy had a father who wanted to take care of him; instead, he was – of course! – given to this ‘perfectly healthy and normal’ lesbian couple! (For another example of homosexual GMS see [here](#).)

AFRICANS’ BELIEF IN WITCHCRAFT

Blacks’ Understanding of Science

A most interesting column by Sam Mabe (*Sowetan*, 7 September 1988, p.7):

Witchcraft Slows Us Down

ONE of our readers wrote ... that we blacks are scientists because we can use witchcraft to strike our enemies and bewitch others to make them go crazy. He suggests that we could be using witchcraft to rid ourselves of ... poverty, unemployment and all other handicaps caused by apartheid. ...

I do not believe witchcraft has any role to play in nation-building. ...

... many people ... have been brutally murdered ... after they were blamed ... for causing ... catastrophes through [witchcraft](#). ...

It is nonsense for anybody to imagine that they can use sorcery to make their business flourish or to get promotion at work.

We need to outgrow the belief that people cannot be sick or that they cannot meet misfortunes such as a car accident and die, unless they are bewitched.

If you are an incompetent or a drunken driver, you must expect to cause accidents ... and this cannot be blamed on witchcraft, or that your ancestors are not pleased with you and are punishing you by letting you knock down another car

Going to a diviner when your relative dies, suggests that you [are] superstitious ... and ... the diviner will not disappoint you: he or she will tell you what you want to

hear – which is that the death is a result of witchcraft by a neighbour ... or some such nonsense.

... We should attach a lot of importance to science and technology There is nothing like, *amakhooa ke baloi* (whites are witches), a popular expression we often use when *over-awed by some of the things done through technology by whites* [emphasis added].

We are as capable as whites are in going to the moon or doing anything they have done. Whatever they ... do in science and technology ... they did through the knowledge ... they acquired through learning.

What makes an aircraft stay in space can be explained scientifically, but what is supposed to make it possible for a person in Timbuktu to send lightning to kill a person in Pietersburg ... cannot be

... [W]e are not fighting [our] handicaps if ... we spend every minute of our free time standing on street corners

Comparing This To White Irrationalities

This perfectly encapsulates blacks' almost child-like 'understanding' of something as [abstract](#) as science. It is, however, quite different from whites' beliefs (e.g.) in prayer and astrology. Whites say their prayers and read their horoscopes, but as in the proverb 'Pray to God – *but keep your powder dry!*', it is understood that praying will not cause wet powder to fire bullets any more than magic will teach people to read and write.

Sincere, If Naive

A Nigerian, on the other hand, *will* pass a car on the top of a hill if he's wearing a 'magic' amulet, because he truly believes that if he smashes into another car he will end up sitting by the side of the road without a scratch on him; and I knew Nigerian lecturers in Philosophy to affirm this without cracking a smile.

Thus, people in Uganda and northern Nigeria reportedly went into battle believing they were immune to bullets because of a magical charm. *But – unlike* comparable Western 'beliefs' (in prayer, etc.) – their beliefs *were* influenced by contrary evidence: when they saw others being struck down by bullets, they questioned the charm's efficacy in a way that Westerners almost never question their religious or astrological beliefs. This is not surprising, since the latter have virtually no [cash value](#). Hence, African belief in magic is more sincere and [honest](#) – if also much more naive.

'Cash Value'

The notion of 'cash value' was introduced by the turn-of-the-20th-century philosopher William James. The cash value of 'These pills will prevent your getting pregnant' is 'If you take them you won't get pregnant'; if you take them and do get pregnant, the claim is false – end of story. But what is the cash value of 'If you pray, she will get well'? If you pray and

she doesn't? 'God moves in mysterious ways', *etc.*. In practical – cash value – terms, there is no difference between this statement being true and its being false, since nothing that could possibly happen will be accepted as evidence *against* it: whatever happens, the 'belief' remains intact. It lacks cash value because nothing really hinges on it, as *does* on the statement 'These pills will prevent your getting pregnant' – *and* on the African's belief that 'If you wear this amulet you cannot be injured by a bullet'. Of course while the former may be true, the one about the amulet is false; but that is still better than being *vacuous*, as statements about prayer typically are.

Blacks Are 'Overawed' By Whites

Note this idea that 'whites are witches', relating to Erich Leistner's ideas regarding their view of [education](#). Mabe is saying that blacks believe this about *everything* whites do: education, science and technology are all white man's magic. He confirms my claim that blacks *are* 'overawed' by whites, though he insists that blacks are as capable as whites, whose achievements come 'through learning', not from some hidden 'secret'. If you have the ability and apply yourself, you too can acquire this 'knowledge and expertise'.

Group- vs. Individual-Judgements (Again!)

But *do* blacks have such ability? To say that blacks as a group *cannot* accomplish what whites have does not mean that individual blacks may not accomplish almost anything done by individual whites. Many people fail to understand this and automatically go from the first proposition – that blacks as a group cannot accomplish what whites as a group can – to the conclusion that therefore no individual blacks are capable of what individual whites are; or, conversely, from the fact that individual blacks *can* do whatever individual whites can, to the conclusion that therefore as a *group* they can do whatever whites (as a group) can. Both of these inferences and both of these conclusions, I believe, are mistaken. (See [here](#) and [here](#).)

Do 'Born-Again' Nigerians Believe In Witchcraft?

I remember asking 'born-again' Nigerian students whether they believed in *juju* (witchcraft). 'Oh no!', they would say. 'You don't think are people who can turn a human being into a crocodile or walk through walls?' 'Oh yes; of course there are. Everyone knows that.' 'Then why did you say you didn't believe in it?'

What they meant was that they wouldn't *practice* it. Since the white man was obviously superior to the black man, the white man's top juju-man – Jesus Christ – must be superior to any black magician, and *that's* who they 'believe in'.

To illustrate the extent of their credulity: when professional (Western) magicians came to Nigeria and 'sawed a woman in half', virtually everyone took it for granted the woman really was cut in half! After all, if blacks can turn a man into a crocodile, this is the least a white magician can do!

Blacks 'Put Their Money Where Their Mouth Is'

Illustrating the sincerity of their beliefs, consider this ("Pastor Gets Three Years For Fatal 'Exorcism'", *The Citizen*, 30 June 1988, p.10):

NAIROBI. – An evangelical Kenyan pastor has been sentenced to three years' jail for killing a 17-year-old girl as he tried to exorcise an evil spirit from her ...

State counsel Horace Okumu described in grisly detail how [the pastor] tried to exorcise [the girl]... after she ran away from a mental institution "The churchman asked for a panga, cut open her chest and removed the lungs. [He] then placed the lungs on [her] mouth ... [to chase] away the demons", Mr. Okumo told the court. "After doing that, the accused and his sect members left the poor girl bleeding profusely while they went into the house to continue praying for the girl".

When they returned, she was dead. – Sapa-AP.

Unbelievable. Note that these were perfectly ordinary, normal blacks, demonstrating how such beliefs go far beyond whites' kindred irrationalities of astrology etc.. Whites almost never *act* on such beliefs; it's 'just talk'. For blacks, however, it most certainly is not – as this example so poignantly demonstrates. Can you imagine the mindset of someone so strongly believing in 'evil spirits' that he destroys another human being in this way! And no one present says a word?

Another example beggars belief (*Mail & Guardian* 22 March 1999: "Bullet Charm Fails"):

A man [in eastern Nigeria] was shot dead when his faith in a bullet-proof charm proved unfounded The ... man boasted ... that he would not be harmed if fired at after wearing the charm. [He] asked a relative to shoot him ... to test the efficacy of his charm. The bullet ripped through his body, killing him instantly. ...

Note that the man doing the shooting – and, for that matter, any bystanders, none of whom intervened – must have 'believed' nearly as strongly as the victim; or they were of such a diminished mental and [moral capacity](#) that does not bear contemplating.

BLACK CLAPTRAP

American Journalist

From *US News & World Report* (22 August 1988, p.57):

A Face-Off With Racism

by Scott Minerbrook

... Inside [the shop, in New York City] ... the [Asian] proprietors ... are watching me I pull some shirts from the shelves ... when one of [them]... standing watch with arms folded, ... asks, "What do you want?". Is she talking to me? She has an edge in her voice that could cut steel. "Do you have money?" I am dressed in a business suit. My shoes are from Brooks Brothers. No matter. I have brown skin, and this seems to invite her suspicions. ... I ask for the price "... \$13", she says. The

fabric feels soft Once again, I have offended the saleswoman, who jars me again by rubbing the shirt as though I have dirtied it.

After completing the transaction – in cash ... and with the proprietress smiling for the first time – four black teenagers jostle each other through the door. The smile vanishes ... and she freezes. “What do you want!” she barks. But now there is another kind of edge in her voice. Her jaw muscles work so hard they look like they could chew pig iron and spit out cannonballs. “If you come here to steal leave right now! Come on! Get going!” For emphasis, she grabs a long broomstick from behind the door and waves it at the kids. ... For her to leap to this conclusion ... seems so gross I feel compelled to speak up. But then the tallest of the crew makes strides for the door. The Asian saleswoman locks it. “You don’t have any right to keep me here”, he says. “I’m not no criminal. I’m not doing nothing”. The saleswoman: “None of you goes until you all go”. One of the kids: “We’re not doing nothing. You think all black people is thieves. That’s just racist”. I am about to leap to their defense when the saleswoman next to me grabs the jacket of one of the young men. It opens to reveal of one of T-shirts from the rack. “Look, man”, says the kid caught in the act. “See what you did? Playing that trick on me.” The kids laugh. Only the old man doesn’t think it’s so funny, and he responds by grabbing the kids and shoving them outside.

... a contest has been playing itself out, a clash of contending stereotypes ... in a stifling atmosphere of bitterness, racial division, fear and rage. Outside the store, the four kids shower the merchants with racial epithets and spit at them: “Dirty Jap”, one shouts; another sends gobs of spittle flying The old man is caught in the face. “Call the cops”, says my saleswoman. “Call the cops.”

Outside the store, I tell the kids that what they did was stupid and dangerous. “They’re just racists”, says one kid. I ask: “But what the hell were you doing with the shirt stuffed inside your jacket?”. “Oh, man, we was just playing with ‘em. Just playing.” Some joke. I had been ready to defend him, but now I wonder what I would have been defending. ...

Barefaced Insincerity

Note the utter insincerity here. Though he’s been through these ‘absurdities’ so often it fails to ‘surprise’ him, he acts as if he doesn’t know that he’s treated this way because so many blacks steal and shopkeepers learn to distrust them, well-dressed or not. When he pays, however, we see she has nothing against blacks *per se*.

Then the incident with the four thieves. Having learned from experience she sizes up the situation immediately; and *because, as a non-white immigrant, she’s not laden with white liberal guilt*, she’s not afraid to act. “If you come here to steal leave right now! Get going!” From a white perspective, quite, *quite* extraordinary.

Their response? ‘You think all blacks is thieves. That’s just racist’. But the Asians will have none of it. What do the kids say when caught red-handed? ‘See what you did? Playing that trick on me.’ When Minerbrook asks about the T-shirt, one thing they *don’t* say is that it was somehow *okay* for them to steal because they’re ‘disadvantaged’. *That* is left to whites!

And then comes this ‘clash of stereotypes’. Is one of the ‘stereotypes’ supposed to be blacks hurling ‘racial epithets’ and spitting at the Asians? And the other the Asians’ presumption that blacks steal? But that’s absolute rubbish! Calling the Asians ‘Dirty Jap’ is the epitome of racism (and notice how quickly they revert to it). But to call the Asians’ presumption a ‘stereotype’ – and hence to mark it as prejudice – is completely cockeyed. The Asians have a *basis* for their ‘stereotype’, whereas ‘Dirty Jap’ is *just* a ‘racial epithet’.

Stealing Is ‘Stupid’ – But Not Bad

What they did was ‘stupid and dangerous’ – but not *bad*. ‘What were you doing with the shirt inside your jacket?’ Does he expect us to believe he doesn’t *know*? Didn’t he say they were ‘caught in the act’? Caught in the act of *what*? What kind of bullshit game is he playing – with these blacks, with us, and most of all with himself?

Finally, his last paragraph:

Back inside the store on the next day, the same saleswoman ... recognizes me. “Oh hello”, she says, almost friendly. When I ask about the incident, she says, “You have no idea about this place. [They] come in here ... and while you watch one, the other grabs [something] and runs out the door, whoosh!”. I tell her I sympathize ... but that’s hardly an excuse for prejudice. “Black people come and try to steal”, she says. But do whites ... steal, too? Yes, she says, but it is the blacks whom you have to watch. “You have to be careful with them.” So much for reason. In such an atmosphere, [how] we can achieve racial harmony?

Notice how she relates to him, talking frankly about conditions in the store. He sympathizes, but ‘that’s hardly an excuse for prejudice’. What nonsense! Her answer is quite clear: of course whites steal, but not nearly as *much* as blacks. ‘So much for reason’ means: *equal blame all around*. In fact, there is no reason whatsoever for accusing these Asians – *unlike* the blacks – of racial prejudice.

Joe Slovo’s Two Cents Worth

I just heard Joe Slovo, the (Jewish) head of the South African Communist Party [since deceased], on *Radio 702* (18 July 1990). He was asked why blacks in the rest of Africa are so much worse off than in South Africa – and he was clearly prepared for the question. The comparison, he said, should be between South African blacks and those elsewhere *in relation to the wealth of each country*. Thus, Tanzanian blacks were less well off than those

of South Africa; but *in relation to the wealth of their country*, they were better off; and there was no country in Africa in which this was not so.

