

# London Swinton Circle

## *Online Magazine*

Summer 2020

<b>Contents</b>	
In Memoriam	2
Why Black People Are Talking To White People About Race	3
The Great Replacement	11
Lockdown Lunacy	13

## In Memoriam

The Swinton Circle mourns the death of our Chairman and organiser, Allan Robertson.

As a youth Allan had been Chairman of the Scottish branch of the Monday Club before moving to London. He joined the London Swinton Circle and took over the running of the Circle from Bee Carthew in 1992. As with Carthew before him, Robertson's name became synonymous with the London Swinton Circle.

He was a contributing editor of *Right Now!* magazine from the end of the nineties until 2004. From 1999 he published his own news bulletin *Tough Talking from the Right*. He was very much a proud Unionist. Allan was a member of the Loyal Orange Order, and always supported Ulster and their rights as fellow British subjects. He was committed to closer ties with the British Dominions, and regularly visited Gibraltar. He enjoyed memorials, statues and plaques to our national heroes and to our past, and would visit them in his travels around the country.

Politically Allan was a traditional conservative. He fully supported the restoration of the death penalty. He took a strong stance on immigration. He opposed 'politically correct' nonsense in whatever shape or form it took, alas much of it emanating from the Conservative Party.

During Allan's time the Circle would pay witness to the rise of UKIP as more and more people called for independence from the EU, a campaign which Allan as a patriot, of course, endorsed. Allan recognised Brexit was not an end, rather that it was very much a beginning.

Allan was a great organiser, and got many MPs to speak to the Circle, as well as many other individuals of note. Members acknowledge the time and effort Allan put into the Circle.

Allan died unexpectedly while still a young man. He would have considered that he still had much work to do. Undoubtedly, he would have wished to be remembered as someone who maintained the traditions of the past, as a true conservative should do; and, he would have expected all Circle Members to continue to maintain and promote the principles of true Conservatism and Unionism.

## Why Black People Are Talking To White People About Race

By Arthur St Hugh

Displacing from our news the monotony of the Great Covid Panic of 2020 has been the political use of the death in the USA of a man at the hands, or in this case the knees, of the Police. The death of George Floyd rapidly went from anger at the actual incident, to rioting at the perceived general behaviour of the Police, to becoming politicised by the Left and interest groups and by anyone who think they can benefit from its use.

We do not yet know the full reasons about how or why George Floyd ended up in that final situation, but that has been of no interest to those who have made of his death a general political issue. The autopsy indicated “intoxication from the powerful opioid fentanyl, as well as recent methamphetamine use”<sup>1</sup> (though Floyd was behind the steering wheel of a car). While that was not the cause of death, it may have contributed to why he resisted arrest; would Floyd still be alive if he had simply sat in the police car? It may well be that at least one Officer had a history of complaints irrespective of race<sup>2</sup> but he was not the only Officer on Floyd. The Officers were on Floyd as the culmination of prior events. Whether it is a case of involuntary manslaughter, or murder as alleged, possibly will be determined in court.

It is amazing how quickly it has been politicised without any investigation into the incident. Inevitably, the matter has been used to attack the incumbent President, and fortuitously for the Left in an election year. Interest groups may well have their fingers ready to tweet on anything and everything in line with their political agenda, but to have got such a response is indicative that there was some other underlying factor. To the Left this matter is something called racism, yet the Police group involved was multiracial. Perhaps if we were American ‘snowflakes’ and there were well known institutional problems with the Police in Minneapolis we might be tempted to give the benefit of the doubt to rioting blacks there, but it is difficult to justify it going beyond that and there. It went from being about a specific incident of alleged police brutality to being about something else because that something else already existed. We should consider whether the general underlying cause is economic, and whether the actions of the Police Officers was just the catalyst. By perceiving it in terms of racism we might overlook the actual cause, and the actual beneficiaries<sup>3</sup>.

It is undeniable that black Americans have been disproportionately affected economically by the lockdown. Yet our media showed that the protests against the lockdown in the US were seemingly exclusively the preserve of whites and right-wing groups<sup>4</sup> and not by the racial group most affected. Why were Black Lives Matter and Antifa and the Democrats not protesting/rioting against the lockdown? Of course, as we know for the Left it is the death of one which is the tragedy. The mystery of why the Left were silent when black lives were clearly being affected must be given some thought. The knee of a white Police Officer has led to outrage, yet the knees of the climate change internationalists pressing down on the necks of millions of black Americans has been ignored. President Trump has spoken out against the World Health Organisation, and consideration needs to be given to the current situation as the culmination of prior events.

---

<sup>1</sup> George Floyd's autopsy revealed he was infected with COVID-19 [Express 5 June 2020](#)

<sup>2</sup> A criminology professor says that police officers accused of brutality often have a history of complaints. Derek Chauvin had 18 [Business Insider 1 June 2020](#).

