

CONTINENT OF LOSERS – PART II
IDEOLOGY, RELIGION AND IMMIGRATION – CHICKEN AND EGG
DILEMMA

Introduction: *Part I dealt with the concept of the youth bulge that is held responsible for global terror by a German scholar, Professor Gunnar Heinsohn. The youth bulge – surplus of disaffected young males – is responsible for most of the problems the world is facing now. The violent ideologies are created and attract supporters as a result of pressure by the frustrated youths and by policies – welfare, unrestricted birth rates and immigration among them - that created the surplus. Heinsohn is convinced that ideologies did not create terror and violence, that it was the other way around – violent reaction to frustration sought out, adopted and spread the ideologies.*

IDEOLOGY

In the 1500s small European countries, starting with Portugal and Spain, began conquering large parts of the world. There is a fallacious belief that this happened because of pressure by overpopulation. In fact, there was no overpopulation – Spain’s population was 9 million in 1350 and 3 million less – just 6 million - in 1493, when the conquests began.

There was, however, a sudden and drastic increase in the number of children per family. The birth rate rose from 2-3 per family to 6-7 after a 1484 Papal edict declared that birth control was punishable by death. As a result, the median age that was 28-30 in 1350 rose to 15 in 1493. Now there were too many boys in one family, there were no places for them and they became colonizers and conquerors.

95% of the conquistadores – they were known in Spanish as *secundones*, the second sons - were young. They probably believed that it was sinful to kill or mistreat the conquered populations, but were indoctrinated by religious authorities to believe that they were not murderers, but rather righteous warriors who had an obligation to eliminate the infidels and sinners, with a clear conscience and a mandate from a higher power.

Heinsohn calls these conquerors “Christianists” rather than Christians; an analog to the contemporary Islamists and Muslims.

He points out that young men need - and eagerly accept - an ideology that will excuse and absolve them:

“When the time is ripe, new religious pamphlets and books will be written. From your holy books — the Koran, the Bible, Mein Kampf, The Communist Manifesto etc. — you take what fits your purpose. You know that you are going to use violence but want a justification. For you are a righteous person. But when the youth bulge is spent, the books that were distributed in millions of copies cannot even be sold in second-hand bookshops. Everybody knows that they are full of rubbish.

“But while the movement is on, these young men are impervious to arguments. So the false ideas do not arise from Holy Scripture. They are generated by the young men themselves because they need wrong ideas to justify their actions. Consequently you cannot stop them by explaining that their ideas are wrong. The movements are not created by wrong ideas. On the contrary, the wrong ideas are created in response to the movement’s need. Islam does not create Islamism, young Muslims do.”

IMMIGRATION

Europe’s problem with immigration is twofold – the talented are leaving in droves while the third world countries do not have a population that is educationally advanced enough to replace the low birthrate and high emigration.

Germans, Dutch, French are emigrating in ever greater numbers. In Germany alone, over 150,000 leave yearly, most of them for the Anglo-Saxon world. Canada, Australia and New Zealand are ready to receive 1.5 million well-educated immigrants yearly, and they are doing everything to ease the way for them. Heinsohn is not surprised:

“It is no wonder that young, hard-working people in France and Germany choose to emigrate. It is not just that they have to support their own ageing population. If we take 100 20-year-olds, then the 70 Frenchmen and Germans also have to support 30 immigrants of their own age and their offspring. This creates dejection in the local population, particularly in France, Germany and the Netherlands. So they run away.”

Europe's current criteria for accepting immigrants are, (1) whether they are victims of discrimination, (2) whether they already have family in Europe, (3) if they are already in Europe they should be legalized, and (4) – and least important - that the immigrant should fit into the labor market.

Germany is just one example of a loss of billions in revenue because of the lack of qualified people. It has two million available jobs that cannot be filled, a welfare-dependent population of 6 million, and the two do not meet.

France has 2 children per woman, but out of five newborns, two are already Arabic or African. In Germany 35 per cent of all newborns already have a non-German background, and non-Germans commit 90 per cent of violent crimes. A woman in Tunisia has 1.7 children. In France she may have six because the French government pays her to have them.

Canada has a policy that is directly opposite to Europe's: every new Canadian who comes from abroad has to meet educational and professional criteria. The result is that of 100 Canadian adult immigrants, 98 have better professional qualifications than the Canadian average. In Germany and France the corresponding number is 10%.

“It started to go wrong around 1980. But the great turn in Germany came as late as 1990. That was when we opened the gates for a mass immigration of, roughly speaking, unqualified people. Between 1990 and 2002, Germany allowed an immigration of 13 million. At almost the same time it started to go wrong in France. We can only avert this burden on the welfare state through legislation. We have to pass a bill to the effect that new children born after a certain date will have to be paid for by their parents. It will be a revolution. But it is not even being discussed here in Europe.”

Professor Heinsohn is not optimistic about the future and has little advice. He would like to see a larger immigration from China but admits that the educated Chinese will not be eager to go somewhere where they will be stuck supporting an ignorant and dependent population. He discounts the possibility of armed resistance if and when European societies will collapse under the immigrant pressure – “who will be left to fight?” he asks, “The young will be gone.” He quotes a 2005 German poll that shows that 52% of the 18–32 age group want to

leave. "The only ones that are truly loyal to France, Holland, Scandinavian countries and Germany are those living off the welfare system. There is no other place in the world that will take care of them," he says.

I agree. There is little reason for optimism about Europe's future. I can only hope that America will not follow Europe's example and that while there is still time, we will realize that the system we are attempting to implement at present, one that is based on preference for the talented, intelligent, adaptable and educated will lay a foundation for a future that may be brighter than the one facing old Europe, the Continent of Losers.

-----30-----