To which the simplest answer would be *Nigeria* – with its billions of petro-dollars squandered. The more important question, however, is: Why *is* South Africa wealthy? It's not just natural resources; someone has to exploit them. More important still, his answer assumes a strict correlation between a country's (natural) resources and it's wealth – which is just false. Many prosperous countries have relatively little resources – Japan, Switzerland, Sweden, to name but a few. They are wealthy because they are hardworking, disciplined and inventive. Correspondingly, African countries are poor not because they lack resources but because they lack this very same discipline and inventiveness, and the *main* reason South Africa is wealthy is because it contains five million (relatively hardworking, disciplined and inventive) whites.

LEARNING ABOUT BLACKS FROM BLACKS

'Why Do We Despise Each Other? Why Do We Not Trust Each Other?'

A most memorable letter ("Artists Need One Another": *Sowetan*, 6 October 1988, p.14; all emphases added):

SIR – I am angry, I am sad, what's more I feel so frustrated I could weep. There are questions burning my mind: ...

Are we really proud of being black?

Why do we not like each other?

Why do we despise each other?

Why do we not *trust* each other?

Why is it that in this particular corner of the world we cannot really unite and be as one?

Why do other nations consider us walkovers?

Why can't we get our act together?

This year ... [we] ... conceived ... a ... noble idea. ... an artist-to-artist benefit show for three of our artists who had stumbled across bad times. At this point I have to take off my hat ... to the Cohen Brothers who ... immediately offered Fun Valley free of charge.

Also ... to Mr. Erfann Gillan who manages Kippie's who ... contributed ... R201.50

Another ... to the Lion Lager Road Show. People who offered their PA system, security and posters also FOC.

The artists who were to be beneficiaries ... were [all] on wheelchairs. They [had given] their best when they were capable. Wasn't it reasonable and decent to expect artists to stretch a helping hand to ... disabled colleagues who ... [could] no longer [earn] a livelihood? Was it asking too much [of them] to give their service free of charge ... ?

The idea was contemptuously scrapped by artist and press alike.

I have just read in the *Star Tonight* ... that the cream of South Africa's performing artists (white) banded together ... to provide a scintillating display of artistry with the performers giving of their best [FOC] in order to come to the aid of [a] fellow artist ...

I daresay they borrowed the idea from us. Our show was to be called The Artist to Artist benefit show. Theirs was Stars to a Star. The only discernible difference was that theirs was a "resounding success".

Rumour has it that they raised something in the region of R100,000. They did not hesitate. Theirs was a spontaneous reaction, they did not say: *Oh! but you have to see my manager first, or some people could be in this for personal gain, you know? Or we do not perform with inferior PA systems.* ... and multiple other excuses. The white artists impulsively went there and displayed their art selflessly, giving of their best without pay to the aid of a fellow artists. ...

Man, to say that I was green with envy at the success of my own black idea must be the understatement of the year! The only black artist I know of, who performed with these white artists and who was involved in our Artist to Artist project, Miss Abigail Kubheka, told me *she wept alone backstage afterwards*. Now, the chickens have come home to roost.

One of the would-be beneficiaries of our aborted ... show ... has silently passed away He died in his wheelchair, sick, destitute, penniless, heartbroken and probably very miserable at the hopelessness of the lost cause he lived for. He must have died with a lot of anguish on his face. Need I say more?

SAM WILLIAMS

Eldorado Park

What a revealing letter! It should be compulsory reading for all bleeding-heart liberals! Everything he relates is *par for the course*. Some of his questions – e.g., why do blacks dislike, distrust and despise each other? – answer other questions – e.g., why they can't unite and get their act together? (Notice that all those who helped him were white.)

And what happened? 'People were praying we would make a mistake.' Incredible, isn't it, this *jealousy* which can't stand to see another black succeed. And look at the 'excuses' from these 'important people' – 'see my manager', 'I can't perform with inferior PA systems', *etc.* Especially interesting is the excuse that 'some could be in this for personal gain'. Precisely. When blacks are involved that is the fear – and the most suspicious will be blacks themselves!

Jealousy Beyond Comprehension

In *Frontline* magazine of November 1989, a piece by Eleanor Anderson ("Death of an artist, death of a friend", pp.20-21) contains some mind-boggling revelations. She gets a phone call from Soweto telling her that a friend's father has been shot dead. On the way to the funeral, she asks a longtime black friend

'Who would want to kill a man like Stanley Nkosi?'

Lettie hesitates before replying.

"You whites don't understand about jealousy among blacks. It makes us steal and hurt and kill."

"Was someone jealous of Stan?"

"Maybe. It could have been because he worked hard and got to be a good artist, or maybe because he gave free art lessons to the children. People would say, 'Who does he think he is, doing that for nothing? Does he think he is better than we are?'"

"But that's horrible", I exclaim, and she nods.

"Yes, it is horrible, but that is what can happen. ... Once, the man who is now my husband had a child by another lady, and whenever he went to that homeland he used to take oranges and sometimes a toy to his little daughter and the people smiled. Then he started taking fruit or a ball to her playmates and the parents said that was very nice and thank you very much, *but they did not mean it*. What they were really thinking was, 'Who does he think he is? Is he so rich and important that he can bring presents to our children? *He should be punished for thinking he is better than we are*'. ...

"Lettie, are you in danger if I come to your house with [things] for the children?"

"I might be if you came too often. The neighbours would watch us and they might say, 'How nice for you to have someone to bring you presents', but they would be jealous ... *and might try to kill me*'. ...

[Lettie] tells me that if men ... were hired to kill Stanley ... they would attend the funeral as part of the "contract", ... would weep very noisily and offer condolences to the widow and children of the murdered man. The weeping might deflect the evil from themselves [All emphases added.]

This woman's gut reaction ('that's horrible') is telling; and horrible is certainly the right word. Everyone experiences jealousy, but that it could lead to murder is, *I* would say, beyond the capacity of any normal white to even *begin* to understand. And yet it is apparently common amongst blacks. I confess to having been a bit shocked by this account. It is a further indication of profound racial differences, and along with Sam [Williams'](#) letter, further supports my claims about mutual *distrust* and *lack of friendship*.

Once Again, Similar Behaviour Found In American Blacks

Jealousy? 'Bull's-Eye'!

Illustrating the far-flung nature of these traits, I quote from Toronto's *Globe and Mail* ("Mother of Shot Boy: 'You have to thank God he's alive'", by Christie Blatchford, 5 August 2005), concerning a four-year-old black child shot in gang-related violence (emphases added):

[The mother] believes, and told *The Globe and Mail* flatly yesterday, that Junior [another son], who is now 15, was the intended target, "because of basketball". In

the summer, he plays for a local team, and as a member of the national team, is a big star *who may as well be wearing a bull's eye on his shirt for the **jealousy** he inspires.*

'Crabs-in-a-bucket'

On talk radio, Michael Smerconish takes a call from a black man named Pat in Portland, Oregon, who mentions what he calls the "crabs in a bucket syndrome", meaning that whenever a black man is 'doing really well' he will be pulled back into the bucket by other blacks (*The Radio Factor*, 11 Jan 08, at about 51:40 into the two hour program).

'Blacks have failed to master the art of *co-operation*'

I quote from the black American historian, Harold Cruse ([*Plural But Equal*](#), 1987): '[E Franklin] Frazier [another black writer] has pointed out that one of the negative "class traits" of the black middle class is an inability to *cooperate* toward any positive economic or political objective' (p.338). The 'seventy-year social process ... since World War I' has been one 'during which blacks, in the aggregate, have failed to master the art of *cooperation* ...' (p.342; emphases in original; see also [here](#) and [here](#)).

Your Being 'Nice' Means You're Making Me Inferior!

This hatred of someone because he is 'nice' is spine-chilling. Transpose this to a nurse whose patients someone else tries to help and you can see the verisimilitude of what the [Army doctor](#) said – that they get very angry. This pathological concern with others thinking they are 'better' provides insight into their preoccupation with [status](#). Blacks realize that they have a desire to feel superior and hence need someone to treat as inferior; and that must be what this other man is doing by being so 'nice': trying to make himself superior and me inferior!

'I'm not a racist – look how I hate them!'

Note also the extraordinary (*pre-arranged*) deception: the murderers 'weeping noisily' at their victims' funeral! Aside from illustrating their facility at dissembling, the murderers are attempting to convince others – *and themselves* – that they are not murderers! In my early days in Nigeria I was puzzled that while thieves were often killed on the spot, theft was nevertheless rampant. Eventually I realized that the people shouting the loudest at the thieves were frequently themselves thieves. As a simple matter of human psychology, how better to convince others – and yourself – that you *not* a thief than by shouting at and kicking a thief! (*I can't be a thief – look how I hate them!*) And, how better to convince others –and yourself – that you are not a *racist* than by indignantly expressing 'outrage' at the merest hint of it!

Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Reaction Formation

In 1975 (in the U.S.), a close friend of long standing was angered and disgusted when I expressed agreement with the (even then) unpopular view that homosexuality was indeed an

unhealthy and unnatural lifestyle, so much so that this was not an insignificant factor in our eventual estrangement. And yet what had been his reaction some years previous when his dearest friend, a homosexual who'd just come out-of the closet, had had the temerity to hint at a sexual relation between them? *'I never want to see you or hear from you again!!'* The homosexual, an ordained rabbi, said he wished he could cut out his tongue to take his words back, but to no avail. This man, who revered and worshipped my friend, was so shattered that he ended up a beggar, going from one synagogue to another for alms. My friend was unmoved. Surely a case of *actions speaking louder than words!*

This phenomenon of protesting too much is encapsulated in the freudian notion of *reaction formation*: in reaction to truths one (self-deceivingly) does not wish to acknowledge – but which one nevertheless knows, deep down, are indeed true – one 'compensates' by vehemently proclaiming precisely the opposite, thus producing a serious [internal conflict](#) which, not surprisingly, manifests itself in such irrationalities. And the person one is trying most to convince is none other than oneself!

Conversation with Black Nurse: 'Who is more distrustful of blacks?' Answer: 'Blacks!'

In late 1988 I ran into a woman in Berea (next to Hillbrow) working as a nurse in a nearby private clinic. Were the nurses mostly black or white? I asked. Both. Were there any black matrons (supervising nurses)? No, they were all white. Did she think there should be black matrons? Yes, and she thought there would be one day. What did I think? she asked.

'Yes and no', I said. If a black woman came along who would make a good matron, then yes, she should by all means be one. *No*, in that I would be extremely wary about having a black in charge of a ward, no matter how 'qualified'. And *No* in the sense that I would not want to see a black dominated nursing staff because of the near certainty that things would eventually go wrong.

The white man, she said, never gives the black man a chance, expecting him to behave 'irresponsibly' and always checking up on him. This made the black man nervous and unsure of himself. It was as if (she said) you marry a former prostitute but remain suspicious of her, thereby making it more likely that she will return to her old ways.

'Let me ask you a question', I said. 'Who is more distrustful of blacks – whites or blacks?' She answered straightaway: 'Blacks'. 'Then how can you blame whites for being distrustful when blacks are even more so?' 'You are right! You are right!', she said. She agreed that there were important differences between blacks and whites and that it was not entirely the white man's fault that blacks were always on the bottom; it was at least as much their own fault.

She 'expatiated' on black-white differences. White men 'respected' one another. If a white man walked by and saw a white man talking to a black woman, he might think it was bad,

but he wouldn't say anything; but a black man would immediately start saying 'You see that white man and that black woman ...' saying bad things about them. If a black man made a mistake, blacks would do their best to see that he suffered; when one was successful others will try to stop him, out of [jealousy](#) and envy.

In fact, one reason blacks often shout is by way of saying to others, 'See, we have no secrets' – *i.e.*, we are not saying bad things about you, which is precisely what other blacks will suspect them of. Another reason (from Walt Harrington's [Crossings](#)): 'Again and again, blacks have told me that black people are just plain louder than white people, that [they] *like noise*' (p.236; my emphasis). From my experience, true enough.

And what, I asked, made him like this – always relishing others' troubles? *That's just the way the black man is*, she said.

But then how can you blame the white man for being leery? 'I will him a chance, but until he proves himself, I will be very careful.' That seems a reasonable attitude, and an honest black man should be grateful for the chance to prove that he's an exception.

'Through a Bantu Glass: Palpable Fear of One Another'

In Allen Drury's [A Very Strange Society](#) (1967; p.125) the author recalls accompanying Helen Suzman to a play at Witwatersrand University put on by township blacks, which, he says, 'failed to get off the ground':

Yet in certain ways it proved illuminating. There was a Bantu storekeeper: *he was murdered by some Bantu thugs*. The young Bantu hero was repeatedly waylaid by Bantu gangs; *his attempts at honesty were constantly thwarted by his own people*. His parents and their friends were good-hearted, decent, well-meaning souls: *they were held in thrall by a vicious little group of murderous Bantu criminals*.

A real and palpable fear of one another came innocently but clearly through the Bantu-written, Bantu-produced script. This was a Bantu glass we were looking through. [Emphases added.]

His observations (*circa* 1967) are most insightful, especially his noting how this glimpse of black reality, through a 'Bantu glass', was 'innocently' provided. Having one's wits about one, this is precisely how one can learn a great deal about black culture and mentality.