<sup>3</sup> Mitchell Feierstein *Don't get race-baited about the US riots: It's about the economy, stupid!* [RT 3 June 2020](#)

<sup>4</sup> For example: African Americans bear the brunt of Covid-19's economic impact, and, Who is driving the US protests against coronavirus lockdown? – video explainer [The Guardian 28 April 2020](#) ; Coronavirus lockdown protest: What's behind the US demonstrations? [BBC 21 April 2020](#)

Black Lives Matter is the group now synonymous with the riots and protests. Black Lives Matter seems rather inaccurately named as its interest is black deaths that politically matter. A black retired police officer was killed by rioters in St Louis yet Black Lives Matter has not taken to the streets to protest about that. At the time of writing it is not clear whether those killed in the rioting are disproportionately black. Black Americans may choose to organise themselves how they please, and they will be the judge of how effective Black Lives Matter is in obtaining greater resources for their ethnic group; though if the lack of response to the lockdown is anything to go by then black Americans are likely to be disappointed.

It is also amazing how the Left now accepts that economic issues are determined by race rather than by class; Marxism is no longer fashionable, though it never has been amongst the intelligent. There cannot be racism without race, and the class struggle now becomes a race struggle. Whites apparently possess some innate – is it genetic? – characteristic called ‘privilege’ that marks them out as different from other races and allows them to acquire most of the wealth. Of course, there are non-left-wingers who endorse this theory, and have done for some time, though they phrase it slightly differently.

What is not questioned is how the races come to be together, and so engaged in this struggle. Also, what is not questioned is the political concept of equality. But would-be revolutionaries never address the causes of the status quo rather they merely seek to benefit from them.

If the issue in the USA is about ‘race’ – invariably what is meant are census definitions, self-identification and people’s perception of the other - and one ‘race’ holding an economic predominance then in a liberal democracy created by white privilege and committed to the doctrines of a few dead white males it might be considered legitimate to challenge that position. Can a ‘fairer’ – whatever that means – society be devised? Back in 1897 the American civil rights activist W.E.B Du Bois suggested that “a satisfactory adjustment of economic life” along with “substantial agreement in laws, language and religion” might be how different separate races could live together in the same country<sup>5</sup>. If that is not possible for whatever reason then it is must be equally legitimate to suggest as the solution that the USA should no longer continue as a multiracial state and instead break up into separate racially homogenous states. One suspects the privileged whites of Antifa and the Democrats would prefer not to consider that option. Alternatively, changing demographics may resolve the current matter, a new ‘race’, the Hispanics or the Asians, would become the privileged ‘race’.

However, that is not the issue beyond the USA. Much as the Left would like to believe, and however subservient we are to the American Empire, we and the whole world are not living in one big unhappy USA. As the decadent West drivels on about whiteness and inequality China becomes the number one economic and military power. We know how China deals with ‘ethnic minorities’ such as the Tibetans and the Uighurs; do Hong Kongese lives matter? In the USA and its satellite states rioters loot and burn, protesters topple or desecrate statues; meanwhile China advances ever forward.

American politics are being mistranslated into a different context. An incident in the USA, of no more relevance to the British than the actions of the Police in any other country in the world, has been made a political weapon in the politics of the USA and is now also being used as a political weapon against the British nation. And few dare speak out against it in today’s ‘fear society’. Obviously, we cannot expect ‘our’ media and ‘our’ appeasement-prone politicians to say anything, but how are we even in such a situation where this sentence could begin with the word obviously without fear of contradiction?

---

<sup>5</sup> W.E.B Du Bois *The Conservation of the Races*, The American Negro Academy. Occasional Papers No. 2 (1897)

In true Cultural Revolution style we are instead expected to speak out in an ideologically correct manner<sup>6</sup>. After all, if you remain silent is that not proof of thoughtcrime? Then you are the same as Derek Chauvin - a man so racist that he married outside his own race, just as George Floyd's girlfriend was of another race. However, whites joining in the protests, particularly where whites do not have a government that acts in their interest, might be considered a good technique for pacification as it may diffuse the perception of racial blocs in opposition to each other and it may reduce the possibility of blacks realising Schmitt's 'friend-enemy' distinction and becoming a genuine political entity, but it may be too late.

