

---

## On the Rise of Mixed-Race Britain

### Description

By ANDREW JOYCE

welfare found or type unknown

“The intermarriage of nations gradually extinguishes the characters, and is, despite any pretended philanthropy, not beneficial to mankind.”  
Immanuel Kant

The recent engagement of Britain’s Prince Harry to a mixed-race actress of Black and Jewish origins has delivered something of a propaganda coup to the promoters of miscegenation. It’s been [hailed](#) as a “great day for interracial relationships and mixed race girls everywhere.” It’s been [claimed](#) that it will “change Britain’s relationship with race forever.” The New York Times has even [suggested](#) it will “save the monarchy.”

While hyperbole saturates each one of these statements, they all betray the truism that, in a ‘celebrity culture,’ such events can spark ill-informed attempts at imitation among the dedicated and dim-witted followers of fashion.

The excitement over the racial status of Meghan Markle is all very reminiscent of similar propaganda in the wake of London’s 2012 Olympic Games, when a number of mixed-race athletes, [Jessica Ennis](#) in particular, were singled out and promoted as the ‘new face of Britain.’ According to a celebratory report published shortly after the Olympics by [British Future](#), a ‘think-tank’ [funded](#) by George Soros’s Open Society Foundation, Ennis and other mixed-race celebrities had “helped to change perceptions about interracial relationships.” This seemed to have been largely borne out by the 2011 census, which [revealed](#) “the mixed race population is the fastest growing in Britain with more than one million people born of interracial parentage.” British Future point out, probably with good justification, that this figure “is only half the story of the rapid growth of mixed Britain. Twice as many people have ethnically mixed parentage – but over half of them choose other census categories, such as black or white.” Ennis, in some senses the precursor to Markle as the darling of miscegenation propagandists, was chosen by British Future to grace the front page of its report, [The Melting Pot Generation: How Britain Became More Relaxed About Race](#), and opened it with the line: “Jessica Ennis was not just the face of the Olympics this summer; she could stake a fair claim to be ‘the face of the census’ too.”

---

One of those most concerning aspects of the report, if accurate, concerns the statement that “it is Britain, not America, which has the stronger claim to be a “melting pot” on race.” The rationale here is that those of mixed racial parentage tend not to marry or reproduce with American Whites — those of mixed race normally become absorbed into the minority ethnic group. By contrast, those of mixed race in Britain marry heavily into the White majority. We might therefore state that while America currently has the more pressing demographic concern in terms of the White share of the population, miscegenation may be considered a greater concern in Britain. The report explains:

“On no other country on earth is my story even possible,” said Barack Obama, a product of Kenya and Kansas, as he burst onto the US political scene in 2004. His is a great story, but he was wrong about that. Mixed marriages are more likely in Britain, where the dynamics of mixing are different too, and accelerate faster in Britain. That is because most Americans from mixed parentage marry somebody from a minority group, as Obama himself did. By contrast, three-quarters of Britons from mixed parentage marry somebody from the majority white group (it does contain over three-quarters of the population, after all)...10% of African Americans are in mixed marriages [with Whites]...compared to over 40% for British born black Caribbeans.

It is difficult to make a full assessment of the true scale of the problem because the Black population of Britain (including those described as “African/Caribbean/Black British”) is roughly 3% of the overall population of England and Wales. One might be tempted to conclude that, while the number of Black men marrying or reproducing with White women is very high, their relatively small percentage of the overall population means that the number of White women entering relationships with Black men is also relatively small. However, these relationships are almost exclusively forming at the lower end of the socio-economic scale, and often at the very bottom.

This is crucial because those at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder, rather than the middle classes, are a key driver of national fertility. The same phenomenon is of course also apparent in the United States, where author and demographic expert Jonathan Last observes in *What to Expect When No One’s Expecting*: “The bearing and raising of children has largely become the province of the lower classes. It’s a kind of reverse Darwinism where the traditional markers of success make one less likely to reproduce.” Similarly, with the rise of the welfare state and the contemporary squeeze on the middle class, anthropologist David Lawson of University College London has argued that “poorer households have relatively little to gain by limiting fertility.” The result, as one article in *The Economist* [put it](#), is that “mixed-race children are now about as common in Britain as in America—a country with many more non-whites and a longer history of mass immigration.”