Black Friendship

It has been my observation that for many blacks, personal intimacy is quite alien, but that with whites, whom they are not predisposed to distrust, they [relish](#) it. It is also my impression that amongst blacks – especially males – real friendship is rare, not least because such friendship presupposes [implicit trust](#), which is also rare. A white guy, fluent in Zulu, said that I wouldn't believe the utter triviality of black 'palaver'; confirming this, in [The Fault, Black Man](#), by Barnett Potter (1970), it is said to be about 'food, drink, their bowels, sex' (p.37). It should not be surprising, therefore, that blacks enjoy talking to whites.

An acquaintance of mine is a childhood friend of the South African musician Johnny Clegg. At a gathering in his house my book (*this book*) came up. ‘A load of crap’ was the consensus. ‘You know what this ass-hole says? one of them asks – ‘That black men don’t form friendships! Have you ever heard of anything so stupid?’ With everyone nodding in agreement, Johnny Clegg, a ‘white Zulu’ who speaks the language fluently, pipes in: ‘Well, I don’t know anything about this man or his book, but I can tell you that in my experience what he says is correct’, followed, I can only assume, by a very surprised silence. (This incident was independently conveyed to me by two of those present.)

BLACKS’ MISTREATMENT OF BLACKS: MAKING YOURSELF ‘SUPERIOR’ BY MAKING OTHERS ‘INFERIOR’

‘Whites respect one another but we don’t’

An honest letter from a black (“Railway Clerk Had Bad Manners”: *Sowetan*, 4 October 1988, p.15):

SIR – ... There goes the saying which says “manners maketh man”; whites respect one another but we don’t.

... I [recently] bought a monthly ticket The ticket sales clerk gave me incorrect change. ... [and then] quickly erupted angrily. ...

Instead of giving me change of R5.50, he gave me only R3.50. After showing it to him, *he simply told me to go to hell* and “this is Johannesburg”, I must “wake up”. ...

The people behind me in the queue were like spectators watching a big match. He told me that I was wasting his ... time and that *the “devil is waiting for me”*.

And so I was robbed of my hard-earned money. I felt a terrible pain for the money which was supposed to be in my children’s money boxes at home.

With a smile, I said to him that may God bless him. And so I was a loser. But at least I have obeyed the sign which says: “Always check your change before leaving the window as mistakes cannot be rectified afterwards”. This sign is a “shield” for these guys to rob us. [My emphases.]

ERIC MOFOKEN

Orlando West

Sounds just like Nigeria!

‘Hostile’ Nurse Doesn’t ‘Have Time To Play’

Also from the *Sowetan* (“Nurse Refused To Treat Me – Patient”, 10 November 1988, p.2):

A YOUNG [hospital patient]... alleged that a nursing sister in the casualty department refused to attend to her as she sat writhing in pain.

The woman, Ms Johanna Sebothoma (27), and her fiancée, Mr. Phillip Ramoshaba, told the *Sowetan* ... that they spent almost three hours at the hospital ... while the

sister in charge ... allegedly boasted that she was going to see to it that no one attended to them. ...

“We arrived at the casualty ward at about 6.30 pm and were received by a hostile nursing sister who demanded to know why my fiancée did not come ... earlier When we tried to explain that she had ... to wait for me to transport her, the nurse said she did not have time to play.

“Not realising that she intended not attending to us at all, we sat there and watched as other patients who found us already there came and went. When there were no more people left, she ignored us and went to sit in a consulting room”, Mr. Ramoshaba said.

... after ... nearly three hours, he ... enquire[d] ... if they would ever be considered for treatment. ... the nurse reacted angrily and said she did not care for rude patients.

[!]

... They left for home at about 9.30 pm, they said.

More Nigeria. Looking for an explanation here within the range of normal human conduct is barking up the wrong tree. Nothing accounts for this except plain nastiness and the pleasure some people get from making others suffer – especially if she can thereby enhance her authority and status!

‘Old Mother’ Made To Wash Clothes That Aren’t Dirty

From the *Sowetan* (22 November 1988, p.15):

SIR – Sometime last year, you published ... the story ... [about] problems faced by black servants working for their fellow blacks.

It was stated ... that ... many blacks, some of them teachers and other professionals, ... ill-treat their servants. This is what is exactly happening to some of our “elite” people in Thaba Nchu.

I have heard of an old mother (older than my mother who is 48), who complained that on several occasions she had to wash clothing that didn’t have any sign of being dirty.

I have also heard poor mothers crying that they didn’t get their monthly pay which is something less than R60 [\$25 in 1988] a month

If we as the black nation continue with this inhuman treatment of our fellow blacks, then we must just forget about making noises about freedom. It will not help us in any way because we don’t even use the little “baaskap” we have correctly. ...

THLABI MONARE

Thaba Nchu

Aside from the sadistic enjoyment of making others suffer, they are making themselves ‘superior’ by making someone else ‘inferior’. And in case one is tempted to blame apartheid, [American blacks exhibit virtually identical behaviour.](#)

'Know-It-All Teacher, Swearing at Students, Calling Them Humiliating Names'

In the *Sowetan* (31 October 1988, p.8), more from Sam Mabe ("Overcoming problems in education"):

Our children are subjected to very strict and often uncalled for discipline. Absolute obedience and passivity are nurtured in them by being denied the right to ask simple questions ...

Our education is still centered around the teacher who is the know-it-all who expects everybody to mimic him or be condemned. ...

We are trained to be labourers, that is, to depend on the white man for employment. [On] our own, we cannot create employment opportunities or generate income for ourselves. This is how the mentality of dependence on the white man is nurtured in us. ...

Typical black elite behaviour. A teacher is 'important'; to ask questions is to 'challenge' him and he simply won't have it. Hence, you get 'the know-it-all' teacher, 'swearing at [students] and calling them humiliating names'. Once again, to make himself 'superior' he must make others 'inferior'.

If blacks were capable of creating wealth and employment, does anyone really believe that an inferior education would forever stymie them?

GRUESOME CRUELTY EVIDENCE OF BLACK MORAL OPACITY

Jeering, Mocking and *Laughing* at Agony and Death

In a book review of *Driving South* (David Robbins [Johannesburg: Southern Books], 1993), 'A Cape social worker sees elements that revel in violence ...

"It's like a cult which has embraced a lot of people who *otherwise appear normal*. Young people in particular. *At the slightest provocation* [**NB** re the volatility of black emotions], their blood-lust is aroused. And then they want to see death, and *they jeer and mock* at the suffering involved, *especially the suffering of a slow and agonising death.*" [The review is in *The Citizen*, July 12, 1993, p.6.]

A letter-writer describes 'necklacing' (*The Citizen*; "SA's New Nazis", August 10, 1993, p.18):

'The petrol-filled tyre is jammed on your shoulders and a lighter is placed within reach of your hand. Your fingers are broken, needles are pushed up your nose and you are tortured until you put the lighter to the petrol yourself.'

In May 2008 Johannesburg's black townships erupted in mayhem and murder. A headline read "FLAMES OF HATE: Reiger Park local laughs after 'necklacing'":

One plump woman in a knitted cap and overall couldn't contain her laughter as she pointed to the barbarous scene and related the events to locals. [*The Star*, 19 May 2008, p.1.]

This is all so unspeakably vile and repulsive, so *beyond* depravity, the human brain recoils. This is not merely the absence of human empathy, but the positive enjoyment of human suffering, enjoying it all the more when it's 'slow and agonising'. Can you believe – *jeering, mocking and laughing* at this?

Rwanda: 'Ecstasy of Killing Beyond My Reach'

From the *Chicago Tribune* ("Hutu killers danced in blood of victims, videotapes show", 14 September 1995, p.8, Sec 1) this from UN investigator Alain Siggs regarding the 1994 massacre of Tutsis in Rwanda: "The ecstasy of killing, the lust for blood; this is the most horrible thought. *It's beyond my reach*" (emphasis added); and there is no reason to think these were 'abnormal' Africans. As further evidence of their lack of moral consciousness, the murderers videotaped their crimes, 'apparently want[ing] to record their actions for posterity'. It truly beggars belief. Unlike (e.g.) Nazi war criminals, who tried to hide their deeds, indicating that at least they realized what *others* would think, even that was lacking in these blacks. (See [here](#) and [here](#).)

Amy Biehl Trial: 'Laughing At Woman Groaning In Pain Impossible To Explain To Rational Minds'

The following, from a book by a retired senior South African jurist, Rex van Schalkwyk, reports remarkably congruent behaviour (*One Miracle Is Not Enough* [Johannesburg: Bellwether Publishers], 1998 (pp.188-89):

... Amy Biehl, the American Fulbright scholar brutally murdered in Guguletu [near Cape Town] – for being white, when she had wanted only to assist in the transition to democracy – will be remembered for the tragic irony of her death. ... *it is impossible to explain in terms accessible to rational minds* this extract from a report of the trial ... : 'Supporters of the three men accused of murdering ... [her] burst out laughing in the public gallery of the Supreme Court today when a witness told how the battered woman groaned in pain' [*The Star*, 25 November 1993; my emphasis].

These incidents – and the responses they evoke ('the human brain recoils'; 'beyond my reach'; 'impossible to explain ... to rational minds') – point to traits that cannot be wished away and further confirm my claim that blacks are deficient in moral consciousness.

UNDERSTANDING BLACK MORAL OPACITY

In teaching Ethics I would use the example of Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish officer in the French Army who, in 1894, was convicted of treason even though the authorities knew him to be

innocent. Admitting such a mistake, it was said, would have a disastrous effect on military morale and would cause great social unrest.

I would in turn argue that certain things are wrong not because of their consequences but are intrinsically so. Even if the consequences of freeing him would be much worse than letting him rot in prison, he must be freed, because it is unjust to keep an innocent man in prison.

To my amazement, however, an entire class in Kenya said without hesitation that he should *not* be freed. Call me dense if you want, but it was [twenty years](#) before the full significance of this began to dawn on me.

Subjunctivity, Counterfactuality and The Golden Rule (TGR): Further Towards Explaining Black Behaviour

Blacks, I believe, generally lack the concepts of subjunctivity and counterfactuality. Subjunctivity is conveyed in such statements as ‘What *would* you have done *if* I hadn’t showed up on time?’ This is counter-factual because I *did* show up on time. Moreover, these things, now, *could* not happen. And yet we are asking the person to imagine what he would have done *if* something which *didn’t* happen (and now *couldn’t* happen) *had* happened. Among other things, this clearly requires self-consciousness, blacks’ deficiency of which we have already [discussed](#); it is obvious, e.g., that animals cannot think counterfactually, because of their *complete* lack of self-consciousness.

A businessman tried to persuade his black workers to contribute to a health insurance policy. ‘What’s it for?’, they asked. ‘Well, if you were to get sick, it would pay for the hospital.’ Their response was uniform and immediate: ‘But boss, *we’re not sick!*’. ‘Yes, but suppose’ Reply: ‘But we’re not sick!’. Given the all-or-nothing nature of black thinking, if it’s not certain that you *will* be ill, then you will *not* be ill, [end of story](#).

The Golden Rule (TGR)

One of the pivotal ideas underpinning morality is *The Golden Rule* (TGR): *do unto others as you would have them do unto you*. To explain TGR we would say, ‘How would you feel if someone stole everything you owned? Well, that’s how he would feel if you robbed him.’ The subjunctivity here is clear. But if I am right, and blacks generally lack this idea, they will have difficulty in understanding TGR and for this reason alone, will be deficient in moral understanding.

Human Empathy

Given this, we might also expect their capacity for *empathy* to be diminished, as is manifest in our [examples](#). After all, how *do* we empathize? When we hear of things like ‘necklacing’ we instinctively, though unconsciously, think: *How would I feel if that were me?*. But of course I am not and *cannot* ‘be’ that person. Yet this *thought-experiment* (‘What if ...?’)

provides us with crucial moral ‘information’ – that we wouldn’t want this to happen to us and so we shouldn’t want it to happen to someone else. To the extent that people are deficient in such abstract thinking, they will be deficient in moral understanding and hence in human empathy – which is what we independently observe.

Black ‘Manners’ and the Lack Thereof: Examples Analyzed

In his book [Devil’s Night](#) (1990, pp.76-77; emphases added), Ze’ev Chafets quotes a black woman in Detroit: “‘I know some people won’t like this, but whenever you get a whole lot of black people, you’re gonna have problems. *Blacks are ignorant and rude*”’.

A few years ago a black friend invited me to her house. There was a bunch of women chatting, all working at the same bank as my friend and all fluent in English. Though I’d been invited by their host, who had introduced me, they went right on speaking Zulu, knowing I spoke not a word of it.

Hard to imagine. But why? Well, most people simply could not be that rude! They know the person would be ‘uncomfortable’ and that were this were to happen to them they wouldn’t like it, and so, putting themselves in his shoes, they wouldn’t do it to him. In short, *TGR: Don’t do to others what you wouldn’t want them to do to you.*

So why *did* they behave this way? Simple. Deficient in the ability to think counter-factually (How *would* I feel *if ...?*) it just *did not occur to them* that I would be uncomfortable. In other words, they were unaware of the nature of their behaviour because of their difficulty in thinking of things which *do not exist*.

Not long ago I was speaking to a black manager about a product of mine she was interested in selling. A customer had been hovering about waiting to speak to her and he finally interrupted us. Instead of saying, “Sorry, but I’ve got to take care of this; wait here and I’ll be right back”, she simply walked off to help him, illustrating (*I would say*) an inability to think abstractly.

Conclusion: For Blacks, Rudeness Is Normal, Natural Behaviour

A friend raised the question of how this woman would have felt if someone done this to *her*, suggesting that she might not have been bothered by it. And he was right: she would *not* have been bothered because when all is said and done, what I’m really saying is that blacks simply *do not know what rudeness is*. For them, what we call ‘rude’ is perfectly normal and hence, ‘from their perspective’, is not really rude. [Fred Reed](#) makes the same point when he says that not keeping appointments, ‘isn’t rudeness or inconsideration. If you do it to them, they won’t be offended’.