But why does an incident in the USA mean that British people in the UK must now speak up, why are we being manipulated and to whose benefit? Can anyone recall Lewis Hamilton being particularly voluble about the death of Lee Rigby or the rape of our women in Rotherham and other towns across the country? But equally can anyone remember any of Hamilton's white colleagues in Formula One speaking out? But why should they have, the cry will go up, those referred to were not victims of American 'systemic racism'. It is political correctness which determines which perpetrators to condemn and which to pretend do not exist, it is political correctness which determines whose lives matters and whose do not. A suggestion why Hamilton's white colleagues in Formula One did not riot after the death of Lee Rigby might be that they, their families and friends and their race were not disproportionately affected by economic recession/depression as black Americans are, a position no doubt exacerbated for black Americans by the recent lockdown. Another suggestion might be a lack of 'whiteness' – but then without this 'whiteness' how could there be 'white privilege'?

The political exploitation of George Floyd's death has seen a re-interest in a number of what are described by *The Guardian* as "anti-racist" books<sup>7</sup>. Notably this includes a contribution from the UK of one of the most duplicitous books of recent times, *Why I'm No Longer Talking To White People About Race* by Reni Eddo-Lodge<sup>8</sup>, with the author now receiving the distinction of being the "first black author to top [the] paperback non-fiction charts"<sup>9</sup>.

While on the face of it simply part of a trend of 'colonial literature' in which migrants complain about how racist the natives are, the book reveals an ideologue's mindset who uses the experiences of black Americans and the language of the Left to camouflage colonial aggression here in the British Isles.

The premise of the book is that 'whites', in this case the British, do not understand Reni Eddo-Lodge's experience, and the experience of those like her, that they display an "emotional disconnect" when "a person of colour articulates their experience" (p ix). Curiously, she does not display emotional interest in the experience of the British. While she is referring to the British she does not refer to them as such but rather she refers to 'whites'. She only talks of race not nationality. "Why don't white people think they have a racial identity?" (p116) she asks - a question some on the Right have often asked. Clearly, we have a racial identity, but nations of each race are not identical to other nations of that race; it would be foolish to regard the British nation as atypical of the white race. We have to question her use of a racial description for us rather than our national one. It could be that she is a racist, but it is probably due to her thinking in the language of the American Left; she is mapping onto Britain what pertains to the USA. She even admits that "the US struggle against racism is globalised into the story of the struggle against racism that we should look to for inspiration" (p54-55).

---

<sup>6</sup> For example: Natalie Morris *White people – this is why it's vital you speak out against racism, even if you're scared* [Metro 1 June 2020](#)

<sup>7</sup> Anti-racist book sales surge in US and Britain after George Floyd killing [The Guardian 3 June 2020](#)

<sup>8</sup> Reni Eddo-Lodge *Why I'm No Longer Talking To White People About Race* expanded edition, Bloomsbury Publishing (2018), first published 2017

<sup>9</sup> 'I can't help but be dismayed': Reni Eddo-Lodge becomes first black author to top paperback non-fiction charts [The Independent 11 June 2020](#)

She chooses not to state her identity here, and does not have to as she is after all attacking not defending. In another essay she states she is a “third generation Nigerian immigrant” with “an incredibly strong sense of heritage”<sup>10</sup>. She moans that her “blackness has been politicised against my will” (p81) but has no problem politicising ‘whiteness’, indeed has no problem believing there is ‘whiteness’ and ‘blackness’. Why not then drop the racial terms? Inua Ellams, writing in the same book of essays notes “it is insulting, reductive, counter-productive, lazy, disingenuous and deeply, deeply, deeply, problematic to attach a single label - one of Western invention as a shield against racism, one as porous a description of skin pigmentation, as ‘black’ - to a group of people so vastly varied and numerous”<sup>11</sup>. Without the error about “a shield against racism” this is something with which we can all agree. We should not talk about blacks we should refer to them according to their nationality when known; equally we should not refer to whites but refer to them according to their nationality when known. On that basis when Black Lives Matters operates outside of the USA the ‘Black’ label should be challenged and they should be asked what nationality are they representing.

Predictably the slave trade looms large (p2-6). In reality it only affected a small proportion of people from countries in Africa, and yet she gives it a prominence as if it were a universal experience for everyone who is from the black nations in Africa. Do those nations regard it as the experience which defines them - why would they? They might decry European imperialism and the evils it brought to Africa – which as that is republicanism, democracy and liberalism they have every right to be angry about – but they are more likely to define themselves by the ancestors of those present rather than those absent. The slave trade is not a universal experience for all black peoples, it is the experience of those who were enslaved and who went on to become Americans and Brazilians and Haitians etc. So in contributing to this ‘black history’ narrative she sustains a false narrative for black people; the slave trade is not the historical experience of all the “vastly varied and numerous” black peoples. And, of course, it is not a narrative for the peoples of the Indian sub-continent, who do though equally have the right to denounce British imperialism for those evils of republicanism, democracy and liberalism which subjugate the sub-continent.