Britain thus finds itself in a situation where White, middle class couples are numerically far superior to the number of mixed race couples, but this balance is radically offset in demographic terms by significant differences in fertility — the White couple have no children, or very few, and the mixed couple produce several children. In other possible scenarios, the Black father sires a number of children with several low-status, low-IQ White women. It is very likely that this is the dynamic driving the increase in mixed-race children in Britain. Indeed, the Runnymede Trust [argues](#) that at least “61% of mixed race children are being raised in single mother households. ... African Caribbean fathers are twice as likely as white fathers to live apart from their children.” Black men are also the demographic least likely to enter into marriage, which accounts well for the fact that despite the rising number of

---

mixed-race births, “interethnic marriages [account](#) for only 2% of all marriages in England and Wales. ... Caribbeans have very low partner rates by comparison with other ethnic groups.” The overwhelming tendency then is for very short-term, low-commitment, sexual relationships between Black males and White females, resulting in high numbers of mixed-race children being raised in low-income single mother households. This is of course just one of the dark aspects of miscegenation that is left out of the panegyrics of its promoters.

The nature of Britain’s social housing arrangements, combined with a lower-class “TV culture” in which celebrity interracial relationships are incessantly portrayed as fashionable, exciting, and successful, make the lowest socio-economic strata of the White population particularly prone to entering into mixed relationships. The Economist [reported](#) in 2014 that “mixed black-African and white children are particularly common in working-class suburbs and commuter towns such as Croydon and Southend-on-Sea, possibly because black Africans are rarely tied to city centres through social-housing tenancies.” Further suggesting that housing and immediate cultural factors are important in the behavior of lower-class White women, it is interesting to note that Black men have also reproduced to a significant degree with White immigrants from continental Europe. The Economist notes that “most of the 21,000 children born to Polish mothers in 2012 had Polish fathers; but of the rest, 23% had African or Asian fathers.” Remarkably then, almost one in four “Polish” births in Britain involve a Black or Indian/Pakistani father.

These are of course far more likely to be Black fathers given that ‘British Asians,’ the term used mainly for Muslims from the Indian subcontinent, are the population most reluctant to engage in the production of mixed-race children, the main reasons being, in the politically correct terminology of [British Future](#), “parental resistance to mixing, influencing marriage choices across either faith or ethnic boundaries; or more limited contact between some minority groups and others.” For this explanation one may simply substitute “Islamic cultural practices.” Another study [found](#) that “British Asians are five times less likely to marry outside their race than their white population.” Interestingly, British Jews also demonstrate a relatively low rate of intermarriage, roughly [half](#) that seen among Jews in the United States. The future of Britain, should present trends continue, will therefore be that of a mixed-race population, punctuated, and perhaps dominated, by endogamous Muslim and Jewish communities.

It goes without saying that the grubby origins of the rise of mixed-race Britain do not feature in the growing number of panegyrics devoted to the biracial population. In 2011 the BBC had a “[mixed race season](#)” to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the category “mixed race” being added to the census. It included a three-part documentary titled [Mixed Britannia](#), praising the ‘tolerant values’ of the British and presenting an image of miscegenation stripped of its statistical realities. Joseph Harket, a journalist at the Guardian, [wrote](#) of a new “love of mixedness.” In the scientific sphere, dubious studies have promoted the idea that mixed-race individuals are seen as [more beautiful](#) and healthy, apparently ignoring existing research [indicating](#) that adolescents “who self-identify as more than one race are at higher health and behavior risks.” Suggestions that mixed-race individuals would be seen as healthier and more attractive because of the genetic process of heterosis, or hybrid vigor, (i.e. that cross-bred offspring have greater genetic fitness than pure-bred offspring), also seem to be flatly contradicted by [evidence](#) showing that, while mixed-race adolescents perform better than their purely Black counterparts, they have a lower birth weight, lower intelligence, and greater disposition to promiscuity than their White counterparts.

