

BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY — SPURIOUS FIGURES ON RACIAL VIOLENCE

In the Big Questions programme on Sunday 8 February 2009 much was made of the BNP website, so I looked it up. Here is an example of what you can find there.

The BNP website puts forward figures for racial violence which look authentic. The conclusion seems to be that whites are much more likely to be victims than one should expect, whereas other racial groups are less likely.

BNP considers five racial groups: white (92.4% of the general UK population), black (2.39%), Asian (4.05%) Jewish (0.53%) and others (0.63%). It accords each group an 'expectation of victimhood'. Then the BNP states the number of reported victims of racial violence: 75,912 for the whites; 7,408 for the blacks; 28,634 for the Asians; 82 for the Jews; and 10,446 for the others. BNP then calculate 'actual victimhood'.

The crux is the purported conclusion: that whites have about 33 times as many victims of racial violence as might be expected; blacks 4 times fewer, Asians about what would be expected, Jews 371 times fewer and others 3 times fewer. So the BNP want us to believe that whites by far the worst off, followed by Asians, then blacks and then Jews who have it easy.

Now let's do the sums for ourselves. We can take the UK population as 60 million, multiply by the racial proportions stated by the BNP and then divide the result into the number of victims in each group. We find that the likelihood of someone in any racial group suffering racist violence is as follows. The likelihood of a Jew suffering racial violence is 0.03% (about one in four thousand); for a 'white' person it's 0.14% (about one in seven hundred); the blacks have a 0.52% chance (one in two hundred); the Asians 1.18% (one in eighty five); and the others 2.76% (one in thirty six). So the Jews do have the best deal, but after that come the whites, the blacks come third, then the Asians who seem to be in serious danger, and finally 'others' who are by far the worst off.

I think the BNP are either knaves or fools. Either they are trying to mislead with spurious figures or they didn't get C grade or better in maths GCSE. I hope not too many people are taken in by this sort of propaganda.

JND 8 February 2009