And by suggesting that historical slavery is in itself indicative of the character of the unrepentant British she immediately runs into a problem, a problem that does not fit into her ideological construct so she chooses to ignore it. And that is modern slavery, which still flourishes in places like Nigeria for example<sup>12</sup>, with black slaves being trafficked into the UK<sup>13</sup>. Surely the black lives of these modern slaves matter? One would have thought what is happening now is of more relevance to those living now, because the present is something we can change unlike the past. But having accepted the ‘black history’ narrative without question Black Lives Matters chooses to topple statues and have streets renamed all of which were affecting no one rather than emancipate modern slaves and actually help black lives. And what of the whites who are spending British taxpayers’ money in trying to stop modern slavery<sup>14</sup> - or is this another example of racist white imperialists interfering in Africa?

And what is the British character? It is racist. Racism “is embedded in British society. It’s in the very core of how the state is set up.” (p56). And it is not just racists who are racists – so based on her viewpoint all those left-wing whites joining in with Black Lives Matter are racists, and who knows on that point she might be correct – because it is “structural” (p63-64). She is at pains to deny racism as an objective, “Racism does not go both ways” (p98) she instructs, because she has given racism a new meaning as “prejudice plus power” (p89); but that does

---

<sup>10</sup> Reni Eddo-Lodge *Forming Blackness Through a Screen* p78 in Nikesh Shukla ed. *The Good Immigrant* Unbound (2016).

<sup>11</sup> Inua Ellams *Cutting Through (On Black Barbershops and Masculinity)* p143 in Nikesh Shukla ed. *The Good Immigrant* Unbound (2016).

<sup>12</sup> 9 Facts on Modern Slavery in Nigeria [The Globalist 19 February 2015](#); [Global Slavery Index](#)

<sup>13</sup> The All-Party Parliamentary Group *Human Trafficking Between Nigeria and the UK: Addressing a shared challenge* [Chatham House 2019](#)

<sup>14</sup> UK aid to stop modern slavery in Nigeria [Department for International Development](#)

not mean powerless Britons are not racist because “Everyone is complicit” (p91). She derides the notion of the white working class (p201- 204), ignoring that before mass immigration they did not used to be called the white working class, just the working class (or the lower orders).

The unifying explanation for British racism is something called ‘whiteness’ which manifests itself as ‘white privilege’ – this is the ideological language of the USA that she is importing – and that is why all the British are racists, always have been and always will be, because they are white. But our skin colour is more than skin deep: “Whiteness is a political position” and “It is an occupying force in the mind. It is a political ideology that is concerned with maintaining power through domination and exclusion” (p170). And it gets everywhere: “we”, or Eddo-Lodge at least “consider humanity through the prism of whiteness”, “Whiteness positions itself as the norm” (p169), “to be white is universal” (p xvii) - would she be making the same claims if she had been born and brought up in India or China one wonders. Eddo-Lodge seemingly has no consciousness that her obsession might be due to her location and current situation.

She claims that for “white people” - the British - it is “never rare or odd to see people who look like them in positions of power or exerting authority” (p xvii); but surely it should be odd to see people who do not look like you in such positions in your own country? As indeed is the case now. By structures she means the structures that join the British nation together: schools, universities, workplaces, parliament. We would expect them to be biased towards the British otherwise that would mean they were dysfunctional and did not serve the British nation. And that is exactly what she wants, for them not to benefit the British. She promotes quotas (p73 - 79) as one strategy, and for the British to oppose “positive discrimination” of course “means inadvertently revealing” (p79) bias for their fellow Britons. Such natural favouritism for our own is also “white privilege”. The British would have that privilege if they were in possession of their own national state, it would mean they would have the right to every school place, every job place, every sports place, every political place, etc. But that privilege has been denied to them by the ruling elite and has been eroded by mass immigration; Eddo-Lodge does not acknowledge this because it is not in her interest as a colonist to do so. Instead she claims that “White privilege is one of the reasons why I stopped talking to white people about race” (p87) because it forces white people - the British - “to confront their own complicity in its continuing existence”. She holds consistently to the idea of all the British, even the powerless, being guilty of attempting to act in their own interest, even when they are not actually in a political position to do so. Redolent of Maoist self-criticism she hints that “We could all do with examining how the system unfairly benefits us personally”, though not of course the system of international capitalism because it is to that system that she owes her current situation. By talking about “white privilege” rather than British privilege Eddo-Lodge deliberately seeks to obscure and try and make the British feel guilty of possessing something racial when in reality they have lost something national as evidenced by the presence of colonists in our schools, our universities, our sports, our media, our politics – indeed can we even still use the word our? If there were ‘white privilege’ why then does the ‘white’ elite not operate in the interests of the British people? Colonisation is not in the interests of the British nation, yet the ‘white’ elite still encourage it. The concept of whites, whiteness and white privilege rejects the reality of elites, and replaces it with antagonistic racial blocs.