Black Littering and ‘Disorganization’

In his book [Crossings](#) (pp.234-35; all emphases added), Walt Harrington, a white liberal married to a light-skinned black, makes some surprising admissions.

I notice a small car ... in the distance. Suddenly, ... a bag of garbage flies out its window I think, *I’ll bet they’re blacks*. Over the years I’ve noticed more blacks littering than whites. I hate to admit this because it is a prejudice. But as I pass the car, I see that my reflex was correct – [they are indeed blacks].

[Once, ... pulling] into a McDonald’s drive-through ... [I see that] the car in front of me had four black[s] in it. Again ... my mind made its unconscious calculation: *We’ll be sitting here forever while these people decide what to order*. I literally shook my head My God, my kids are half black! But then the kicker: *we waited and waited and waited*. Each of the four [blacks] ... leaned out the window and ordered individually. The order was changed several times. *We sat and sat*, and I again shook my head, this time at the conundrum that is race in America.

I knew that the buried sentiment that had made me predict this *disorganization* ... was ... racist. ... *But my prediction was right*.

A friend, quite independently of these observations, related that such ‘disorganization’ is one of the reasons late-night shop-keepers in Manhattan (typically Koreans or Palestinians) hate waiting on blacks.

How a Thought-Experiment Explains Black Littering

How does one explain this trait of littering in American blacks as well as Africans? Once again, we can start by asking why whites *don’t* litter (as much). At the core here is a **thought-experiment** – what *would* happen *if* everyone threw rubbish everywhere? It would be a mess. So you shouldn’t do it! Blacks’ deficiency in abstract reasoning ability makes them less able to think counter-factually, and any behaviour requiring such thinking is therefore unlikely to develop in their cultures. Even when living for generations in societies where such thinking is common, many still fail to absorb it, because of their limited ability to *develop the ability* to think abstractly.

BLACK ARROGANCE, STATUS-CONSCIOUSNESS, AUTHORITARIANISM AND MORAL CONFORMITY

‘I’m Not Here To Be Interrogated By You!’

Given the unavailability of textbooks in Africa, I got into the habit, starting in Nigeria, of providing ‘handouts’, analyzing things discussed in class. They proved so popular that other lecturers got requests for similar material.

This annoyed some of them and the matter was raised at a department meeting. The head of the department began intoning on how this might lead to ‘spoon feeding’ etc.. ‘Well’, I

said, ‘I assume you’re not talking about my handouts, because as you know, you have said on more than one occasion that they were extremely useful and “just what the students needed”.’

His response? ‘I am not here to be interrogated by you!’

‘You Can’t Challenge the Head of the Department Like That!’

I found this startling, to say the least, as I did the reaction of another lecturer: *‘But you can’t challenge the head of the department like that!’*. The correct reading of these ejaculations – reflecting extraordinary status-consciousness and deeply ingrained authoritarianism – was so alien to me, that it was several years before I came to appreciate its fundamentality in African character and culture.

[One night](#), quite late, I was driving in the centre of town with one of my students. It was pretty deserted, but occasionally someone would dash across the street, and in the pitch dark I had to be careful not to hit one of them. My student, having mentioned that in his village he was an important person because he was at the university, casually remarked “Oh, you can just run them over – they’re just insects!”

A few years later in Nairobi, Kenya, the head of my department (a Luo, a tribe with a reputation for arrogance), in reaction to my remark that something he had said ‘didn’t make sense’, went ballistic, coming close to a physical assault. Putting his face right next to mine he began ranting and raving, shouting over and over again: *‘You can’t say that something I say doesn’t make sense!’* (brackets: I’m head of the department and a professor and you’re only a lecturer and therefore you cannot ‘challenge’ me since [I am automatically right!](#)).

Ditto for American Blacks

A statement by Roy Innis indicates further congruence between African and black American behaviour. ‘Something I find among blacks in general, and with CORE people in particular, is that they are *very concerned with status ...*’ (*Role and Status: The Meaning and Requirements of Leadership*, A Lecture by Roy Innis, National Director of the Congress of Racial Equality, delivered on October 28, 1968, as part of the leadership training program of CORE Target City Cleveland Project; emphases added).

Black Americans’ Authoritarianism

In his ideologically-laden book [Crossings](#), typically liberal Walt Harrington quotes a black principal of a 60% black high school in Little Rock, Arkansas: ‘black teachers ... had an authoritarian way about them because black culture is more authoritarian than middle-class white culture’ (p.152). There are also numerous references to blacks’ ‘envy’, ‘jealousy’ and ‘anger’ at other blacks’ success. Despite his liberal prejudice – and though at pains to explain these facts away – Harrington cannot, in talking with ordinary blacks, keep such nuggets from surfacing.

In New York, a South African third secretary at the UN first provokes a quarrel with an Indian taxi driver and then flatly refuses to pay the fare, shouting 'I am a diplomat! I am a diplomat!' – read: I am important! I am important! (And who, pray, is he trying to convince?) He also reveals the latent racism common in so many blacks by telling the driver to 'go back to India' ("SA envoys cause storm after refusing to pay US taxi driver", *The Star* [Johannesburg], 16 June 1998).

Cowardice and Conformity: Fear of 'Challenging Authority'

In 2002 there was a uproar over the South African government's views about HIV/AIDS and the use of anti-retroviral (ARV) drugs. President Thabo Mbeki has accepted a 'dissident' view questioning the connection between HIV and AIDS as well as the usefulness and safety of these drugs – which as a result have been banned in government hospitals.

ANC officials reflexively kowtowed to this 'policy', and even that icon of virtue Nelson Mandela had to tie himself in knots for having had the temerity to disagree with Mbeki, so fearful was he to be seen as 'challenging authority', publicly 'recanting' by insisting that the government's AIDS policy was "the best in the world". So powerful are these authoritarian attitudes – added to their contempt for blacks and the rage they must have felt at being made to 'look so bad' – that one government-employed white doctor, using private funds, was actually fired for making ARVs available to pregnant black women to reduce the risk of mother-to-child transmission.

Anecdotes of a White Man on a Bicycle in Africa

Re this moral conformity, I recall a conversation with a girl in Nairobi, who said it was bad of me to ride a bicycle (my sole mode of transportation for the five years I lived there). 'Why is it bad?' I asked. Her answer was simple: '*No one else does it*'. For many Africans, I suspect, that is a complete and sufficient answer. For the readers' amusement, here are a few bicycle related anecdotes.

Danger Man

I was known throughout Ibadan (Nigeria) as *danger man*. I knew this had to do with my riding a bicycle, but only much later did I learn what it actually meant. I rode with a 'safety flag' – an international-orange pennant atop a fiber glass pole. Their only acquaintance with such flags was at construction sites, warning of explosives. Consequently, when this bearded white man came by on this strange bicycle with an orange flag, they could only conclude that in my little black bag I was carrying dynamite! All I knew was that whenever I approached an intersection the soldier directing traffic would *always* stop all other traffic to wave me on through!

'The White-Man -on-a-Bicycle-With-a-Flag Will Come and Take You Away!'

As an indication of how extraordinary I must have struck people there, I was told of a woman attempting to discipline her unruly child by telling it: '*If you don't behave the white-*

man-on-a-bicycle-with-a-flag will come and take you away!'. (The Yoruba word for white man was pronounced 'oh-ee-boe' and meant *a peeled banana*.)

Bicycle Mobility

In 1979, as I prepared to leave Nigeria, I was given a list, put together by an expatriate, enumerating the countless 'tasks' to be taken care of before leaving. One was getting a 'tax clearance'. You filled out a form, took it to an office at the university – a mini-football field sized room full of people doing who-knows-what – from whence your form would be taken to the government tax office and eventually come back endorsed.. That could take months; and if it didn't come back in time, mind-boggling hassles would ensue. You were clearly warned that the process must be started several months in advance.

Most things could be done within the university. But the tax office was some distance away, and given that traffic on Ibadan's few paved roads was in gridlock sunrise to sunset, doing this by car was not an option. One would first have to drive there and leave the form; having it signed and stamped on the spot was unthinkable. But since there were no working phones, the only way to find out if it was 'ready' would be to drive there again, only to be told that it was not ready, etc.. Each of these trips would be up to two hours each way, under intense tropical heat. (Forget aircon.)

I, however, simply hopped on my bike and was there in fifteen minutes; and that was only the beginning of my advantage. The building was a large and attractive colonial structure. I locked my bike to the nearest tree and walked in. Papers and folders lay everywhere in chaotic disarray.

Now remember, whites are highly respected in Africa; a white professor all the more. But a white professor arriving out of nowhere on a ten-speed bicycle with a flag on a pole is something about which legends are made! (And as I think back on this, I realize that my arrival, including my *danger-man* identity, must have reached those in the building – by that mysterious quicksilver-like African grapevine.)

I wandered around until I found the right man. We sat down and he looked at my form. 'No dependents?' he asked. 'I don't think so', I replied. 'How about your parents?' 'No, they're okay.' 'Well, we'll put them down anyway. ... Children?', he asked 'Not that I know of.' 'But you might have some that you don't know about, right?' 'Well ..., sure.' Fine. Two more dependents.

He signed the form, stamped it, and that was that. No one could have been friendlier or more helpful. We shook hands warmly and in a few minutes I was back at the university. In an hour I had accomplished what normally took months, all because I rode a [bicycle](#).

BLACK 'SELF-HELP' ORGANIZATIONS RUN BY WHITES

Black Incapacity

In the November 1988 issue of *Frontline* magazine, an article by Nomavenda Mathiane ("Pointed Fingers", pp.17, 31). She tells of a woman working in the anti-apartheid 'Movement' who

complains ... about the tendency for whites to run the affairs of the progressive organisations. ... workshops ... conducted ... for the benefit of blacks. ... [B]lack people should be taught how to run these workshops, and then run them on their own in the townships.

The issue has long been simmering, and it is now time it was openly brought out and discussed. ... those who complain have a case. The blacks often do not get a chance, faced with whites ... from the richest and most well-educated sector, confident and sometimes pushy. ...

On the other hand one can ask *why the complainers do not just go and do their thing*. [Many] whites ... would love to give projects over to blacks and rest assured that they will continue. But unfortunately that has often not been the case. Some organisations have made a big noise about the blacks taking over, *only to collapse a few months later*. It is common also to see frail old ladies from the suburbs break their backs getting work done and some of the black leaders turn up in time to make speeches. [Emphases added.]

Not Wanting to Know the Truth

If whites are so foolish as to tolerate this, is it surprising that blacks take advantage? *Nothing will teach someone the truth who doesn't want to know it*. Blacks cannot run such organizations because of a lack of managerial ability, jealousy and envy – and, their positive disinterest in helping fellow blacks.

The Panacea of 'Democracy'

Apropos the clamour in Africa for 'multiparty democracy' and the new-found wisdom that 'lack of democracy on the continent lies at the root of its underdevelopment' ("Africa's new wind of change", *The Star*, August 19, 1991, p.10, by Barney Mthomboti), I would point out that while democracy no doubt facilitates development it is by no means sufficient; India comes to mind. Nor is it necessary: Hong Kong has never been a democracy, nor has Taiwan, Korea or Singapore, and yet they prosper. (Nor, by the way, does the absence of democracy entail tyranny, as shown, e.g., by Hong Kong.)

What probably is true is that the characteristics required for democracy – such as managerial ability, [co-operation](#), mutual trust, foresight and discipline – are also amongst those that contribute to development, so that a democratic country is more likely to also be

developed – and *vice-versa*. But where these attributes are lacking – as in Africa – creating prosperity *or* democracy is apt to prove equally futile.

WHY BLACKS END UP HATING THEIR BENEFACTORS

Who's Been the 'Friend' of American Blacks? Jews. Who Do Blacks Now Hate? Jews!

Through the mid-60s, 75% of the funds for Martin Luther King's civil rights organization [came from Jews](#). In fact, I believe, whites – disproportionately Jews – didn't merely promote the civil rights movement; they virtually *created* it.

Whom do these militant black elite now hate and revile? Jews. There are at least two reasons for this. First, the psychologically astute black asks himself: 'Why are these Jews so nice to us? We certainly don't deserve it. He must be weak and frightened' – which of course stimulates the bully mentality. In the words of Rabbi Meir Kahane:

'The Jew has always been more liberal than other white ethnic groups. So now most Jewish neighborhoods are integrated, and the militant blacks there practice terror, extortion, and violence. ... Hemmed in by ... homeowners who refused to sell to them, [blacks] followed the path of least resistance. That path was ... Jewish neighborhoods'. ([Broken Alliance](#), by Jonathan Kaufman, 1988; pp.63, 150, 162-3.)

Second, as spelled out by [Marvin Olasky](#), there is a difference between the deserving and the *undeserving* poor, i.e., those who are poor through no fault of their own and those whose plight is of their own making. When we help the former, the response is usually gratitude; but to be a recipient of *undeserved* 'help' is to be 'told' that you are inadequate – which is why you *need* it.

