

No Privilege, Just Words

by [Nikos Akritas](#) (January 2025)

NO PRIVILEGE
JUST WORDS

A COLLECTION OF OVER
20 BOOKS BY ETHNIC
MINORITY AUTHORS NOW
AVAILABLE IN ENFIELD
LIBRARIES



FEATURING

- RENI EDDO LODGE
- NIKESH SHUKLA
- AKALA

IN PARTNERSHIP WITH



TWOFRESH

NE~~X~~US
CONNECTING THE COMMUNITY FOR A BETTER ENFIELD

Returning to the UK briefly a few months ago the above words, displayed in large letters at the local library, caught my attention. Seeing the word 'privilege,' I automatically assumed it was an anti-white claim to equality for writers of 'colour.' However, I also hoped it literally meant what it said, or implied, through normal use of language: that the words were important, the literature itself, not the skin colour or any other identity marker of the authors.

I approached the display only to find my initial thoughts had been correct. How naive of me to hope otherwise—that people, the books, had been judged on merit rather than some prejudicial criteria.

Under the display title was written: 'a collection of over 20 books that explore race by authors who are Black, Asian and/or have an ethnic minority background.' That last clause is rather interesting as the anti-white sentiment prevalent in the UK has become de rigueur to the point of banality. [*] It means, in theory, you can be white and lack privilege, as long as you are from an ethnic minority. So basically privilege is associated with English ethnicity. Why don't they, then, advertise it as literature from non-English writers?

But could the library, in referring to authors who 'have an ethnic minority background,' be acknowledging that not all whites are privileged? Or do they mean specifically non-whites? Given the wording, would 'an ethnic minority background' include Australians, New Zealanders, Canadians, and Americans? That would assume logical consistency. Possibly, by being native English speakers, if they were white, they would also be classed as honorary English persons and therefore privileged. But many writers could be of non-British, European descent. Where would Europeans fall? In the current zeitgeist of the times Northern Europeans, such as Germans, Scandinavians and French would also be classed honorary English persons, too white to be thought of otherwise.

What about Poles? Slovaks? Ukrainians? Every bit as white as their more western European neighbours. I'm guessing they would count as being from an ethnic minority background but their skin colour still places them amongst the privileged, regardless of how poor they might be. But then why stipulate *ethnic minority background* rather than *non-white background*?

Could potential candidates include 'darker whites' from southern Europe? But then how do you know the author's shade of whiteness? Ethnic Greeks, Italians and Spaniards come in an eclectic shade of colours, ranging from stereotypical Scandinavian white with blue/green eyes and blonde hair to dark-skinned stereotypically Arab looking. Stereotypically, because in the popular imagination, including obviously



WATCH VIDEOS FROM OUR FEATURED AUTHORS



in partnership with



A COLLECTION OF OVER 20 BOOKS BY ETHNIC MINORITY AUTHORS NOW AVAILABLE IN ENFIELD LIBRARIES

patronising woke and leftist 'Orientalism,' Arabs, Middle Easterners and even Indians look a particular way—dark skinned: olive to dark brown.

According to this view I might just make it into the privileged—I mean non-privileged—in order to have the privilege of my book being displayed because my skin colour suggests I am almost always confused for Arab or Indian but my brother would not, having a whiter, 'European' skin tone. Yet we are siblings and therefore hail from the same ethnic minority. Which begs the question: who counts as white?

Is being perceived as white purely based on skin colour, implying ethnicity doesn't really matter? Or is it based on ethnicity, which should mean colour doesn't matter? A similar problem plays out from North Africa, across the Middle East, Iran, Pakistan and into India itself. Muhammad, according to Muslim tradition, was white. Would he be privileged, due to his skin colour, or not, due to his ethnicity?

It seems the current prejudice of the age is partly based on skin colour and partly on ethnicity. What it is wholly is anti-Western. For if you are white you are associated with the West, unless you have credentials proving otherwise. If you are from a particular ethnic group (regarded as part of the West) you are associated with the West—unless you are met in person and the prejudiced realise not all Westerners are white (or at least what they think of as white). But if you are in any way associated with the West, you are considered privileged, whether by skin colour or ethnic group. Which makes a nonsense of the immigration European countries have experienced over the last century. Are the children of immigrants not Western? Including those of black, brown or any other skin colour and from any ethnic background?

I have met both Americans and Indians who, because I am British, accuse my ancestors of—or hold them responsible

for-British rule in their countries, swelling with pride over uprisings against 'my' people. Oddly, my parents only came to the UK in the late 1950s and did so by virtue of being part of the British Empire. My ancestors, in fact, shared a common experience with theirs, but by virtue of my current nationality, I am associated with the oppressor not the oppressed.

They, by virtue of being descended from peoples ruled by the British, are the oppressed. According to this logic by migrating one can change one's status from oppressed to oppressor. Can it work the other way around? Given their confused thinking I am both oppressor and oppressed, or one of those or neither according to whoever is preaching at the time. An individual's actual status seems to matter little; it is group identity that we are all judged by. And so the millionaire Indian does not pay the equivalent entry fee to me to visit a national park in India, because foreign visitors can afford a higher fee but not locals, and the poor of Britain, including the descendants of those who, as children, worked in coal mines and sweeping chimneys are privileged oppressors.

Facts do not matter. Logical consistency is an aberration. Ideology is all. But ideology, with its logical inconsistencies and demonisation of 'the other', is steeped in prejudice. The current ideological prejudice is anti-Western and anti-white. It is on open display in public libraries, universities, the media and government institutions. Its influence, especially through legislation, now affects the private sector.

Western societies, through the befuddled ignorance of politicians bowing to pressure from 'social justice' activists and virtue signaling 'liberals' have become anti-Western and anti-white, openly and proudly. Such open prejudice against groups of people used to be, not long ago, abhorred, seen for the vile inhumanity it bore. Since it is so open, why aren't

we more honest about what we stand for in the West? We do not believe in equal worth, nor do we aspire to the UN declaration of human rights. We do practise racism and bigotry: a reversal of Said's *Orientalism*—an Occidentalism that vilifies the West. If you are seen as belonging to this vilified group, what you say or claim doesn't matter. We know what you really mean and, as a consequence, are perfectly justified in punishing you. Know your place.

What we are witnessing is, in essence, a new type of dhimmitude. Those labeled *privileged* must know their place – not judged by their deeds but by an imposed identity. That place is one of unequal status. Their words – and any other achievements – are no longer of equal merit.

[*] A few years ago, I contacted the BBC regarding a comedy sketch on the show *Famalam* featuring black chefs cooking *white people's chicken*. The sketch centred on using no ingredients to flavour the chicken and simply putting it in the oven as it was. The BBC maintained that no offence was intended. However, I pointed out my concern was not about offence, but about the double standards regarding what the BBC deemed acceptable. I proposed a hypothetical sketch featuring white chefs cooking *black people's chicken*. Regardless of how it was portrayed, such a concept would never be allowed to air. In response, they claimed the sketch was satire. Yet, could the actors of my proposed sketch also claim satire? I wonder.

[Table of Contents](#)

[Nikos Akritas](#) has worked as a teacher in the Middle East, Central Asia and the UK.

Follow NER on Twitter [@NERIconoclast](#)