But Eddo-Lodge wants to go further. She wants to “deconstruct” and “reconstruct”, to destroy the structures of the British nation in other words. She does not want to be “assimilated”, and mockingly taunts that “Equality is fine as a transitional demand” (p184-185). She talks of change and the need to proclaim “that black is British, that brown is British” (p223) - she had asked us to accept that we have a racial identity but this phrase deliberately seeks to negate the racial identity of the British; it is telling then that when she does use the term British it is not to refer to the British but to replace them.

The question is alluded to as part of an interview in the book but she does not answer: does Eddo-Lodge believe that Nigerians should surrender their privileged position in Nigeria to say the Chinese? The Chinese position in Nigeria is of some consideration for Nigerians<sup>15</sup>. Equally, one might ask, what about recent Chinese treatment of Nigerians within China<sup>16</sup>: why is Eddo-Lodge not denouncing ‘yellowness’ and ‘yellow privilege’, and why are Black Lives Matter not pulling down statues in China? There have been protests in China<sup>17</sup>, but we do not hear from Eddo-Lodge and Black Lives Matter on these things not just because of an adherence to the construct of ‘whiteness’ and ‘white privilege’ but because they themselves are in the UK and not China.

Eddo-Lodge notes the “White resentment” (p23) against incoming peoples but does not ask why, not just because of her “emotional disconnect” from the experience of the British, but because she holds to a ready-made ideological construct of racism and so does not need to ask, it is all because of “Britain’s racism problem” (p26); it is the British who are to blame, just as no doubt from the Israeli perspective it is the Palestinians who are to blame. But the fact that she claims that “For a long time now, far-right political groups have hijacked the anti-colonial struggles of native people in America and Australia to create a story of the embattled indigenous white British, under siege from immigration” (p120) is indicative that she has some consciousness of the colonisation issue but simply refuses to talk to white people about it, because it is not in her interest to do so. Note how she uses the work “hijacked” to try and delegitimise the discussion. She refers to “the struggles of black and brown people who were colonised, raped and beaten by white British people to preserve white British culture” (p121) but the experience of British women in Rotherham and elsewhere is marginalised with a swipe at the “far right” (p175), though she, surprisingly, acknowledges “There is a race aspect to these incidents that can’t be ignored” (p176), but then unsurprisingly retreats to the language of the Left and claims it is to do with patriarchy and class (p179-180). She closes her eyes and ears to female British victims of immigration because their experience does not accord with her own interests and ideology.

Eddo-Lodge ignores her own settler colonialism, page after page after page. Her rejection of assimilation (“I don’t want to be included ... I don’t want to be assimilated into the status quo” p184) defines her as a colonist rather than as an immigrant. Her anti-racism argument deliberately obscures her colonialism; to use a phrase from a Canadian study, “It posits people of color as innocent”<sup>18</sup>. As Lorenzo Veracini notes in his insightful study *The Settler Colonial Present* “The ‘settler question’ is now seen shaping political confrontation in locales and experiences where it had not been detected before”<sup>19</sup>. The only objective value that can be accorded to *Why I’m No Longer Talking To White People About Race* is it allows students of settler colonialism to observe that discipline in the flesh: the attack on the sovereignty of the native people (“white privilege”), the origin story based on the colony not the homelands (“the black British story”, “Black History”), and the call for a replacement sovereignty (“We need to let it be known that black is British, that brown is British, and that we are not going away”). Alas, we live in a country where Eddo-Lodge tops the non-fiction charts and Veracini is known only to a handful of academics; whether or not you read Eddo-Lodge’s book is an irrelevancy, however if you have not read Veracini’s book you are literally ignorant.

So when Eddo-Lodge asks “Why am I saying one thing, and white people are hearing something completely different” (p215), the answer is quite simple: she is speaking as a colonist but not using the words of a colonist, while the “white people”, the British whose

---

<sup>15</sup> A current essay is Omolade Adunbi and Howard Stein *The Political Economy of China’s Investment in Nigeria: Prometheus or Leviathan?* [Oxford Scholarship Online 2019](#) from Arkebe Oqubay and Justin Yifu Lin eds. *China-Africa and an Economic Transformation* Oxford University Press (2019)

<sup>16</sup> For example: The maltreatment of Nigerians in China isn’t likely to end anytime soon [Quartz Africa 31 May 2020](#)

<sup>17</sup> Nigerian nationals, police in rare stand-off in China [South China Morning Post YouTube 16 July 2019](#)

<sup>18</sup> Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua *Decolonizing Anti-Racism Social Justice* Vol 32, No 4 (2005) p132

<sup>19</sup> Lorenzo Veracini *The Settler Colonial Present* Palgrave MacMillan (2015), p54



country is being colonised, are hearing the words but not the speaker. The reason then Eddo-Lodge has given up talking to “white people” about race is because the language of her polemic does not accord with what she is actually arguing about which is the experience of a colonist being thwarted by the natives. This then makes it a self-fulfilling maxim that “white people”, the British, cannot understand what she is experiencing - because “white people”, the British, think she is talking about racism and equality, concepts they can understand, when what she is actually talking about is her subjective experience as a colonial settler which is something of which the overwhelming majority of Britons will have no comparable experience.