It would thus be extremely maladaptive for a White woman desiring healthy offspring of optimal

---

intelligence to reproduce with someone of African origin. In an age before Cultural Marxism took hold in academia, Herbert Spencer Jennings, the Harvard professor of experimental biology, was able to advocate the idea that the mixing of two different but genetically similar ethnic groups (e.g. the Celt and the Saxon) would produce very strong offspring, but the mixing of two very diverse groups would mean “a lowering of quality” — a distance theory of hybridity.[\[1\]](#)

Really there is only one way in which the mixed-race individual is ‘superior’ or best adapted, and that is entirely due to the cultural environment we currently find ourselves in. We happen to live in an age in which the development of ‘technological man’ is almost complete, by which I mean that we are racing headlong into an era in which man himself is viewed almost exclusively as technology, a tool, a resource. This is the age of the ‘human resources’ department, and the predisposition of individuals and governments to encounter human beings in a technocratic way. In today’s environment, the best ‘human resource’ is the man or woman most flexibly able to deal with shifts in the marketplace (able to cross borders and move where the jobs are), capable of existing among pluralities of cultures (loyal to none, and open to all), and content with changes in social norms. In ‘fluid’ environments, those orchestrating things, and profiting from them, require ‘fluid’ people. Ideas of nationhood, of rootedness to the land, of fixed sexual identity, of coherent ancestry, and future destiny, are all viewed as obstructions to the rush of ‘progress’ and globalized, usurious capital. The mixed-race individual ultimately possesses a plurality of origins and consequently a loyalty to none. He or she is the ultimate tabula rasa upon which may be written the fevered dreams of Cultural Marxism; the apex global citizen, and the final destination in the search for a ‘technological man.’ The first casualty, other than native birth-rates, will be individual White national identities. The Economist [opines](#) with the greatest of understatement, that “Englishness, which has remained distinctly a white identity for many, may become less exclusive.” The truth is that it will cease to exist in any manner commensurate with its historical form. Englishness, as a centuries-old sense of defined peoplehood, will have made its last entry in the annals of Man.

In this context, and at this crucial point in the history of the British, it is highly symbolic that Prince Harry should take a mixed-race woman as his bride. The Royal Family, along with the entirety of the British aristocracy, is a dying breed, now a mere parody of what it once was. Forced by modern capitalism to compete for resources rather than derive wealth from ancestral rights, many of the landed gentry have collapsed into [bankruptcy](#). Since 1900, 1,200 country houses once owned by Lords have been [demolished](#) in England. A significant proportion of those remaining are kept alive only via the renting of the property for weddings or other gatherings, with many listed on [dedicated websites](#).

The self-styled aristocrat is thus reduced to proffering his wares to the ‘commoner’ in order to maintain even the semblance of dignity and continued refinement. In much the same way, the Royal Family in recent decades, perhaps with the exception of the Queen herself, has taken to trading in its dignity in order to appear more user-friendly and accessible (again, we are in the age of ‘technological man’) to the masses. Part of this approach has been the intermingling of the Royals with the cause célèbres of the multicultural age, including but not limited to the [appearance](#) of Prince William on the cover of a gay magazine and an accompanying interview in which he issued the apparently obligatory statement that homosexuals and transsexuals are “truly brave.” Prince Charles has apparently shown an interest in having his coronation reflect “the religious diversity of the country that he will be ruling,” by having a multi-faith ceremony — leading The Spectator to [ask](#) if he will be “the first multicultural monarch.”

A nation overseen, even symbolically, by stagnant aristocracy is like a lion pride overseen by a

toothless, old, former alpha male. It has outlived its purpose. Aristocracy assumed its power through competition and violence, and grew stale in comfort and peace. If it can be said that the Alt Right is an elitist movement in the sense that it believes in inequality and the will to power, then it must be clarified that this does not necessitate an acceptance of those currently holding elite positions. In many cases these positions are unearned or sustained through corruption, and it should be an essential principle of our thinking that meritocracy is the only means by which we select our elites. Uniquely of course, we face a scenario in which our current leaders have “failed the pride” by essentially inviting rival factions to share in our resources and territory.

Young lions have risen up for less.

### Notes

[1] H.S. Jennings, *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* (1930), p.287. For a useful, if flawed, discussion see T. Teo, ‘[The historical problematization of ‘mixed race’ in psychological and human-scientific discourses](#)’ in A.S. Winston (ed.) *Defining difference: Race and racism in the history of psychology* (Washington, D.C., American Psychological Association, 2014), pp. 79–108.

(Republished from [The Occidental Observer](#) by permission of author or representative)