Where events are left to take their normal course – white paternalism under colonialism, in apartheid South Africa, Asians looking after blacks in [East Africa](#) – this did not typically cause resentment because it was understood to be 'the natural order' of things. But when Western blacks, hyped by myths of equality, *still* need 'help', it can only be a constant *reminder* of an inadequacy that is *not supposed to exist*. Not surprisingly, this can breed resentment of those 'reminding' you of your failures – even though these 'helpers' would never say this; on the contrary, they will insist it is all due to white malice. My guess is that, subliminally, blacks see this as 'protesting too loudly'. In the words of [Shelby Steele](#), 'If I am not inferior, *why the need to say so?*'

MORE UPFRONT CONVERSATIONS

Growing Up On a Farm, Gladys ‘Didn’t Know What Apartheid Was’

In December 1988 I talked with a black woman teaching Zulu at a private (white) school. I met Gladys at a flea market and gave her a lift. One of the first things she said was that ‘96%’ of the Afrikaners ‘hated’ blacks. The English whites were their ‘friends’, though even many of them hated blacks but wouldn’t show it. The Afrikaner, on the other hand, made no attempt to hide it. If you went into an Afrikaner store, the owner would have one of his black staff wait on you because he wouldn’t want to get near you.

She told me that as a youngster, growing up on an Afrikaner farm, she ‘didn’t know what apartheid was’. The farmer treated her family with great respect, including her father, who (she said) wore a suit and tie. It was only later that she learned about it. I didn’t ask her how, if 96% of Afrikaners hated blacks, she happened to end up with one of the rare exceptions.

‘Blacks Are Violent’, Make A Lot Of Noise; You Can’t Expect Whites To Put Up With That

I asked whether whites who didn’t want their schools or neighbourhoods to become black were ‘against’ blacks or could still be their ‘friends’. Well, she said, I can understand them not wanting their schools or neighbourhoods to become black, because, as she put it, ‘our cultures’ are so different: blacks slaughter goats, make a lot of noise, and do other things whites don’t like. And – she volunteered – ‘blacks are violent’. These are things whites don’t want to live with and that’s quite understandable and not bad.

But how about schools? No one is suggesting that blacks are going to slaughter goats in school. Why should whites mind if *they* became mainly black? She agreed that they nevertheless had good reasons but we didn’t pursue it.

She began telling me about her family, how she became pregnant and married at the age of 13, and, quite remarkably, was still married to the same man; she had four grown children, two studying law in Boputhatswana (one of the black ‘homelands’) and one in the Polytechnic in Pretoria. Was the Polytechnic integrated? ‘Semi’, she said. They were careful about how many and which blacks they let in. She agreed it was not bad to limit the number of blacks, since it was in no one’s interest for the school to become all black.

Why Did Whites Create Education But Not Blacks? Very Simple: ‘The White Man Is So Clever!’

But why would this be in no one’s interest? Well, she said, the white man brought education to Africa; we never had it on our own. But why was it that the white man had education and the black man didn’t? Very simple, she said. *‘The white man is so clever’*. You mean the white man is cleverer than the black man? ‘Certainly’, she said, as if it were the merest commonplace.

We stopped and she went into a small store. She came back with two Cokes and related an incident. She had asked the Portuguese owner if ‘the boy’ (his son) could get her a straw. ‘He’s not a “boy”’, he said, ‘he’s white’; and this annoyed her very much. This man was an immigrant – ‘It’s not even his country’ – and this is how he treats blacks. She could speak to some people and they would come and destroy his store. (A good illustration of black mentality.)

Did Apartheid Cause Black Behaviour or Did Black Behaviour Cause Apartheid?

I explained the chicken-or-egg situation here. You say blacks behave badly because of the way whites treat them; whites say they treat blacks this way because of their behaviour. So which came first – black behaviour and *then* white reaction to it, or, white (mis)treatment and then black behaviour? Putting it in terms of apartheid: *Is apartheid the cause of black behaviour, or is black behaviour the cause of apartheid?* Or is it both?

She admitted that it was not entirely whites’ fault; it was at least in part black behaviour that makes whites not want to live amongst them and unwilling to give them political power.

In November 2005, Muslims in France created a state of near-insurrection. Virtually everyone who wrote about this referred to the ‘fact’ that young Muslims were ill-treated. This may or may not be true, but to the extent it *is* true, the question which *no* one considers is whether their behaviour is a response to this mistreatment, or, whether this treatment is simply a normal response to their behaviour.

‘You’re a Very Interesting Fellow’

Gladys began talking of how whites were selfish. They knew how to build houses, provide education, etc. etc. – but only did it for themselves, not for blacks; nor would they teach blacks how to do it. (Secret formulas?) She mentioned that as individuals blacks didn’t hate whites, but as soon as they got into a group this could change. If one person spouts race hatred the whole group will all of a sudden ‘hate’ whites.

She remarked how much she had enjoyed our conversation – I was a ‘very interesting fellow’ – and expressed the hope we could meet again. At the end of the day what she wanted is for the white man to help the black man – *more*. But that will only happen if people start talking about what they already know ‘in their hearts’. And *that* will only happen if this philosophical nut is cracked: the unquestioned assumption that the very idea of racial differences is bad and must be swept under the rug.

‘What a Brain You Must Have To Write Such A Book!’

Shortly after Nelson Mandela’s release in February 1990, I spoke with a Tswana woman, working as a dental assistant. Things were going to change now that Mandela was free and the ANC unbanned, she said. ‘Are you telling me you want to see a black government?’ Yes – and it was coming. ‘But you know’, I said, ‘it takes brains to run a country like South

Africa. Do you really think blacks can do it?' And she said immediately: 'Well, that I grant you: the white man is much cleverer. But still'

She later read the first few pages of this book. 'Nothing bad there', she said. I gave her the first 60 pages, and when I next ran into her she said: "Jimmy' [as she calls me], 'I've read your book. It's wonderful! What a brain you must have to write such a book!'

THE INCOHERENCIES OF 'BLACK RULE NO MATTER WHAT'

'Liberation, Lousy As It May Be'

An article in *Frontline* magazine ("Misdirected Advertising", May/June 1989, pp.37-38, by Asiwoni Amaphixiphixi [a pen name for Nomavenda Mathiane]; all emphases added), contains some interesting statements:

Africa's Way

I was disturbed... when one of the delegates [at 'an international conference about South Africa'], a cabinet minister from an African country, spoke of solving problems the "African way". ...

... What does "the African way" mean? Does it mean the demise of order and rise to chaos? Does it mean the replacement of an orderly but unjust white domination by a disorderly and *equally unjust* clique domination? ...

.... One African writer, addressing a group of South African writers, warned us to write now because *in a black-run South Africa we may find it difficult*.

On the plane home I [sat] ... next to a Kenyan. ... as the flight wore on and he mellowed, he finally said: "*stop looking forward to your liberation because once you have got it you will go backward. We know*".

For me this was a terrible shock. It does not really sway me, because *I demand and insist upon total liberation and total citizenship of my country*, and until I have achieved that *I do not care what happens thereafter*. Nonetheless this Kenyan made me realise that we do not need liberation in name alone, we need liberation which is real. [But she's just said – and says again below – that she doesn't care *what* it's like.]

... [T]he irony [is] that while the Botha regime ... is ...-famous for its oppression, I have cousins in other parts of the continent *who cannot say even a tenth of what I say in public*. The ... South African government ... points to hunger and corruption in neighbouring countries and uses this to justify white rule. *I can never accept white rule. As long as they make me an inferior being I do not have the luxury to work on what it means to make liberation real*. I have to be prepared to swallow *whatever kind of liberation comes up, lousy as it may be*.

Mind-Boggling Contradictions

I have said that black rule means *real* oppression and that blacks know this. Are we to believe that so many can be so irrational as to desire what they recognize to be against their interests – justice, ‘freedom’ and economic well-being? If they were going to *get* something for this sacrifice – some intangible called ‘freedom’, of inestimably greater value than anything material – it might be understandable. But as she herself admits, they will not *get* ‘freedom’: however ‘unfree’ they think they are now, they will ‘go backward’ after ‘liberation’. Wanting a ‘liberation’ which she knows will not *be* a liberation makes no sense. Black rule means replacing ‘orderly but unjust’ white rule by ‘disorderly and equally unjust’ black rule. But the latter will clearly be *more* unjust. So it’s not merely a matter of replacing one (alleged) injustice with another but with a much greater one – *plus* disorder and chaos.

If Black Rule Means Disaster, How Can It Be Wrong To Prevent It?

A clue to her thinking may lie here: ‘As long as they make me an inferior being I [can’t worry about] what it means to make liberation real’. In white-ruled South Africa, blacks *are* regarded as inferior, *i.e.*, as people whose behaviour warrants denying them political power. But to the extent to which blacks are thus treated as inferior it is *justified*, for the simple reason that in this respect they *are* inferior; *i.e.*, their group traits *do* justify keeping them from political power. Moreover, she apparently agrees, since she agrees that black rule means disaster. How then can it be wrong to prevent this?

From a Liberal Committed to Black Rule: Blacks ‘Incapable All Over’

Apropos black inability to govern, I quote from Denis Beckett (“Beyond Anti-Apartheid”, *Frontline* magazine, September 1990, p.10):

... [Joe’s] experience points to a level of utter incapacity [of blacks] that is hard to come to terms with, and never addressed in the anti-apartheid literature. It points to people who are wholly incapable of making decisions, incapable of distinguishing opposition from treason, incapable of mastering the merest basics of economics, incapable of coping with disputes, incapable all over.

This from a man who advocates ‘full-scale’ democracy as a cure for South Africa’s ills! One wonders when he will allow himself to put two and two together and see how profoundly incompatible is this incapacity with democracy. And once he understands *that*, he may wonder whether blacks are just as aware of these same truths – and that they too can come to the same obvious conclusion: that black rule is in no one’s interest. (For a book detailing the horrors of post-colonial Africa – while indignantly dismissing the idea of racial differences which might account for them – see [Africa Betrayed](#), 1992, by George Ayittey, a Ghanaian economist living in America.)

How Egalitarian Dogma Precludes Blacks Electing Whites

In an earlier issue of *Frontline* (May/June 1990, pp.3-5: "Why Blacks Will Elect the Nats"), Beckett by implication agrees that blacks prefer white rule; given the chance, he says, they would elect a white government. But with intimidation, mob psychology, black credulity and belief in witchcraft (etc.), it seems evident that blacks would, one way or another, be 'persuaded' to vote for blacks, and that, one way or another, blacks would be 'elected'. (See, however, discussion of Brazilian blacks [electing whites](#).)

Furthermore, since the suggestion that blacks might elect whites smacks of white superiority, this option will be severely hampered by egalitarian assumptions, and anyone espousing it will be hamstrung *by their own acceptance* of that liberal ideology. Blacks will be told – by whites – that (of course!) they want a black government, and this will have a major impact, since they will say, 'Hey, even the white man thinks we should have a black government!'

An Incidental Paradox

And if there's one thing which can persuade blacks that whites are *not* more intelligent, it's the white man saying so! Put simply: because the white man is so intelligent, if he says something is so, it must be so; the white man says he's *not* more intelligent; therefore *that* must be so!

WITH BLACK RULE ON THE HORIZON, WHITE CONCERNS

How a Philosophical Error Left Whites Without a Leg To Stand On

A well-to-do man asked me (in March 1990) what I thought was going to happen in light of the unbanning of the ANC and the releasing of Nelson Mandela. He thought the government would avoid giving power to blacks.

But why *are* whites afraid of black rule and why *should* they wish to prevent it? The only honest reason is that blacks simply cannot manage a modern industrial economy. They are – in these respects – inferior; and this is *the* reason for fearing black rule.

But F W De Klerk (the last white president), would reject such ideas out of hand as morally unacceptable. Hence, in his desire to avoid black rule, he won't have a leg to stand on since he has ruled out the only valid defense of that position, and so will be forced to accede to black rule. All because of a mistaken *philosophical* premise, viz., that any suggestion of black inferiority is morally reprehensible, *cannot* be true and hence will not be considered. The only way to avoid this *cul-de-sac* is to take the bull by the horns and challenge this dogma head-on.

And so once again we see the practical importance of philosophy: a crucial underlying factor in making black rule inevitable is this philosophical error and, far-fetched as it may strike some, the only way to obviate it is through hard-headed philosophical analysis.

Mandela: 'If whites leave we're in big trouble'

Nelson Mandela, in the early days of his release, referred several times to white fears of black rule, saying that they must be dealt with in 'negotiations'. I also heard him say on the *BBC* that 'If the whites left we'd be in big trouble'. But I wonder if he's ever asked himself whether this white fear is *justified* or is simply a matter of racial prejudice. If the latter, there is no reason why blacks *should* 'accommodate' them; but if it's the former, then that's a horse of a very different colour.

'Power-Sharing'

And what about 'power-sharing'? Whatever else, this would mean whites having more power than their proportion of the electorate. Yet why should whites have more power? Again, there is only one answer: because, as De Klerk's brother Willem once said, an all-black government would be 'too ghastly to contemplate' ("Whites Now Realistic", *Sunday Times*, 24 July 1988, p.24). But that is essentially the *same* reason for exclusive white rule, and if it's unacceptable in that case it will be equally so in the case of power-sharing.

In a nutshell: If there are no important racial differences, there is no reason to fear black rule; according to egalitarianism there *are* no important racial differences; *ergo*, there is no reason to fear black rule. But common horse sense tells us there *is* reason to fear it – because there *are* important racial differences. Whites are thus caught in a bind between an instinctive refusal to accept the first conclusion and an ideological/emotional refusal to accept the latter.

As before, this no-win situation springs from the philosophical error of assuming that the idea of racial superiority is in and of itself wicked.

BLACK TAXI DRIVERS PUNISHED DUE TO THIS SAME PHILOSOPHICAL ERROR

What *Is* Discrimination?