If she had been honest she would have dispensed with the left-wing verbiage and the repetition of slogans and simply stated that she seeks greater access to the British economy for those of her nationality and for those from other similar nations, and recognised the detriment to the British nation. Detriment, for how could it ever be in the interests of the British nation to relinquish their economy and politics to other nations? Why the intrusion into our national state? She refers to the non-sequitur claim made by Ambalavaner Sivanandan that “ ‘we are here because you were there’ ” (p9). The British justified their colonialism in Africa and India in terms of civilization, while in contrast Eddo-Lodge justifies the colonisation of the British Isles in terms of a global struggle against ‘whiteness’.

While the British could decide to start talking about race if that would make Eddo-Lodge happy, it would be a fruitless diversion. What the British should be talking about is elitism, colonisation, nationalism, and politics. Why do we tolerate rule by an elite which does not act in the interest of the British nation? Eddo-Lodge is not talking to white people about that because she is a beneficiary of the anti-British elite. It is vital that the British end their silence and speak out against colonisation. That does not mean racism, though the colonist who loses their privileged position will claim so and for that reason Eddo-Lodge is unlikely to be talking to white people about it. In discussing nationalism, which Eddo-Lodge is not, it would be racist if we only thought in terms of our own nation, and racially similar nations. All nations, whatever their race, should feel confident and proud to express their identity in terms of blood and spirit rather than meaningless generalised colours or geographical continental designations. If ‘people of colour’ wish to rid themselves of ‘whiteness’ then they should begin by overthrowing what ‘whiteness’ actually means politically: the slave chains of internationalism, egalitarianism, homosexuality and feminism that has been imposed on them by the ‘white’ elites and enforced locally by ‘black’ elites; and let them instead return to the natural order of patriarchy, hierarchy and authoritarianism, just as we should. One can guess that is something else Eddo-Lodge will not be talking to white people about, or, as she is an agent of globalisation, black people either.

Black people are talking to white people about race because they want access to economic benefits. The idea that it is simply all about anti-racism and justice is ludicrous, as those things do not put bread on the table; rioters cannot live by looting alone. Eddo-Lodge is aware of this but seeks to divert by making a generalisation that those who make the claim are saying that blacks are “unfairly vying” for them when that is not the case at all, that it is all a “fear of a black planet” and a “fear of loss” (p129), rather than a recognition of reality. One suspects that for Eddo-Lodge there is no such thing as reality, only a ‘white’ reality and a ‘black’ reality.

But in the UK recession<sup>20</sup>, whether that be due to the elite’s incompetence or competition from other countries, and greater automation eliminating many lower paid jobs<sup>21</sup>, or any combination there of, plus an increasing immigrant population equals greater struggle for the existing wealth. Everyone other than mainstream politicians and the ideologues of the Left understand this. Eddo-Lodge notes the unemployment rates for “black and minority ethnic people” (p193) but does not propose migration as a solution, again emphasising that her

---

<sup>20</sup> Bank of England warns of sharpest recession on record [BBC 7 May 2020](#)

<sup>21</sup> Which occupations are at highest risk of being automated? [Office of National Statistics 25 March 2019](#)

primary motivation is colonisation. She offers no proposals for increasing wealth in the UK. Likewise, Black Lives Matter have no proposals for increasing wealth in the USA or in the UK or indeed anywhere.

In the USA the context is different. The USA composes of some nations - Hawaiians and the various Red Indians, if you are a neo-confederate you would add Southerners; and part of a nation, northern Mexico; but it is otherwise made up of various different ethnic groups. They have not merged into one nation, but they are still in one state. It seems Americans are now more than ever defined by an 'ethnic' prefix of some sort or another. That does not in itself mean that the USA is falling apart, unless that prefix becomes more important than the American part. There are racists in the USA, but the idea that the USA's main problem is 'systemic racism' ignores what holds the state together and keeps the USA going as an entity. The USA faces economic problems and imperial challenges, and if it cannot address them, then as Du Bois noted, "the friction between different groups of people" might indeed mean it is "manifest" that they "cannot live in the same territory without fatal collision"<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>22</sup> W.E.B Du Bois *The Conservation of the Races*, The American Negro Academy. Occasional Papers No. 2 (1897)

The following article is dedicated to the memory of Allan Robertson, Chairman of the London Swinton Circle, who approved the original draft

## The Great Replacement

By Arthur St Hugh

“Whether we approve or condemn what is called the *direct and revolutionary method*, it is clear that is not about to disappear”  
Georges Sorel *Reflections on Violence*

Brenton Tarrant has been sentenced to imprisonment for life without the possibility of parole. This is the first time such a sentence has been imposed in New Zealand, indicative that it was recognised to be a political act of murder, not just an ordinary case of murder. To emphasise this Tarrant has been branded as a terrorist and an extremist; as this is accepted by everyone his actions should therefore be considered as political.

However, that then raises the questions was Tarrant engaging in ‘propaganda by the deed’ and what weight should be given to his manifesto? While for rather obvious reasons Tarrant’s manifesto will be unpalatable to many, his maxims, however crude, could be regarded as revolutionary politics even if one disagrees with them or with the idea that they are. It makes one wonder if he been able to expound his views as an ideologue rather than a killer how he would have fared. Still, the pen is only mightier than the sword if people read what is written by the pen, and what better advertisement is there for the pen then action by the sword?

In his manifesto “The Great Replacement”, subtitled “Towards a new society we march ever forward”, Brenton Tarrant describes what brought him to his current position: the recognition of the plight of our race due to the disastrous effects of mass immigration, the continuing Muslim terrorist attacks in Europe, and the rapes in cities in Britain and elsewhere to which governments made little response. In particular, it was the experience of visiting a France which is no longer French. This is something with which many will sympathise, perhaps even experience his rage, though whether they express it politically is another matter.

He states he acted in “revenge”, and as an incitement, so that it will generate an “inevitable backlash” against the immigrants, and also to create a divide between the natives and “the invaders currently occupying European soil”. He wanted a reaction, to light “a path forward for those that wish to follow”; except that did not happen, instead New Zealand examined its gun laws. This part of the manifesto seems silly as it does not reflect how people act, though it may reflect how he thinks they should act.

Strangely, the person he said he most identified with was Sir Oswald Mosley, hardly a person one thinks of when one thinks of revolutionary terrorist action. Stranger still, the person who he regards as having radicalised him is the American Candace Owens, a black Republican who is married to the son of a former treasurer for the Conservative Party; *Tatler* described them as “the most controversial couple in politics”<sup>1</sup>. It has been suggested that Tarrant was engaging here in “misdirection”<sup>2</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Tatler* [Courting Controversy: Tatler meets George Farmer and Candace Owens](#)

<sup>2</sup> Robert Evans on [bellingcat.com](#) [Shitposting, Inspirational Terrorism, and the Christchurch Mosque Massacre](#)

He asks the question we all ask: “what has modern conservatism managed to conserve?”. As it does not conserve then for him it is dead. As an “eco-fascist” he prefers instead “Green nationalism”. Conservatism is dead because there are no practitioners of it in politics, only duplicitous wage-seekers who offer to play the part in the theatre of democracy. There can be no real conservatives when democratic politics is merely a staged show.

Tarrant chose not the conventional political path; perhaps despair at the failure of western democracy was so great that it could only be resolved by personal action. “Why won’t somebody do something?” turned into “Why don’t I do something?” This is something that governments should note. Despair that nothing is being done led to despondency, but then rather than depression and docility as is perhaps more usual with citizens in western democracy it led to violence.

But why murder immigrants when for every one that is killed the politicians will bring in hundreds more? He contends “there is no democratic solution” but then surely the solution becomes the removal of that which prevents the solution, which is to replace the current political structure with something that is better suited for the interests of all our nations. To escape the replacement of our nation, and of our race, clearly then it is those responsible, the politicians, who need to be replaced. He insists on force rather than the “delusion” of democracy, but it is not possible for an individual, or even several like-minded individuals to drive away the “invaders” from our countries while the government opposes such action; only by driving the current governments away will access be gained to the force that will permit a peaceful solution to the problem.

A “violent, revolutionary solution is the only possible solution to our current crisis” may or may not be true, but it could only ever be true if conducted against a government. Unless utterances and actions are directed against those responsible then it cannot fully be revolutionary politics, or even terrorism. He openly calls for the murder of “High Profile Enemies”, (he names Angela Merkel, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, Sadiq Khan) but he himself chose not to do so. Tarrant’s actions could he said to be analogous to that of nineteenth century anarchists. They killed, or conspired to kill, but ultimately they did not change anything; they could not bring about a revolution as they wanted and it was only with the formation of structured revolutionary groups was it possible for aims to be channelled and fulfilled.