'Not Blacks. Niggers.'

In Washington, D.C., taxi drivers (mostly nonwhite) face a fine of \$500 fine 'for discrimination' if they fail to pick up black passengers ([Paved With Good Intentions](#), p.58.) Such a law rests on a presumed understanding of the nature of discrimination. The question of whether or not this is the *correct* understanding – and hence whether these taxi drivers, acting on reasonable and justified presumptions, *ought* to be punished – is yet another instance where a compelling practical issue rests on an essentially philosophical one, viz.,

Exactly what is discrimination (aka racism)? (For my attempt to answer this question, see [here](#).)

To quote from [The End of Racism](#) (p.251):

“This racism stuff is bullshit” one African student who was driving to put himself through school told me. “I’m not going to pass up a fare, which is money in my pocket. But I don’t want to get robbed. You know what the black crime rate is in New York? Do you want me to risk a gun to my head, man? What’s wrong with you?”

A white driver in Chicago told me, “No exceptions, pal. I never pick up niggers”.

“You don’t like blacks?” I asked.

“Not blacks. Niggers.”

“That sounds like racism to me.”

“Hey, that’s crap. I pick up older blacks all the time. I have no problem with giving black women a ride. My black buddies won’t pick up no niggers. I ain’t no more racist than they are.”

Self-Preservation Requires *Policy-Decisions*

Note that the decision these drivers must make is not simply whether to pick up *this* customer, but rather whether to adopt a certain *policy*, i.e., of *regularly* picking up this *type* of person in this *type* of situation; in other words, regularly making certain kinds of decisions in certain kinds of circumstances – because of course they don’t pick up just one passenger; they pick up thousands.

There are, roughly, three choices: one, pick up anyone looking for a taxi; two, try to discern, in the case of young black males, whether they ‘look safe’; three, don’t pick up young black males at all (except, perhaps, in exceptional cases). The first is clearly fraught with great danger, which is why few adopt it. The second may look better, but experience tells us that it will eventually lead to the same result as the first, since, over the long haul, you are bound to make mistakes. This leaves the third policy, which most drivers adopt out of common sense self-preservation – and yet for which they risk a harsh penalty.

A BLACK MAN’S PENETRATING ANALYSIS OF RACIAL PROFILING

‘If God Were a Cop, He Wouldn’t Need Racial Profiling’; Placing Blame Where It Belongs

‘Indicators’

A [column](#) by the well-known black economist Walter Williams contains such a clear and concise statement of these ideas that I quote it at length. It concerns the controversial policy of

'racial profiling', which became a news item in connection with New Jersey State Police trying to control drug trafficking (all emphases added):

... If God were a state trooper, He wouldn't be involved with the imperfection and indignity of racial profiling – not because He's good but because He knows all. God would know who is a drug trafficker and who's not.

Mere mortals like us don't know everything. Unlike God, we face a world of costly and incomplete information, and that means we have to do a lot of guessing and playing hunches. Part of that strategy requires the use of *indicators* race [is] among those indicators Thus, we can benefit from learning to employ *cheap-to-observe* characteristics as proxies for more-costly-to-observe characteristics. Race is a cheap-to-observe characteristic that, while imperfect, is nonetheless sometimes useful.

I've hailed taxis in downtown Washington, D.C., at night, only to watch the driver pass me up and pick up a white passenger down the street. *As often as not, the driver was black.* Was the driver a racist? Or was he using my skin color as a proxy for an undesirable destination such as a high-crime neighborhood or as a proxy for the probability of being robbed? He was racially profiling me, but he was wrong in my case. It is never pleasant to be a victim of racial profiling, *but whom should I blame*: the taxi driver who's not God and is simply doing what he can to protect himself? *Or should I blame black thugs who prey on taxi drivers*, making them leery about picking up black customers at night?

My physician practices racial profiling. Even though my PSA is 2.3, he is very aggressive about the slightest change. He's also aggressive about treating my mildly elevated blood pressure. He doesn't know anything certain about my individual risk of prostate cancer and hypertension-related diseases. Not being God, he uses the medical evidence about blacks in general to make guesses about me. Should I take a cue from [the governor of New Jersey who fired the head of the State Police for practicing racial profiling] and *fire him for making assumptions about me based upon my race?*

What about racial assumptions the New Jersey State Police may make? According to the 1997 FBI, 63 percent of the 65,624 drug arrests were minorities (50 percent blacks and 13 percent Hispanics). Since blacks are only 13 percent of the ... population, ... law enforcement officials can assign a higher probability that a drug trafficker is a black ... than other racial groups. In terms of arresting drug traffickers, doing disproportionate traffic stops on blacks will have a higher payoff than traffic stops on say Japanese, Russian Orthodox Jews or 75-year-olds.

Statistics about the grossly disproportionate number of blacks involved in drug trafficking is no comfort to the law-abiding black who is stopped and searched. It's humiliating and demeaning, not to mention inconvenient. *But with whom should we*

be angry: police officers or those who've made black synonymous with crime? Of course, an alternative is not to stop cars at all.

I don't think I could improve on this lucid statement of the completely obvious. Many of the arguments in this book hinge on precisely these ideas. Amazing, is it not, how whites literally *jump* at the merest hint of a 'racial infraction', while blacks remain free to state these self-evident truths? Maybe Williams can stiffen the backbone of these white jellyfish!

Example of Black IQ?

My [black fireman](#) friend, a successful businessman and comfortably retired – as well as the proud owner of a brand new Cadillac – responded to the fact that 50% of drug arrests are of blacks thus: '[I]f stats show 50% are black, that does not represent "more" to me. Seems to me it represents one half.' Coming from a high-achieving black, this is not exactly an advertisement for black IQ! Nor does having attained the 'good life' in America prevent – indeed, it may largely explain – his harping on the 'fact' that blacks in America have just about the worst of all possible worlds. (Compare remarks by [Shelby Steele](#) that 'the intractability of white racism is a black group "truth" that licenses the pursuit of special preferences for blacks'.) In a contest for hypocritical BS this rivals the whining of Edward Said about how horrible things are for Arabs in America – an Arab who was a tenured full professor at one of America's great universities (Columbia), living in the lap of luxury in one of the world's great cities (New York). (See "Edward Said's *Orientalism* Revisited", by Keith Windschuttle, *The New Criterion*, January 1999. [Said died in 2003. *GRBR*.]

APPENDIX A

WHAT IS RACISM? OR, HOW PHILOSOPHY CAN BE 'PRACTICAL'

Outline of Principal Theses

Determining the nature of racism is a philosophical issue. Nevertheless, it is of great practical importance and I would argue that many of the West's racial problems arise from a mistake thereof.

To be accused of racism is to be condemned. But (I claim) no fact or idea can itself be racist. Therefore the idea of racial differences is neither racist nor bad and hence is insulting to no one.

At present all political discussion in the West is based on the assumption that the idea of such differences *is* racist – a philosophical error with fateful consequences. If there are such differences and they are *not* racist, then they should be taken into account in policy-making; but if they are wrongly assumed to be racist and hence swept under the carpet, any policies based on such willful ignorance are doomed to failure.

What Racism Is *Not*

The question *What is racism?* is philosophical, not sociological, anthropological or linguistic. It is nevertheless a question of enormous practical importance, and I will argue that most of the racial problems facing South Africa and the West arise because of certain false assumptions in this regard.

While agreeing that racism is bad, we must ask just what this means. An earthquake which kills thousands of people that is bad, but it's not *morally* bad. We don't, e.g., *condemn* it, for the simple reason that it is *inanimate* and hence doesn't *do* things. Earthquakes simply *happen*; there is no question of moral blame because there is nothing and no one *to* blame.

Moral vs. Nonmoral Badness

But while being *animate* may be a requirement for moral blame, it is not sufficient. We don't condemn a marauding lion or an infant for dropping your cell phone into the bath, for though both are animate, they are not responsible for their actions; and it is only responsible human behaviour that can be condemned or blamed and which is wicked or sinful.

Hence we can distinguish moral from nonmoral badness. The former concerns human beings and their behaviour; this is the sphere of right and wrong. Nonmoral badness concerns things which are unfortunate but which involve no (responsible) human behaviour and for which there is therefore nothing and no one to blame. The chemical accident at Bhopal (in India) in which thousands died was horrible and if someone was responsible for it

they should be punished. But if it simply happened, then, though no less lamentable, there would be no moral evil and nothing deserving of condemnation.

What *Kinds* of Things Can Be Racist?

It is clear that when we say racism is bad we mean morally bad, for to call someone a racist is to condemn him. But what sorts of things, besides a person and his behaviour, can be racist?

Suppose someone says blacks are not good at mathematics – not that *no* blacks are, but that on average, fewer are. Is saying and believing such a thing racist? It is crucial to realize that, practically speaking, what we are asking here is whether this is *morally bad*; because to say it is racist is to say that it *is* bad. And in essence that is what the argument over racism is all about: whether saying, doing, thinking or feeling certain things are *bad* and hence should be condemned, prohibited or even penalized.

A Philosophical Touchstone

At present it is widely assumed that such ideas – that blacks are poor at math or that they have a higher crime rate, etc. – *are* racist, and while I do not wish to deny that genuine racism deserves condemnation, I most emphatically question whether certain things assumed to be racist really are. In fact, the badness of racism can serve as a philosophical *touchstone*. For any ‘theory’ of what racism is – as expressed by saying that this or that belief, attitude or action is racist – we can apply this simple test: Is this thought, attitude or action *bad*? If, on reflection, we conclude that it’s not, we may conclude that it is not racist and hence that this theory of racism is incorrect.

Can an *Idea* Be Racist?

We can begin by asking whether an idea can be racist? For our purposes, an idea is like a **thought**, which is closely related to a **proposition**. When we make an assertion we are always asserting something to *be so* – to *be the case*. That which we are asserting to be the case is a proposition. (For present purposes ‘statement’, ‘assertion’ and ‘proposition’ are more or less the same.)

Propositions and Facts

Thus, if I say (1) ‘Pretoria is the administrative capital of South Africa’, I have asserted a proposition. That proposition happens to be true, but propositions can just as easily be false as true. Thus, (2) ‘Cape Town is the *administrative* capital’ is false. The assertion that (3) ‘Cape Town is the *legislative* capital’ is true, but saying that it is the administrative capital is false, just as (1) is true but (4) – that Pretoria is the legislative capital – would be false.

Hence, while a proposition can be either true or false, it remains the *same* proposition whichever it is. Thus, (3) ‘Cape Town is the legislative capital’, is true; but if it were to

become false (if they relocate parliament), it would be the same proposition it is now but would simply be false instead of true.

What makes one proposition true and another false? Why is (3) [that Cape Town is the legislative capital] true but (2) [that it is the administrative capital] false? Obviously, because it is a **fact** that Cape Town is the legislative capital while it is *not* a fact that it is the administrative capital. Facts, therefore, are what *make propositions true (or false)*. All propositions assert some fact or other to be the case; when that fact is the case, the proposition is true; when it is not, the proposition is false.

Thus, it is a fact that Cape Town is the legislative capital and hence the proposition which asserts this – (3) – is true; while it is not a fact that it is the administrative capital and hence the proposition which asserts it is – (2) – is false.

Propositions Are ‘Pictures’ of Facts

Propositions are therefore intimately connected with facts: a proposition is like a ‘picture’ of a fact. Just as you can have a picture of something that does not exist (e.g., of the fictional character *Superman*), and just as the picture is a perfectly *bona-fide* picture and will remain the same picture whether Superman exists or not, so a proposition ‘pictures’ a fact. It asserts a certain fact to be the case but is quite independent of whether or not that fact is the case (and hence of whether or not the proposition is true); and just as the picture of Superman remains the same picture whether Superman exists or not, so a proposition remains the same proposition whether or not there is a fact to make it true.

Can a *Fact* Be Racist?

And now let us ask whether a fact can be racist. The answer is clearly ‘No’; indeed, the very idea is absurd. When we say that racism is bad we mean it is morally bad and deserving of condemnation. But a fact cannot be deserving of condemnation since it is inanimate and hence is not the *sort* of thing which can be blamed. A fact is not responsible for being a fact, nor is it deliberately or knowingly a fact; it just *is* a fact, and it would be ridiculous, e.g., to say, ‘*Shame on you – you are a bad fact!*’.

But since to call something racist is to criticize it, it makes no sense to call a fact racist, since it makes no sense to criticize a fact. A fact may be *nonmorally* bad – i.e., something which it would have been better had it not been the case – but it cannot be wicked.

If a fact cannot be wicked, what about a proposition? Again the answer is clear: if a fact cannot be morally bad, neither can a possible fact (which is essentially what a proposition is), if for no other reason than that it is inanimate and hence not subject to (moral) blame or criticism. And if it can’t be sinful or wicked neither can it be racist.

Hence we may conclude that neither the idea, thought or proposition that there are racial differences can be racist, since no thought or proposition can itself be morally bad – and if it can’t be morally bad it can’t be racist. Thus, neither the possible fact nor the actual fact of

such differences can be racist, since facts, actual or possible, are not and cannot by themselves be morally bad, sinful or wicked. (See also [here](#).)

Conventional Wisdom Embodies Philosophical Error

But if there *are* important group differences which are not ‘allowed’ to exist, then any decisions based on such willful ignorance are doomed to failure. Yet this Accepted Wisdom and the *de facto* policy resulting from it rests on a *philosophical mistake*, viz., the unchallenged and unexamined assumption that certain ideas are racist and hence morally abhorrent and hence ‘beyond the pale’. This dogma has far-reaching ramifications. As [Stephen Carter](#) says, ‘Silencing debate solves no problems; it only limits possible solutions’. Hence my claim that a philosophical question, concerning the nature of racism, has practical import.