Tarrant’s manifesto raises a question that all must consider, however reluctantly. If governments under western democracy will not act in the interests of the nation, if change cannot be achieved by democratic means, as our people become more and more disinherited and disenfranchised, does revolutionary violence become the necessary answer?

## Lockdown Lunacy

Covid-19 is a novel coronavirus, it is a new form of coronavirus. It is infectious and people die from it. It is a medical condition and one would have expected it to have been treated as such – except it was not.

Because Covid-19 has been treated as a political matter rather than as a medical matter it has become a political matter. And like all political matters that means in simplistic terms a divide into two camps, which people rush to label as right and left. As seems normal nowadays it has also attracted various conspiracy theories, such as that it was created in a laboratory, or that it does not even exist. But it must be emphasised that the use of right and left is not accurate. It is notable that the foremost lockdown rebel has been Piers Corbyn rather than a leader of a 'right-wing' party.

Inflaming matters in the UK has been the inconsistent messages and all-round incompetence from the government. A 'project fear' was endorsed to get people to comply, but the fact that was necessary highlights that the government was not capable of organising a medical response; but it is this 'project fear' which is the main cause of the political division. There are those who seemingly believe everyone is going to die unless more and more repressive measures are taken, while the other camp view existing measures as repressive enough and not applicable to the medical situation. Because the government chose not to tell the truth at the beginning it created the situation we are in. And that situation is an economic crisis rather than a medical crisis. And if the government chose not to tell the truth then we cannot be surprised that the media, almost exclusively left-wing in this country, promoted fully and unquestionably the government's fearmongering. This bred panic, exemplified by the irrational stockpiling of toilet paper something which you would not normally do if you thought you and your relatives were going to get the flu.

The government's and the media's action have effectively bred a 'social contagion' alongside the actual contagion. The hysteria and anxiety which has broken out amongst some social groups could be attributed to this social contagion rather than an over-reaction to the actual contagion. Likewise, it can be suggested that much of the reaction against lockdown is more likely a reaction against this social contagion rather than a denial of the actual contagion. Different social groups accept, promote or reject the social contagion in different ways, which is why there is no unanimity and also why a political 'left' or 'right' divide does not provide an accurate description. The obvious comparator is climate change which is now a well-entrenched social contagion, infecting some and robustly rejected by others.

If the government's failure to act in a decisive and authoritative way has been largely responsible for spreading the social contagion, the incubation can be traced to the decision(s) to treat Covid-19 as a political rather than medical matter. The cause of this problem can be attributed to the globalisation of decision making, but not exclusively. The Swedish government, for example, is as left wing as the Conservative Party yet they chose to take an alternative approach. For some strange reason the Conservative Party decided to take the advice of Professor Neil Ferguson and his flawed modelling. Ferguson had a known history of false predictions: foot-and-mouth disease, mad cow disease, bird flu, swine flu – Ferguson consistently made incorrect predictions about them all. Elon Musk tweeted "This guy has caused massive strife to the world with his absurdly fake 'science' ".

Musk also referred to Ferguson as a "tool" and certainly Ferguson's connection with the World Health Organisation (WHO) needs to be considered. However, Ferguson is not the only individual connected to the WHO, indeed it is fully supported and funded with taxpayers' money by the Conservative Party. While allegations have been made about its Director-General Tedros Adhanom and his relations with China, the issue is why Britain has anything to do with this organisation irrespective of which foreign power controls it. The underlying

principle of Brexit is national sovereignty, but Brexit is also a recognition that decision making under international organisations is simply bad for our country. That principle applies here as well; we need a Brexit from the WHO. We should never have suffered the lockdown that we have, yet if we remain under the WHO as Boris Johnson wants we risk repeated lockdowns every time someone in China sneezes.

Professor Mark Woolhouse OBE summed it up perfectly when he stated that “Lockdown was a panic measure and I believe history will say trying to control Covid-19 through lockdown was a monumental mistake on a global scale, the cure was worse than the disease.” – panic, mistake, global, three words which explain our current political leadership.

The problem, and it is a long standing problem in our country, is that the Westminster elites passively accept rather than challenge global decision making. Separation from the EU was forced upon the elite by the public, it was not something of their own making. The responsibility for our current madness resides with the government. The lockdown was a deliberate political policy decision, just like any other political policy decision. The government may well have relied on advisers with inflated forecasts of apocalypse, the government undoubtedly paid too much attention to the ‘international community’, but it was the government that made, or at least implemented, the lockdown decision, and it is the government that has held to that decision without re-consideration even though it is well aware of the economic damage it has caused. We can discuss their motives and we can speculate why they acted as they did all we like, but what we must all do is hold the Conservative Party to account for what it has done.