What Racism Is

If the very idea of racial differences is not racist, what is? We have said there are racist beliefs, statements, behaviour, attitudes and individuals. But is it, e.g., bad to believe that whites are smarter – or more honest and reliable – than blacks? For if the *idea* of such differences is not morally bad, how can it be bad simply to believe they exist?

Two Senses of Belief

We can distinguish two senses of belief. If I say ‘Your belief that witchcraft was the cause of Kokomo’s losing the race is false’, I am talking about the *proposition which you believe* (that witchcraft was the cause of his losing) and I am saying that it’s false. In a sense this has nothing to do with you, but only with the *content* of your belief, i.e., with the proposition which you believe. Call this the **propositional** sense of belief.

But suppose I say ‘Your belief that witchcraft was the cause of Kokomo’s losing the race is *foolish*’. Can a proposition be foolish? A person can be foolish, *for* believing something, but a proposition itself cannot be. (We may *say* a proposition is foolish, but that simply means it is a proposition it would be foolish *to believe*.) So when I call your belief foolish, what I am calling foolish is not the proposition you believe, but *you, for* believing it; for while we cannot criticize a proposition, we can criticize someone for believing it. Let us call the act (or state) of believing – as opposed to *what* is believed – the **psychological** sense of belief.

Which Kind of Belief Can Be Racist?

Which sense are we talking about when we say that a belief is racist? In the propositional sense, a belief is simply the proposition which is believed, and we have already said that a proposition cannot be racist; so belief in this sense cannot be racist. How about in the psychological sense? Can a person be criticized for believing something, i.e., for how or why he believes it? Certainly, for we are responsible for our beliefs.

Would it be racist, then, to say ‘Blacks are more often thieves than whites’? If we say yes, we must be saying that it is the proposition itself which is racist; for that’s all we know about: we don’t know who said it or how or why. Therefore, if we say this statement (or belief) is racist it can only be because of its content. But we already know that a proposition, by itself, cannot be racist, because to say it is racist means it is morally bad and it makes no sense to say this of a proposition.

A Belief Can Be Racist Only Because Of the *Manner In Which It Is Held*

So *can* we say that ‘Blacks are more often thieves’ is racist? In fact, we cannot – at least not just like that. It will depend on how it is believed. But if it *is* racist, *what* will be racist will not be the proposition itself but rather the *manner* in which it is believed. For that *is* something for which we are responsible, for which we can be criticized, which can be bad, and hence which can be racist.

And when will such a belief be racist? First, it must attribute some ‘negative’ trait – such as dishonesty or lesser intelligence – to some racial group. We might think, however, that such a belief will be racist only if it is *not true*.

Suppose someone grows up in a place where many blacks are thieves and where whites are constantly bad-mouthing blacks. He is likely to end up thinking blacks are just thieves; and yet suppose (for the sake of argument) that in fact the only reason blacks steal is poverty. He would be believing that blacks are, by nature, thieves and his belief would be false. Would it not therefore be racist?

If a Belief Is Honest It Cannot Be Bad and If It Is Not Bad It Cannot Be Racist

The answer is ‘No’; for although this is a ‘bad’ belief about another race that is false, it is – *from his point of view* – based on evidence (what he sees and what people say). Given this background, it is perfectly reasonable – and honest – for him to believe what he does. But if his belief is honest, it cannot be morally bad and hence cannot be racist. So being false doesn’t make such a negative belief racist; what matters, again, is the manner in which it is held.

But neither does being true preclude racism. Let us assume (again for the sake of argument) that blacks are by nature more likely to be thieves than whites and that Jones believes this to be so. But suppose he believes this because he was once mugged by a black man and ever since then simply thinks blacks are thieves.

In fact this is not such a simple case. What determines whether a belief is racist is not its truth or falsity but how it is held. One relevant factor is *evidence* – though note that a person may have good evidence for his belief even though it is false, and conversely, have poor evidence though, by accident, it is true.

Thus: you ask for the time, I look at my watch which says 5 o'clock and I say 'It's 5 o'clock'. Unknown to me, however, my watch stopped an hour ago and it really is 6 o'clock. I had good evidence for saying what I did and yet my statement was false.

Conversely, you ask for the time, and (again) my watch, unknown to me, has stopped, so though it says 5 o'clock it really is 6 o'clock; but this time, taking a quick glance, I misread it as saying 6 o'clock and say to you 'It's 6 o'clock'. In this case, my evidence is poor and yet my statement happens, by accident, to be true.

Being mugged by a black man is obviously not a good reason for thinking that blacks are thieves, and if someone believes such a thing based on this evidence it would be a negative belief about blacks *and* based on insufficient evidence. Surely that makes it racist.

Hold your horses. If, through dim-wittedness, one honestly believes that this one incident *is* sufficient grounds for his belief, then though we might think him stupid, we could not label his belief racist. Racism is morally bad and deserving of condemnation; if his belief is honest, though foolish, he cannot be morally condemned for it. Such mental sloppiness, though lamentable, is not morally wicked.

So this in fact is not the case we were looking for: a negative belief about another race which was racist in spite of being true – for though true, it is not clearly racist. What then would an example?

Suppose someone believes that blacks are thieves – and let us again assume for the sake of argument that this is true – though in his case he has never had a bad experience with blacks; rather, he simply has an ingrained animus against them. When confronted with evidence to the contrary he refuses to consider it ('I'm not interested in that communist propaganda!'). Such a belief would clearly be racist even if it were true, showing that truth no more precludes racism than being false is a requirement. What matters, again, is not *what* is believed, nor its truth or falsity, but *how* it is believed.

The difference between the once-mugged person and the genuine racist can be illustrated by considering their reaction to contrary evidence. Suppose we explain to the former why his evidence is insufficient and he says, 'Yes, I see what you're getting at; my reasons were not very good and I was wrong to say that'. This would show that his belief had not in fact been racist but merely foolish. Whereas in the second example, his dismissing your argument as communist propaganda is a good indication that his belief *was* racist.

Why Neither Truth Nor Falsity Determines Whether a Belief Is Racist

In fact, given our previous discussion, we can show both that and why truth or falsity is irrelevant in deciding whether a belief is racist. Truth and falsity are properties of propositions, not of people; whereas racism, as a moral concept, is ultimately only attributable to people, and not at all to propositions. So when we speak of a belief as being true or false, we can only be referring to the proposition believed; whereas when we say

that a belief is racist, we can only be talking about the person who is believing it. Hence, truth and falsity have to do with things – viz., propositions – entirely other than what racism has to do with – viz., people and their actions and beliefs. And so truth and falsity can have nothing directly to do with whether a belief is racist. Of course if the belief is not only false but is *known* to be false, that’s a different matter, to which we may now turn.

The Essence of Racism Is Self-Deceit

Believing What You Know Isn’t True

The belief of the once-mugged person would be racist if he knew it was not true and yet *went right on believing it*. But is it possible to *believe what you know isn’t true*? Well, it is possible if *self-deception* is possible; self-deception is not only possible; it is actual; *ergo*, believing what you know isn’t true is possible. What we are talking about is simply *dishonest belief*, what the existentialist philosopher Jean Paul Sartre called *bad faith* (“*mauvaise foi*”), and it is precisely this dishonesty *with oneself* that makes genuine racism and prejudice so execrable. This makes perfect sense, since self-deceit – believing what you know isn’t true – is something for which we are responsible and something which is morally blameworthy. And it is this *inner dishonesty*, typified by avoidance of evidence that might prove one’s beliefs false, that makes racism so contemptible.

While Content Never Makes Belief Racist It Can Be Good Indication Of It

One final point. I have said that the content of a belief by itself never makes it racist. But how about believing not just that blacks are more often thieves but that they’re *all* thieves? Or that *all* Jews are liars and that [not a single one can be trusted](#)? Or that *no* blacks are capable of any intellectual achievement? (Thabo got a PhD in mathematics from Harvard? He *obviously* cheated!) Certainly we can say that such beliefs are racist without knowing anything more.

True enough, but that does not refute my thesis. Such beliefs would correctly be deemed racist because their content is so implausible that the person *has* to know that they’re not true, and if he nevertheless insists on believing it, he must be doing so in the knowledge that it is a false. To have such a belief *is* racist and reprehensible; and what makes it so is at least partly this inner dishonesty: saying – and believing – what you know is not true.

Hence, it remains true that beliefs are not racist merely because of their content, but rather because of the manner in which they are held. What is true is that content is often a good *indication* of this – and *thereby* of whether they are racist.

(This appendix is an edited version of a talk given in June 1988 to philosophy students at the [then-named] University of the Orange Free State, in Bloemfontein, South Africa.)

APPENDIX B

BLACK ACADEMICS ARE INTERESTED IN MY VIEWS

In March 2002 I received this email message:

Society for Research on African Cultures, Montclair State University

SORAC: Upcoming Conferences: Internalist vs. Externalist Interpretations of African History and Culture

SORAC 2002 INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE CALL FOR PAPERS ...

In the past twenty years ..., two schools of Africanist scholarship have slowly developed

The first school, that of the externalists, has continually blamed the general debacle of Africa and the people of African descent on the West. In Africa, this group has argued that Africa's ... problems can be directly ... attributed to ... actions ... of the West, actions that have had long-lasting and debilitating effects In the diaspora, [they see] the White man and his ... insidious racism as the root cause not only of African people's enslavement, but also of their dehumanization and exclusion

However, due to a general disillusionment that has left many disappointed at African leadership and its corrupt ways, a new school, that of the Internalists, has gradually voiced its opposition to a view that sees only external forces behind all the problem[s] ... facing African people In Africa, this school has argued that the causes of Africa's challenges ... are to be found in Africa itself, not in the West. Their argument is that the ...-negative role [of] the West ... is not sufficient to explain the corruption, civil wars and power struggles ... in Africa today because of African peoples' own actions and greed. In the diaspora, this group argues that Africans alone must be held responsible for the slave trade because they freely sold their own into slavery. The group also opposes Reparations claims and Affirmative Action policies in the US, and suggests that African people should start to acknowledge their own ... failures

I responded by submitting the following:

A Philosopher's Thoughts on "Externalism" vs. "Internalism"

Gedaliah Braun, PhD

I am an American who from 1976 to 1988 taught philosophy at universities in Nigeria, Kenya and Papua New Guinea, since which time I have lived in South Africa. While only vaguely familiar with the terms 'externalism' and 'internalism', I am quite familiar with the ideas behind them. I would say that in the public arena, internalism is a pretty well-kept secret. There are prominent blacks –Walter Williams, Thomas Sowell, John McWhorter, Shelby Steele and others – who in effect express this view,

but they are marginalized and rarely appear on major media outlets. Anyone whose knowledge is media-based would assume, with good reason, that the only black view is that of black victimhood.

That there is a 'debate' in academia between these two explanations for black failure is refreshing news. What *I* can report is that in black Africa – i.e., outside of South Africa (with its white presence and Western influence) – *this is not a live issue*. With very few exceptions, blacks in Africa regard it as an obvious, commonplace fact, needing no argument, and provoking no 'offense' whatsoever, that the white man is superior to the black man. 'Blaming' this inferiority on whites or colonialism ('externalism'), therefore, is obviously a nonstarter.

This claim about black attitudes is based on conversations with hundreds of blacks in Africa and Papua New Guinea. That indigenous blacks so matter-of-factly believe this does not make it true; but it does establish that for them, the question of racial differences is not a 'sensitive' issue. Where does this idea come from – that racial differences is a despicable idea, so disgraceful that the mere suggestion of it can end careers? I believe it comes from whites rather than blacks, which is why, in black Africa, where there are few whites and remarkably little Western ideological influence, the idea that all races are the same and that it is morally bad to say otherwise is almost unknown.

The situation in America is different and yet not so different. References by blacks to the fact that most blacks believe that whites are 'better' are common. Though such observations will always be coupled with the reassurance that these beliefs are 'myths' created by racism etc., that does not change the fact that most American blacks do indeed *believe* that as a group they are inferior. I myself have had numerous conversations with black Americans who unproblematically acknowledge such racial differences.

Unlike the situation in Africa, however, many Western blacks have learned that whites are uptight about race, feel guilty about black failure, and hence blame it on themselves – which is what creates the very idea of externalism. ('Whites themselves say they are to blame! So who are we to argue?') They quickly learn that they can benefit from being 'angry'; hence the phenomenon of 'black rage', a perfect vehicle for psychological blackmail ('no justice no peace') – all of which I believe is a gigantic *con game*.

After all, if one accepts my claim that blacks themselves believe they are deficient in ability and character, it follows that they do *not* think their failure is due (at least not entirely) to such things as racism. And can anyone doubt that they must *also* realize that these deficiencies themselves almost certainly have a role in explaining black failure? To the extent that that is true, it follows that they are 'internalists' and that 'black rage' is a scam.

In general, if one concedes 'internalism' – that the explanation for black failure lies 'within' – the possibility that at least part of the cause lies in such differences in

ability and character must inevitably be confronted, precisely what ‘internalists’, like most everyone else, have so far been unwilling to do. Once again, this is due to their unthinking acceptance of the dogma that such differences are morally abhorrent, an assumption for which arguments are never presented.

While I do not claim to have an immediate solution to the racial problems in the West, I do know what is a *sine qua non* for any progress. First and foremost, there must be an *end* to this assumption that it is wicked and evil to talk about racial differences. If such differences do in fact exist, then they must be taken into account in formulating policy – economic, political, social and educational. What the concrete policy implications might be is a hugely complex matter, but they cannot be dealt with until they are addressed, and they will not be addressed until they are acknowledged (at least as a possibility). The one way to guarantee continued racial turmoil is to pretend that these differences do not and cannot exist – *because they are so wicked* – and for whites to be consumed by racial guilt, stemming from the fact that they themselves, deep down, know as well as blacks the truth of racial differences.

A Surprising Response

In reply I received this [emphases added]:

Friday, May 03, 2002

Dear Prof. Braun:

We have reviewed your abstract for a paper entitled "A Philosopher's Thoughts on "Externalism vs. Internalism", and we are indeed pleased to inform you that it has been accepted for presentation at our upcoming conference *Our reviewers found your paper's thesis very appealing*, and are looking forward to hearing more about it at the conference.

Sincerely,

Dr. Rabia Redouane

Assistant Professor

Associate Executive Director

SORAC

Department of French, German, and Russian

Most whites would be utterly dumbfounded by this response. Yet it is simply further evidence for many of my theses, including that black ‘anger’ is a scam, that race is not always a ‘touchy’ subject and that many blacks, including elites, welcome a frank and no-holds-barred discussion of some of these most ‘sensitive’ issues.

APPENDIX C

The article below appeared in *Frontline* magazine (Johannesburg) in May 1991. It was subsequently reprinted by the black editor of a newspaper in Port Elizabeth (South Africa), who told Denis Beckett (publisher of *Frontline*) that it was the best thing he'd seen on the subject. Beckett deserves credit for publishing what were by then highly 'incorrect' views.

RACE EQUALITY

The Myth that Blacks Want to Rule

By Gedaliah Braun

It is now clear that black rule [in South Africa] is inevitable. What is less obvious is why it is, since, I believe, few people really want it. Blacks don't have to know anything about Zambia or Nigeria to know how blacks behave in positions of power and influence; they know how blacks run the police stations in Soweto, how black nurses treat black patients, and how the black elite treat their servants.

At the same time, the vast majority of whites assume that blacks are 'touchy' about race and would be deeply offended by any suggestion that whites are, as a whole, cleverer – the kind of cleverness that leads to science and technology.

I think this assumption is false, and as a result South Africa's five million whites labour under a harmful illusion. I have spent more than a decade living intimately with indigenous blacks in East and West Africa and I can state categorically that except for a few westernized blacks – who have learned that the white man is sensitive about race and hence that it is often to blacks' ad-vantage to act offended – black people generally accept as the merest commonplace fact that the white man is cleverer and are no more troubled by this than by the sun's rising and setting.

But since whites think the average black man is uptight about race they can't imagine asking him about it, and hence never find out that they are wrong.

Whites think this because they make one fatal philosophical assumption, which is that the very ideas of one race being – on average and in certain respects – smarter than another, is morally abhorrent. This, I believe, is a profound mistake, having far-reaching consequences.

But when whites find that in spite of all their liberal protestations they can't help noticing racial disparities, they feel guilty. Their unconscious thought is: 'I am a bad person because I think whites are smarter than blacks'. This makes them insist all the more vehemently that there are no differences between the races, can be none, and how dare you suggest otherwise!

What we are talking about here is the notion that (e.g.) whites are, on average, more intelligent than blacks. Some consider this a fact; others dispute it. But the possibility of such differences existing cannot, of itself, be bad; being inanimate, a fact, whether actual or not, is just not the sort of thing which can be praised or blamed. After all, it wouldn't be responsible for being a fact; it simply is (or isn't) a fact. The existence of natural inequalities might be unfortunate and the world a better place where they not so, but earthquakes are also unfortunate and we don't condemn them as wicked.

So why, in spite of being in almost no one's interest and something almost no one wants, is black rule inevitable? It is because whites consider such thoughts "bad", so that no one can publicly defend white rule, since to do so implies racial superiority and that is considered highly objectionable. And so South Africa heads towards black rule, all because of the self-imposed silence stemming from this specious philosophical premise, providing a classic example of the Emperor's Clothes Phenomenon, where everyone 'accepts' something which everyone knows is not true.

The only ones who really want black rule – and the only ones who will benefit – are a small group of black elite. For the rest, blacks will be – and know they will be – worse off under a black government: economically, politically and in terms of basic human rights. And hence there is nothing whatsoever racist about therefore fearing black rule.

These matters are never discussed, for the same reason that black rule is inevitable: white guilt and the dogma that any talk of racial differences is rep-rehensible. Yet it is certain that until we can talk about such things – without cringing – we will never be able to deal with our racial problems; and we will never be able to talk about them until we recognise that there is nothing scandalous about the possibility of natural racial differences.

Some readers will still insist that such talk is "disparaging" to blacks. I recommend they ask ordinary blacks if they're insulted by the idea that the white man is – on average – cleverer. Then ask yourself: would you feel denigrated by the suggestion that Japanese are, on average, smarter than whites? Of course not, for the simple reason that you wouldn't understand this to mean that every Japanese is smart and every white is stupid. You'd be thinking in terms of group averages, and in those terms there is nothing bad about thinking the Japanese are smarter.

When this sinks in, the idea that blacks might favour white rule may not seem so far-fetched. Again, ask black individuals which they'd prefer: a white-run hospital or a black; a white-run school or a black; a white-run police station or a black. Given their predict-able answers – 'white' in every case – what makes you think they'd like to see the entire government in the hands of blacks.

APPENDIX D

THE *A PRIORI* METHOD

Introduction

First, let me explain briefly what I mean by the *A Priori* Method. The term '*a priori*' means, roughly, knowing or learning something *just by thinking or using your mind*, as opposed to acquiring knowledge *a posteriori*, i.e., by experience – from what you see or hear or read.

Prime Numbers

If you 'just think about it', you can 'see' that the number seven is not divisible by any other number, whereas the number six is (by two and three). Hence, seven is a *prime* number. There is no need to take seven bananas (e.g.) and try to divide them into equal groups of bananas. You can just 'see' this in your mind, partly because numbers are *abstract* and hence can *only* be 'seen' by the mind.

Whereas, if you wish to know what is the capital of New York State you can think all you want, but if you haven't heard it somewhere or read it in a book (etc.) there is no way you could know that it is Albany (where I was born). In other words, this is *a posteriori* knowledge, because it deals with concrete, tangible objects, which can *only* be seen by the senses.

And by the *A Priori Method* here I mean simply a way of teaching something to someone without their having to use any 'outside' information, but rather, only by using knowledge which they already have, analogous to the way in which we can 'see' that seven is prime.

First Example

At the University of Ibadan in Nigeria, a bicycle was my [principle means of transport](#). After dark, however, I used a car; there was no street lights and the roads were full of potholes, etc. Intrepid as I was, there was no way I was going to ride under those conditions.

One night, on the main road, teeming with people milling about, buying and selling anything imaginable, including very large roasted rats held up by the vendors by their tails (which I never tasted) as well as large snails (which I did), and moving at not much more than a snail's pace (which was still faster than in the daytime), I notice two woman waiting for a taxi one of whom appears to be carrying a violin case. I stopped, told them to get in, which they promptly did. (Remember, I used to play the [violin](#).)

The one with the violin case got in the back. "Is that a violin you are carrying?", I asked. Yes, she said. "How do you happen to have a violin?" She explained that she belonged to an evangelical church, on the other side of town, which decided they wanted to start a

string orchestra and bought violins from London. (These evangelical churches, I knew, were usually affiliated with churches in the U.S. and so were relatively well-funded.)

I asked her about her church and this orchestra. It had started about a year before. “Are you taking lessons?” Yes. “For how long?” One year. “Can you play a scale?, I asked. Yes, she said. “OK, let’s see.”

She took out the violin and started to ‘play’. The violin was way out of tune. “You can’t play a scale until you tune it. Do you know how to do that?” She had no idea. “Let me have it.” So right there, in this slow-moving traffic, I tuned it. “OK, now try again, starting with the D string.”

Unfretted Stringed Instruments

For those of you who may not know this, a violin (along with its sister instruments the viola, the cello and the bass viol) are *unfretted*; i.e., the neck of the instrument where you place your fingers, is smooth, so that wherever you place your finger, that is exactly the note you will get – unlike the guitar, where there are *frets*, little bars that cross the neck at intervals, so that when you put your finger on a string it touches two frets and ‘plays’ the uppermost. It doesn’t matter where between the two frets you touch – you will get the same note.

But a violin, being *unfretted*, will produce a note corresponding to exactly where you place your finger, which is just one of the reasons why such instruments are difficult to play. (Of course this has profound advantages. It allows for *vibrato*, a ‘throbbing’ motion of the left hand, which is again entirely created by the violinist and which can produce a sound so exquisite as to be surpassed only by the voice of a Maria Callas.)

Lesson Begins

So she starts. After the open D string (already tuned), she puts down her fist finger. *Stop!!*, I shout. It’s way off. Stop, I say. “Is that the right note?” No, she replies. “Ah!” I say. “So you *know* that it’s not the right note!” Yes. “Do you know what’s wrong with it?” Yes, she says. “And what is wrong with it?” It’s too low. “So”, I exclaim, “you not only know that it’s not the right note, but you know *what’s wrong with it!* Is that correct?” Yes. “Do you know how to correct it?” Yes. “How?” Move my finger higher up. “*Absolutely right!*” I say. “So do it.” She does. “Is it right now?” Yes, she says; and she is right. It is indeed the right note.

What I’ve Demonstrated So Far

So, I said, I have shown to you that already know the following things. (1) You know whether the note is the correct note or not. Right? Yes, she said. (2) You not only know whether it is right or not, but if it is wrong you also know *what* is wrong with it (too high or too low). Is that right? Yes, she said. And finally (3), knowing what is wrong with the note, you know how to *correct* it. Is that right? Yes, she said.

So, I said, *you already have all the knowledge you need to play the correct note.* Am I right? Yes, she said. Then why, after a year's worth of lessons, can you still not play a scale correctly? No reply. "Because", I said, "you are not using this knowledge which you already have! You have the knowledge, *but you're not using it!*" Do you understand what I'm saying? Hmmm Not sure.

"Use the Knowledge You Already Have!"

OK. Here's what I want you to do. Start with the D strong. Play the first finger. But before you go any further, stop right there and ask yourself: *Is that the right note?* I've already shown you that you know the answer to that question. If it is the right note, go on to the next. If it's not, ask what's wrong with the note. I've shown you that you know that answer to *that* question and that you will know whether it too high or too low. Then ask what you need to do to correct it. And I've shown you that already know that answer to *that* question as well and hence that you will be able to correct the note and play the right note. Do you follow what I'm saying? Yes, she did.

OK, so start over again. When you play each note, you're not to go on to the next one until you establish whether that first note is correct. If it is, continue with the next; if it's not, correct it. Do the same with each note until you reached the octave above (completing the scale).

So she started. With a few "stop!"s and "OK"s we got through the whole scale. Here's what I want you to do, I said. When you get home, have someone tune the violin. And then do just what we did here: start playing the scale, but after each note ask yourself if that is the right note; if it is, continue; if it's not, fix it. Come and see me next week and we'll see how you've done.

Success- Putting Two and Two Together

She came and the improvement was dramatic. We 'practiced', with some more reminding and prodding. When she came gain a week later she was able to play a scale perfectly in tune. Not quite Jascha Heifitz, but in two weeks, with a few hours of my help, she was able to do what, after a year of 'lessons', she couldn't even begin to do.

How had I worked this little miracle? Simply by helping her *access and use knowledge she already had.* I gave her no knowledge which she didn't already have. It was, therefore, a perfect example of the *A Priori Method*, i.e., helping someone to 'learn' something just by showing them how to use knowledge they already possessed. She didn't have to read any books or ask anyone for any information. *Ergo*, I had helped her to 'learn' something *a priori*. (I use scare quotes because in a sense she already knew it; she just had to, as it were, *put two and two together.*)

Second Example

Learning to Write Coherently Without Learning Anything New

In 1986, at the University of Papua New Guinea, I had a class with just a single student. After each class I would give him a question to discuss. When I would read what he'd written I saw that many of his sentences *made no sense*; they were literally incoherent.

I was at a bit of a loss. How could this be? He *spoke* normal English. Why was he writing such gibberish? Finally, one day, I said to him, "Wait a second. Read out loud what you're written here." He read the first sentence. Stop, I said. Does that sentence make sense? Yes, he said – correctly. OK, read the next one. Does that make sense? No, he said, again correctly. Aha!, I said. You know that it doesn't make sense, right? Yes, he said. Can you change it so that it does make sense? Yes; and he did so immediately. We went through a few more sentences, each time with the same result.

So, I said to him, you already know which sentences are not making sense and know how to correct them. Take this paper home. Read each sentence out loud. If it makes sense, rewrite it as written. If it doesn't, correct it and write it as corrected.

Voila! He returned with a paper consisting entirely of coherent sentences! I had simply helped him to access and use knowledge he already had; he had not needed a single new piece of information. Clearly, an example of the *A Priori Method*.

Plato's *Meno*

These are real-life examples of what Plato depicts Socrates as doing in *The Meno*, where he tries to show that an ordinary person, with no (conscious) knowledge of geometry, can 'learn' the Pythagorean Theorem just by being asked the right questions, eventually 'leading' to the truth. Socrates says, clearly, that he has taught him nothing he didn't already know. My examples, perhaps, have the virtue of being simpler and more mundane.